tend a monopoly grip on the Nation's breadbasket. They are striving constantly to eliminate the small operator."

John Dasch reported on the case of a Polk County farmer who had 35 lambs ready for market. When he sought permission of the OPA to slaughter them, he was told he could not do so without a quota and he would not be allowed a quota inasmuch as he had not had one a year ago. (He had had no lambs in 1944.)

MESSAGE TO PATTON

It was decided to send a message to President Patton outlining the specific OPA regulations affecting meat, poultry, and dairy products which are the cause of so much of the present confusion. President Wendell Barnett appointed a committee consisting of Messrs. Schlicker, Davis, Libby, and Ahrens to serve on a committee to draft this message.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, as I said the other day, if anyone thinks I like to stand up here day after day and continually plead for a protection of the food supply of this country, he is mistaken. Yet I know of no domestic issue more vital to the security of our Nation than the protection of our food supply. It is not being protected by Mr. Chester Bowles. If Mr. Chester Bowles would pay more attention to the problems of OPA and less to his well-known endeavors to become Governor of the State of Connecticut I think we might have a more efficient administration of OPA.

I happen to be one, Mr. President, who is such a firm believer that unanswerable facts will prevail, that I intend to continue to put into the RECORD for use by the officials of Government an accumulation of evidence which unquestionably supports one conclusion, Mr. President, and that is that OPA, by the order it issued last Saturday, is solely responsible for the continued wastage of meat in the State of Oregon. I do not think either OPA or this administration, from the President down, can justify that wastage of meat to any American consumer.

I do not know how long it is going to take me to win this battle or in what form final victory will take. I do know that a very powerful Democrat from the State of Oregon called me today, and he said, "Wayne, if you continue to hammer on the failure of the Democratic Party to solve this problem in Oregon there will be no Democratic Party left in Oregon." He sees the problem and told me I am absolutely right. He said that his party should be fair enough to recognize it. He recognizes that there is no case that can be made out by this administration for the great malfeasance of OPA in regard to the handling of the Oregon lamb problem.

Mr. President, the solution is a very simple one. And it can be solved in 5 minutes by Mr. Chester Bowles. All Mr. Chester Bowles has to do is to amend the order of last Saturday providing that ration points shall be lifted on all soft lambs as recommended by the Secretary of Agriculture last Friday. You recall that the Secretary of Agriculture, in his telephonic communication to my colleague the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON], authorized Senator CORDON to announce on the part of the Secretary of Agriculture that he had recommended to OPA the lifting of ration points on all—a-l-l—all soft lambs. The Senators from Oregon took the Secretary of Agriculture at his word. We now expect him to keep that word and demonstrate that he has done all he can to get OPA to carry out his recommendation. That recommendation last Friday did not exempt choice and good lambs. I call upon the Secretary of Agriculture to now back up his recommendation and not back down on it.

Mr. President, my 5 minutes are up. I ask OPA to carry out the recommendation which the Secretary of Agriculture made last Friday.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. CONNALLY, from the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Edwin F. Stanton, of California, now a foreign-service officer of class 2 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general; and

George Gregg Fuller, of California, now a foreign-service officer of class 4 and a secretary in the diplomatic service, to be also a consul general.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

Farrell D. Coyle, of Apponaug, R. I., to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Rhode Island, to fill an existing vacancy.

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

Theron Lamar Caudle, of North Carolina, to be an Assistant Attorney General, vice Tom C. Clark, resigned;

Harold William Judson, of California, to be Assistant Solicitor General of the United States, vice Hugh B. Cox, resigned; and

Alphonse Roy, of New Hampshire, to be United States marshal for the district of New Hampshire, vice John M. Guay, term expired.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

RECESS

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Texas?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. With the hope that I will be received more cordially by the Senate than I was a little while ago, Mr. President, I now move that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, Friday, July 27, 1945, at 11 o'clock a. m.

SENATE

FRIDAY, JULY 27, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, July 9, 1945)

The Senate met in executive session at 11 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

Almighty God, our Father, Thy love alone is the flame by which we kindle the altar fires of our conquering hopes. Make us ever mindful that upon the free soil of this continent our fathers with holy toil reared a house of faith hallowed by Thy name. Make us so to believe in America that we shall covet for the whole earth its emancipating truth and light. Launching a great spiritual venture, may our faith master our fears as we join men of good will in creating new instruments of global order. Forbid that we should succeed in putting the foes of our common humanity in chains and yet fail to confess and to curb the besetting sins which lay waste our own lives.

In this solemn hour as the despairing and sorely wounded world waits for the voice of this land of our hope and prayer—

"O God of earth and altar,
Bow down and hear our cry,
Our earthly rulers falter,
Our people drift and die.

"The walls of gold entomb us,
The swords of scorn divide;
Take not Thy thunder from us,
But take away our pride."

In the Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. HILL, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Thursday, July 26, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following business was transacted:

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER—PETITION

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD in connection with the proceedings on the adoption of the United Nations Charter, a petition, without the signatures attached, I have received from citizens of Wichita, Kans., appealing to the Senate to approve the Charter.

There being no objection, the petition presented by Mr. CAPPER was received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD without the signatures attached, as follows:

FAIRVIEW CHRISTIAN CHURCH,
Wichita, Kans., June 22, 1945.

Senator ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Chamber, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPPER: It is the conviction of the undersigned that the adoption of the Charter of the United Nations by the United States will contribute effectively toward insuring a just and enduring peace among the peoples and nations of the world.

CREATION OF BUREAU IN AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT FOR WORK IN AGRICULTURAL STATISTICS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference, and to have printed in the RECORD, a resolution adopted by the North Central Association of State Commissioners, Directors, and Secretaries of Agriculture at Topeka, Kans., on July 23, requesting the Secretary of Agriculture to create a separate bureau for the work in agricultural statistics. I heartily commend the suggestion.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

There being no objection, the resolution was received, referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

RESOLUTION ADOPTED BY THE NORTH CENTRAL ASSOCIATION OF STATE COMMISSIONERS, DIRECTORS, AND SECRETARIES OF AGRICULTURE, JULY 9–11, 1945

"We deplore the confusion caused producers by conflicting statistical estimates and reports by various governmental agencies. We recommend that all such statistical information be analyzed and disseminated through one official statistical agency, be it resolved that the Honorable Clinton P. Anderson, Secretary of Agriculture, be requested to create a separate bureau for the work in agricultural statistics, within the Department so as to separate this work from planning and program making agencies and to provide for more effective cooperation with the States and a more comprehensive service to agriculture."

The foregoing resolution was unanimously approved by the Kansas State Board of Agriculture at its quarterly meeting at Topeka, Kans., July 23, 1945.

J. C. MOHLER, *Secretary.*

REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. HILL, from the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 129) to provide for the barring of certain claims by the United States in connection with Government checks and warrants, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 550) thereon.

REPORT OF SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES (PT. 3 OF REPT. NO. 47)

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, from the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises, I ask unanimous consent to submit, pursuant to Senate Resolution 28, Seventy-ninth Congress, extending Senate Resolution 298, Seventy-sixth Congress, a report entitled "Impact of Reconversion Policies on Small Business."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the report will be received and printed.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. SMITH:

S. 1319. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Alice Condon; to the Committee on Claims.

(Mr. MEAD introduced Senate bill 1320, which was referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and appears under a separate heading.)

By Mr. WAGNER:

S. 1321. A bill to authorize the cancellation of deportation proceedings in the case of Ancieto Zacevich or Anicento Zacevich or Ernest Zacevich; to the Committee on Immigration.

By Mr. McCARRAN (by request):

S. 1322. A bill to amend the Trading With the Enemy Act, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EASTLAND:

S. 1323. A bill for the relief of the estate of William Carl Jones; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McFARLAND (for himself and Mr. HAYDEN):

S. 1324. A bill to amend title V of the Servicemen's Readjustment Act of 1944; to the Committee on Finance.

SMALL BUSINESS FINANCE CORPORATION

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce for appropriate reference a bill which I believe to be of the utmost importance to small business. As a Member of the House of Representatives, I introduced a bill similar in intent in 1936, and again in 1939 and 1941 as a Member of the Senate.

I shall not take the time now to discuss the bill, but I desire to state that it has the endorsement of members of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve, and of experts in the field of finance. I trust that the bill will be favorably reported, and that Congress will enact it in the very near future.

There being no objection, the bill (S. 1320) to provide for the reconversion of small industries to civilian production, to expedite the reentry into business of small businessmen whose businesses have been curtailed or closed because of war emergencies, to aid men and women of our armed forces and others who desire to enter into business on their own after the war, and to encourage the free flow of American capital into small and intermediate-sized enterprises by the establishment of a permanent Small Business Finance Corporation within the Federal Reserve System to assist financing institutions in making short- and long-term credit available to small and intermediate-sized enterprises, introduced by Mr. MEAD, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

ULTIMATUM TO JAPAN—EDITORIAL FROM THE WASHINGTON POST

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, supplementing the brief remarks I made yesterday, found on page 8089 of the proceedings of the Senate in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, which had to do with the ultimatum sent to Japan by the President of the United States, the Prime Minister of Great Britain, and the President of the Republic of China, which, as I said yesterday, defines the term "unconditional surrender," I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in my remarks an editorial found in the Washington Post of this morning which corroborates some of the statements I made. I particularly should like to call attention to one paragraph, which is as follows:

The final paragraph of the document—

Referring to the ultimatum—

is the most important of all. Here at last the vexatious formula "unconditional surrender" is defined.

I ask unanimous consent that the entire editorial be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

TERMS TO JAPAN

The conditions of peace offered to Japan by President Truman, the Government of Great Britain and Marshal Chiang Kai-shek are, it seems to us, a stroke of high statesmanship. A way now seems open to the Japanese to capitulate on terms that will preserve their national entity and to a certain extent their national dignity. The document in which the conditions are set forth is described, no doubt for propaganda purposes, as an "ultimatum," but what it amounts to is the offer of an armistice on terms which the Japanese must accept or reject in toto.

The final paragraph of the document is the most important of all. Here at last the vexatious formula "unconditional surrender" is defined. It is now plainly shown to mean not the total surrender of the Japanese people, nor even of the Japanese Government, but simply an order from the Japanese Government to the Japanese armed forces to cease hostilities and to lay down their arms. By accepting these terms Japan, it would seem, can save not only her national existence, but to a considerable degree her precious "face." She can accept the status of a defeated but not a broken nation.

The first point, calling for the extirpation of the "authority and influence of those who have deceived and misled the people of Japan," significantly and deliberately omits any mention of the Japanese Emperor. But elsewhere the document speaks of "self-willed militaristic advisers." This point, taken in conjunction with later clauses referring to "freedom of worship" and to a government freely chosen by the Japanese people, would seem to leave a possibility for the preservation of the Emperor, at least in the capacity of a national and religious symbol.

The article providing for the occupation of the Japanese homeland by Allied forces until the other terms of the armistice are fulfilled, was, of course, to have been anticipated, and it was probably anticipated by the Japanese themselves. The next point, reiterating the terms of the Cairo declaration that the Japanese must surrender all territories save the islands of their own archipelago and "such minor islands as we determine," is perhaps the weakest of the lot, since it leaves many questions—for example, the disposition of the Kuriles—in abeyance. It is possible that, as concerns the territorial question in the Far East, the statesmen are still without a clearly defined policy or program, and this is highly unfortunate, since a patchwork settlement would certainly sow the seeds of future troubles.

The assurance that the Japanese soldiers, after putting aside their arms, will be permitted to return home and will not be molested there is wise and magnanimous. It reveals a close understanding of Japanese psychology, for the spiritual attachment of the Japanese to his native place is both profound and intense. The provision for the punishment of war criminals and of Japanese officers or guards who have been guilty of brutalities toward Allied prisoners is not only just in itself, but also necessary to make the terms palatable to Americans whose memory of the Bataan death march and other incidents is still vivid.

The economic provisions are highly important. The promise that Japan shall be permitted to retain such industries "as will sustain her economy and permit the exaction of just reparations in kind," and the guaranty that Japanese industry will be given access to raw materials and ultimately permitted to participate in world trade, hold out the hope of early economic reconstruction. Doubtless these were inserted to strengthen the peace party in Japan, which is said to comprise most of the industrial and business leaders.

The promise that all Allied troops will be evacuated from the Japanese homeland as soon as these conditions have been fulfilled and "a peacefully inclined and responsible government," representing "the freely expressed will of the Japanese people," estab-

lished, may be interpreted as yet another guaranty of Japanese national sovereignty. In sum, it seems to us that this settlement of terms has brought peace in the Far East and peace on earth measurably nearer.

HOUSING FACILITIES AT COLLEGES FOR VETERANS WITH FAMILIES

Mr. MAYBANK. Mr. President, in view of the fact that I have had considerable correspondence in connection with the GI bill of rights educational program, and in view of the fact that many colleges throughout the United States are not equipped, or certainly not fully equipped to permit large numbers of men who are married and who have children to be quartered on the campus, I have taken the matter up with Commissioner Foley, of the Federal Housing Administration, and he has assured me that everything possible would be done by the Federal Housing Administration to provide housing facilities for the returning veterans so they can complete their education. I ask unanimous consent to have a letter which Commissioner Foley wrote me printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

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

FEDERAL HOUSING ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, D. C., July 26, 1945.

Hon. BURNET R. MAYBANK,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MAYBANK: I appreciate very much your calling to my attention the problems involved in furnishing housing for our returning veterans, who will seek to continue their education under the provisions of the so-called GI bill of rights, in connection with housing situations in various colleges and university communities.

Please let me assure you that the Federal Housing Administration will be keenly interested in any opportunity to be of service, and especially in this particularly appealing area of the veterans' problems. I have requested that study be made within the agency to determine as fully as possible in what ways the authorities we have may be made useful. From time to time I will advise you and hope to have the benefit of your counsel in this and other matters.

Sincerely yours,
RAYMOND M. FOLEY,
Commissioner.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR THOMAS OF UTAH ON RAISING THE MINIMUM WAGE

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement made by him relating to Senate bill 1282, providing for raising the minimum wage from 40 to 60 cents an hour, which appears in the Appendix.]

TRIAL OF WAR CRIMINALS

[Mr. THOMAS of Utah asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter dated May 22, 1945, addressed to Field Marshal Jan Christiaan Smuts, on the subject of the trial of war criminals, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER—STATEMENT BY THE CATHOLIC ASSOCIATION FOR INTERNATIONAL PEACE

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a statement concerning the United Nations Charter by the postwar world commitee of the Catholic Association for International Peace, which appears in the Appendix.]

RELATION BETWEEN ECONOMIC CONDITIONS IN UNITED STATES AND INTERNATIONAL ECONOMIC PROBLEMS

[Mr. MURRAY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD quotations from leading authorities on the relation between economic conditions in the United States and international economic problems, which appear in the Appendix.]

POSTWAR EMPLOYMENT POLICY—ADDRESS BY JOHN H. G. PIERSON

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an address on the subject of postwar employment policy, delivered by John H. G. Pierson at the University of Michigan Extension Service meeting, Detroit, Mich., on June 22, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

FOR ARMY-NAVY MERGER—EDITORIAL FROM ST. LOUIS POST-DISPATCH

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an editorial entitled "For Army-Navy Merger" from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, of July 22, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE AMERICAN INDIAN

[Mr. BUSHFIELD asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Set the American Indians Free," written by O. K. Armstrong and published in the Reader's Digest for August 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

A BILL OF DUTIES—ARTICLE BY JOHN KIRLAND CLARK

[Mr. WAGNER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "A Bill of Duties," written by John Kirland Clark, and published in the May 1945 issue of the Bar Bulletin of the New York County Lawyers' Association, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PRESIDENTIAL SUCCESSION—ARTICLE BY CHARLES WARREN

[Mr. GREEN asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by Charles Warren entitled "The Presidential Succession—Why the Existing Statute of 1886 Was Enacted," which appears in the Appendix.]

MEDICINE AND THE WAR—ARTICLE FROM JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION

[Mr. WILLIS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article entitled "Medicine and the War," published in the Journal of the American Medical Association for July 14, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty, Executive F (79th Cong., 1st sess.), the Charter of the United Nations, with the Statute of the International Court of Justice annexed thereto, formulated at the United Nations Conference on International Organization and signed at San Francisco on June 26, 1945.

Mr. TUNNELL obtained the floor.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

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

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	O'Daniel
Andrews	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gurney	Overton
Ball	Hart	Pepper
Bankhead	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hayden	Robertson
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Saltonstall
Briggs	Hoey	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Burton	Kilgore	Taft
Bushfield	La Follette	Taylor
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	McCarran	Tobey
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Carville	McFarland	Tydings
Chandler	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	McMahon	Wagner
Connally	Magnuson	Walsh
Cordon	Maybank	Wheeler
Donnell	Mead	Wherry
Downey	Millikin	White
Eastland	Mitchell	Wiley
Ellender	Moore	Willis
Ferguson	Morse	Wilson
Fulbright	Murdock	Young
George	Murray	
Gerry	Myers	

Mr. HILL. I announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is necessarily absent.

Mr. WHERRY. The Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is absent on official business.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness.

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is necessarily absent.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Many Senators have inquired of me about the prospects for a final vote on the treaty. I think no one will feel that we have tried to rush the debate or hurry it, or shut off any Senator, but I think the general feeling among Senators is that we would like to conclude the debate tomorrow, and in my opinion that is well within the possibilities.

I merely rise at this time to say that I hope Senators will be willing to remain in session until at least 7 o'clock this evening and to meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow, in the hope that we may finish consideration of the treaty. A little later in the day I hope to be able to secure an agreement from the Senators who contemplate speaking that we may vote at, say, not later than 5 o'clock tomorrow; but I shall not make that suggestion now. I hope it will be in the minds of Senators, because without in any way running out on the treaty or the debate or the situation, many Senators would like if possible to leave on their vacations Sunday.

Two or three of us will have to be in session next Wednesday, which will be the 1st of August, in order that we may adopt a motion formally adjourning until the 8th of October, but other Senators who will not be required to be present can be free to leave as soon as we have disposed of the treaty. I hope that during the day it may be possible to secure an agreement for a vote finally tomorrow,

and that we may remain in session today until 7 o'clock, and that it will be agreeable to meet tomorrow at 10 o'clock. So far as I know there will be no committees in session tomorrow, and we can afford to meet at 10.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. WHITE. I share the hopes of the majority leader. The debate on the charter has occupied a week, and there has been a serious discussion of every phase of the problem that is presented to us. It is pretty difficult to conceive that anything new can now be said. I very much hope that the Senate will remain in session until 7 o'clock this evening, that we may meet at 10 o'clock tomorrow morning, and I hope that during tomorrow, or even later today, it may be found possible to reach an agreement as to a time for a final vote on the Charter. I understand the Senator from Kentucky is not undertaking to fix such a time at the moment.

Mr. BARKLEY. No.

Mr. AIKEN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield to me?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. AIKEN. I wish to ask the majority leader if there is any likelihood of calling the calendar again or taking up numerous items of last-minute legislation before the recess is taken. I am not asking that that be done.

Mr. BARKLEY. If possible I should be glad to cooperate to dispose of any essential legislation, but it was pretty well understood that we had cleaned up the calendar before we entered upon the consideration of the treaty, and I myself would hesitate to open up the avenue for a lot of last-minute legislation that can go over until the Senate returns in October.

Mr. AIKEN. I hope the majority leader will stick to that idea.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

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

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield to the Senator from Maine.

Mr. WHITE. Again I want to express my concurrence in what has been said. I hope the majority leader will adhere to the position he has just expressed. The difficulty is that when we start opening up the program, when we start reaching back into the calendar, bringing forward measures and asking unanimous consent for consideration of this and of that, all the fences are down, and we cannot logically or justifiably object to the consideration of matters that other Senators may think important. It will be just an endless chain if we once begin doing that. So I hope the Senator from Kentucky will stand firmly against opening up the program, and that he will not ask for a further call of the calendar at this time.

Mr. McCLELLAN. Mr. President, I have been on my feet waiting for an opportunity to ask the Senator from Delaware to yield. I will say that the information which has been afforded is what I wanted to obtain.

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

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say, Mr. President, that I have cooperated and shall endeavor to cooperate with the majority leader so long as the present debate continues. However, I think it is only fair to say to the majority leader that I shall object to any unanimous-consent request for limitation of debate on the charter, because I think we must guarantee that this forum shall remain an open forum. I had a little experience last night with throttling attempts to close this forum, and I shall endeavor to keep the forum open as long as a unanimous consent is required to limit debate. Therefore, I shall object to unanimous consent for limitation of debate on the Charter.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Delaware yield further?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. I do not suggest any limitation on debate. We all want the Senate to remain an open forum. It is an open forum. What I suggested was that we remain in session later tonight and meet earlier tomorrow in the hope that we might vote on the treaty tomorrow afternoon. That in no way seeks to limit any Senator in the length of his speech on the treaty, but I think it would be in accordance with the wishes of the vast majority of the Senators if we could conclude action on the treaty tomorrow.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I will say to the majority leader that I shall be very glad to stay as long tonight, and to meet as early tomorrow morning as the majority leader wishes. I understood him to say, however, that he wanted the Senate sometime today to enter into a unanimous-consent agreement as to some hour tomorrow when the Senate should vote on the charter, and to such unanimous-consent agreement I will not consent.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, the minority leader has just said that this has been a serious debate, and perhaps more than any other debate since the debate on the League of Nations it merits being serious.

Those who have been inclined to criticize the Charter of the United Nations have said that the charter is the result of propaganda. Apparently that statement is made with the idea of convincing the world that our representatives at the San Francisco Conference were influenced by propaganda. I look at the matter from a little different point of view than that taken by the critics. I do not believe that 50 or 51 nations have been influenced by propaganda along the same line. I desire to congratulate the members of our delegation from the United States Senate in particular, because we have heard more respecting their activities and their work at San Francisco than that of the others. It seems to me we can determine now that they were not influenced by propaganda, but were influenced by a desire to please the peoples of the world by complying with their demands. Perhaps never in the history of the world has there been such a universal desire for any peace proposal as that which now exists for adoption of this charter. In other words, so many different nations have asked for and have agreed to this charter that one cannot think of any program of propaganda that could have influenced such an enormous body of people or such numerous bodies.

I shall speak for a few minutes on the debate which arose a couple of days ago with reference to article 43. It seems to me that when the charter is approved by the Senate there is a clear agreement or undertaking "to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security." When the charter is approved by the Senate we shall have agreed to that. Just what is meant by an agreement seems to be the issue about which individuals differ. I looked in the dictionary this morning and I saw that a treaty means an agreement between independent states. I do not know whether we can say that the Security Council is an independent state; I do not know whether we can attribute to the Security Council sovereignty such as is required for the making of a treaty.

When our Constitution was adopted the States agreed to relinquish their power to make treaties with other nations. The right to make a treaty is one of the things which the sovereign States of the American Union relinquished, and it is specifically so provided. Are we going to agree voluntarily that the Security Council has greater power, has more authority, and higher sovereignty than a sovereign State of the United States At this time are we going to limit the United States to dealing with the Security Council on the basis of an independent state? It seems to me that those who have injected the idea that such an agreement must necessarily be a treaty are treading on dangerous ground, because in that way we may be placing the Security Council on a higher plane that it was ever intended to be placed by the writers of this treaty. At any rate, if we are going to say that it has the power of dealing as an independent state, as a treaty-making power, we are going to admit that it is a super-government; and there are those who have criticized that provision. I do not think it was intended to be a super-government.

I believe that the meaning of article 43 is clear. There is a treaty which we are now ratifying, or an agreement which we are ratifying with all the formality of a treaty, in which we agree to furnish armed forces, assistance, and facilities. That agreement is being made by the United States, a sovereign power, with other sovereign powers, and they agree to do certain things, the extent of which is to be determined by an agreement. I see nothing in the language of article 43, or any other language in the Charter, which would indicate that by agreeing to the number of the armed

forces, their general location, the degree of readiness, and the nature of the facilities, we must recognize the Security Council as an independent state. It is provided that this agreement must be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council; and if a member desires to participate in the decision of the Security Council concerning the employment of the contingent of armed forces——

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

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I should like to inquire of the Senator if it is his understanding of the word "agreements" that the Security Council members are to sign such agreements with the sovereign states?

Mr. TUNNELL. The provision is that the agreements shall be made with the Security Council:

> The agreement or agreements shall be negotiated as soon as possible on the initiative of the Security Council. They shall be concluded between the Security Council and Members——

Mr. BUSHFIELD. Is it the Senator's understanding, then, that members of the Security Council should sign the agreements?

Mr. TUNNELL. The agreements must be concluded between the Security Council and the members, of which the United States will be one if we ratify the treaty. That is my understanding.

Mr. BUSHFIELD. I thank the Senator.

Mr. TUNNELL. That is a phase of the situation to which I wished to call the attention of the Senate at this time, because it occurs to me that, there being nothing but an agreement as to readiness, general location, and nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided, since we have agreed in a treaty that we will furnish such assistance, the agreement with the Security Council simply determines the amount of the assistance, as I understand; and I do not believe that such an agreement should be given the sanctity of a treaty, because I think there are implications in that position to which we might hesitate to agree.

The Constitution, when it took from the States the right to make treaties, agreements, or contracts with foreign powers, showed that the Federal Government was the only organization in our United States which could make a treaty.

There is a world sentiment around this charter. It is considered to be absolutely essential to the happiness of the world. I believe that that sentiment is one of the things which are referred to as propaganda. I believe that our delegates have recognized such a sentiment in the world. There are those who take the position that the United States cannot do this.

With reference to the Charter, I am receiving a great deal of mail claiming that the public sentiment which exists for the charter is the result of propaganda, and will therefore be very temporary. One is caused to wonder, sometimes, why there should be this propaganda against the Charter. Who pays for the printed material which is sent out? Who pays those who are propagandizing Senators? I can see why a person who is imbued with the idea that the peace of the world depends on the ratification of this Charter might spend some money. I am not in a position to see why a person, a company, or an organization should send out material such as this:

> Any appropriation made by Congress to finance an unconstitutional act (one passed by our representatives in the Senate in violation of their oaths of office) is equally unconstitutional, and it is the privilege of the people to refuse to contribute to the support of such legislation.

In other words, according to this sort of propaganda, each of us is to judge whether this act is constitutional or not; and if we decide that it is not, we can refuse to participate in the taxes by which it is to be supported. This article is clearly treasonable and intended to incite rebellion against the acts of Congress. The fact that some person or organization is willing to spend money for the purpose of inciting treason is worthy of some investigation. I do not see why anyone should spend money for that purpose. I do not see the motive. Certainly we cannot believe that the delegates at San Francisco were not either sufficiently able or conscientious to place in the Charter all the safeguards which they thought necessary. Material is being sent out advising the people of the Nation not to submit. If each person is to determine for himself what acts of Congress are constitutional and what acts are unconstitutional, and each person is to be permitted to ignore the acts of Congress and resist the collection of taxes, then, indeed, we shall have no government.

The propaganda about which these traitors complain began a long time ago. They are complaining about propaganda. Now, in all seriousness, the people of the United States want this Charter. One of the first things which led to their wanting it was the First World War. Advertising by newspapers, the news advices with reference to the League of Nations, caused millions of people to believe in some kind of world organization for peace. It began with the speeches and acts of those Members of the Senate who opposed the League of Nations and prevented the membership of the United States in that league. That caused quite a little sentiment in favor of an international organization. That attitude on the part of the opponents of the League of Nations aroused a great deal of public sentiment for the League at that time. The propaganda about which they now complain was aided by the Selective Service System, when it became necessary to take our boys from their homes, from their farms and workshops, and place them in the armed forces of the United States. From millions of homes the father, the brother, the husband, or some other member of the family has been taken by the armed forces and sent away, and that has caused people all over the portion of the world where any form of selective service is used to study how that could be avoided. It has caused people seriously to consider it. Each one of us has received messages asking that something be done to make this impossible, so that their homes might not again be broken up; so that their homes might not lose some of their members, either temporarily or permanently.

People began to see just what opposition to the League of Nations was meaning to them personally. That made propaganda unnecessary. The destruction of American lives and property at Pearl Harbor helped to remove the necessity for propaganda. Public sentiment very quickly centered around the thought as to why we had not joined the League to try to prevent the death of our boys and the destruction of our property. The casualty lists of more than a million from the beaches and battlefields of France and Okinawa and Iwo Jima have helped to make propaganda unnecessary. The opponents of world cooperation fired their blasts of malice and hatred at an enfeebled old man. They destroyed him, but their shots also struck millions of the flower of the young manhood of the world in World War II. The partisan ambition which entered into the opposition to world cooperation after World War I found a fitting successor in the ambitions of Hirohito, Mussolini, and Adolf Hitler for world domination. The partisans of America fought for party victory; sacrificed the world for partisan victory. The implacable hatred of the enemies of Woodrow Wilson in 1919 had a fighting counterpart in the hatreds of the leaders of totalitarian government as represented by the Axis Powers. Those acts and those sentiments have been the cause of public determination that an effort shall be made to protect the innocent of the world against mass murder; and this time there is no partisanship.

The Charter of the United Nations begins with the following words:

> We the peoples of the United Nations determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war, which twice in our lifetime has brought untold sorrow to mankind.

Mr. President, is this a laudable motive? What does modern warfare mean? There was a time when a David and a Goliath met to represent the strength of contending armies and to fight individual battles. Civilians were not greatly affected by that kind of war. Today, war is waged between whole peoples; this war is a war of the whole world. Every nation has felt the pinch of World War II, regardless of whether it is an active combatant. This is not a war of contending armies. It is a war in which the most powerful chemicals known to man are turned against the civilian populations of the world. This is a war in which contending armies may not see each other. It is a war in which destruction may come from beneath the sea or from the heavens. It is a war in which civilian women and children are in equal or greater danger than are the military forces. It is a war in which more homes have been affected, more sorrow engendered, more blood shed, and a greater number of civilians starved and mistreated than ever before at any other time in the history of the world. The future gives assurance of even greater weapons of destruction, greater losses of

life and property, greater blasting of human ambition, greater destruction of the instruments of civilization, and greater paralysis of human progress.

Early Americans believed that mankind was entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The writers of the United Nations Charter state that they are determined to "reaffirm faith in fundamental human rights, in the dignity and worth of the human person, in the equal rights of men and women and of nations, large and small." What fundamental human rights are secure today? Who knows when or how or where his supposed rights are to be violated? What nation, large or small, can withstand the attacks of the remainder of the world? As we go through such cities as Munich or Cologne and look at the deserted streets, the debris in the homes, houses in which civilization once existed, but in which nothing, not even rats, now live, one looks forward with dread to what might in some future day be the fate of our own America. So, Mr. President, it is not strange that there has arisen this wonderful sentiment throughout the world for something to prevent a repetition of what has been suffered in the past.

We are told that one of the purposes of the United Nations Charter is to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties and other source of international law may be maintained. Treaties are no longer guaranties of the security of rights. Treaties have become scraps of paper. Declarations of war are unnecessary. No longer is it considered even desirable for aggressor nations to maintain any decent respect for the opinions of mankind. The founders of our Nation respected the opinions of mankind. The world is subject now to organized power applied by the whims of ruthless dictators. The Charter seeks to reestablish respect not alone for the rights of mankind, and for nations both large and small, but it seeks also to reestablish a decent respect for the opinions of mankind. It seeks to reestablish the power of right over might.

We are told by the Charter that the peoples of the United Nations are determined to unite their strength for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security. Heretofore, each individual nation was compelled to try to maintain its own peace and security. The greatest armies, navies, and air forces of the world have now been voluntarily injected into the fight to establish international peace and security.

The United Nations Charter seeks to maintain international peace and security after it has been established. If this could have been done before, untold millions would have been saved from suffering, and untold millions who are now dead would be enjoying life. Our forces were not united or applied for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security but to establish peace and security after it had been violated by those who ignored the moral and religious principles of the world.

Again we are told by the Charter that the peoples of the United Nations are determined that armed forces shall not be used except in the common interest. That indeed is a departure. The armed forces which have been assembling around the world shall now, under the charter, be used in the common interest. Violations of the peace of nations are based upon the same indifference to the rules of right and wrong as are violations of international rights. The movements are merely on a larger scale. The principles involved are the same. When armed force is used to violate the principles of justice in small segments of the world, or of its populations, whole nations later become involved. Later the world becomes involved. The origin is the same in principle, as that which in the case of a violation of law leads to the arrest of a disturber of the peace anywhere in the world.

The Charter of the United Nations says that we, the peoples of the United Nations, are determined to employ international machinery for the promotion of the economic and social advancement of all people. Mr. President, two-thirds of the entire population of the world live in Asia where the standards of living are low, where starvation is prevalent, where life is short and is not safeguarded by scientific or economic rules. The 400,000,000 inhabitants of India, as well as the 700,000,000 inhabitants of China, are examples of the possibility of the employment of international machinery for the promotion of economic and social advancement.

I remember that a great many years ago a man in my State said that he had decided to build a public road in such a manner as to permit the payment of a reasonable return on the investment. There were those who thought that he was a dreamer. I heard him state at the time that if a similar strip of land had been reserved along Fifth Avenue in New York City it would today pay all the taxes of greater New York. I refer to this as one of the possibilities of social advancement. I believe that it is possible to aid in social advancement in such a way as to pay a reasonable return on the investment.

The United Nations Charter, Mr. President, goes beyond the selfish advancement toward which each nation can and should strive. The charter is for the advancement of the social and economic progress of all peoples.

It is not my purpose to discuss the instrument by which these fundamental rights of humanity shall be recognized. I do not intend to discuss at length the General Assembly, the Security Council, the Economic Social Council, the Trusteeship Council, the International Court of Justice, or the Secretariat. It is sufficient for me to say that each of those organizations have specific purposes for which they are to be used, and that each of them has met the test of serious and successive challenges. They have been discussed ably and at length by Members of this body who were delegates to the San Francisco Conference. They have also been discussed by the representatives of the small nations.

Strange to say, there are in the United States many critics who claim that the charter is not fair to the small nations. I do not know about that, but I believe that unless something is done for them the small nations will take the course which has been taken by Estonia, Latvia, and Lithuania. I think that the small nations see the course of their future unless something is done to aid them. In other words, I believe that the small nations have very sensibly signed this charter, and are ready to become members of the world organization because they realize, just as we realize, that large nations and small nations are all in danger if combinations of nations, such as have been made in the two world wars, are to continue without restraint. It is not a case of wanting to do something; we must do something. It is not a case of something being desirable; it is absolutely necessary.

Mr. President, the various phases of the charter have been discussed ably and at length by the Members of this body who were our United States delegates to the San Francisco Conference. They have told us of their efforts, and the means by which the requirements to which I have referred are to be accomplished.

One hundred and sixty-nine years ago the people of the United States believed that all men are created equal, and that all men are entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

I shall not at any length discuss the standpoint of those who favor the Charter. They are too numerous, indeed, nobody attempts to deny that they constitute a very large proportion of the American people at this time.

It is not my intention to enter into any minute description of the United Nations Charter itself or accurately to describe its workings. It may be sufficient to say that the Charter is the product of centuries of thought and the result of untold bloodshed and suffering. Its purpose, among others, is to prevent the repetition of wars which have been so devastating to the world and which threatened to destroy civilization.

My purpose at this time is to answer some of the particular objections which have been made to the ratification of the Charter. The Senate Foreign Relations Committee, of which I am a member, devoted several days to hearing witnesses who desired to express themselves either favorably or unfavorably as to the ratification of the Charter.

The first objection made was in the nature of a charge on the part of some of the witnesses appearing before the committee that the treaty was being railroaded through the Foreign Relations Committee. The truth is that this whole matter has been considered by all of the United Nations since the beginning of World War II. The Dumbarton Oaks proposals were submitted to the world on October 9, 1944, and the delegations to the San Francisco Conference spent more than 8 weeks discussing the provisions of the Charter. These discussions were widely publicized by the press and there has been no attempt to keep anything relating to the subject secret from the American people. After the charter was submitted to the Senate, a full week elapsed before a hearing was had by the Foreign Relations Committee. The committee devoted all of a week to

the hearings, and would have devoted twice that amount of time had it been either necessary or desirable to do so. A record has been made of the testimony of all who appeared before the committee. I have received many communications, from people in my home State in particular, expressing a desire to have the charter ratified speedily.

It was feared that any speed over the protest of those desiring to be heard would be considered as unseemingly and would in fact be in the nature of railroading. Nothing of this sort can truthfully be charged. Exactly the opposite course was taken, and the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee tells me that every person who asked for a hearing and who presented himself or herself for a hearing has been heard.

Again it is contended that the Charter does not provide for easy amendment. The charter provides, by article 108 that "amendments to the present Charter shall come into force for all members when they have been adopted by a vote of two-thirds of the members of the General Assembly and ratified with their constitutional processes by two-thirds of the members of the United Nations, which must include all of the permanent members of the Security Council. Thus, there is provided a clear method of amending the Charter. The provision permits any of the five principal nations to prevent the adoption of any particular amendment. I do not believe that any citizen of the United States should desire to place this country in the position of being compelled to submit to an absolutely objectionable amendment. Certainly there should not be any objection when we have the power to veto any amendment by our own vote. Under the provisions of the charter as they now stand our country would be one of the five nations with the power of veto over such an amendment. This is not the veto power which is sometimes objected to by opponents of the treaty, although it borders closely on it. However, this veto power is reserved to the nation in such manner that our Government is fully protected against objectionable amendments. The opponents would like amendments favored by the United States to be easy of enactment and those to which it objects difficult of enactment.

Another of the objections made to the charter is that once we are in the United Nations we cannot get out. There is no specific provision of the Charter for resignation. However, the very fact that sovereign nations have not surrendered their right of withdrawal is a reservation to them of that right. Any nation, and particularly one of the five great nations desiring to withdraw from the combination of nations would be in a position entirely to prevent any positive action on the part of the other powers. In other words, if there should be such power to prevent the removal of a nation, that nation when in or any nation when still a member—any of the larger nations—could always veto any positive action. The nations constituting the membership under the Charter will not want to retain a dissatisfied member.

However, the opponents say that the confirmation of the United Nations Charter would cancel the Monroe Doctrine. This matter was discussed rather freely in the Foreign Relations Committee, and the belief there seemed to be that it not only does not destroy the Monroe Doctrine but that the Monroe Doctrine would stand out perhaps more clearly than at present, marking the boundaries of the jurisdiction of the United States and other American nations that now recognize the Monroe Doctrine. The United Nations Charter will aid in the enforcement of the Monroe Doctrine. If any difficulty arises which requires the attention of the United Nations we will have the assistance not alone of the nations of the Western Hemisphere but of all members of the United Nations. Therefore the Monroe Doctrine, instead of being in danger, will be fortified in its position.

Our opponents tell us that this is a power combination and that peace can never be guaranteed by a combination of military powers with the right and intention of using that power. The complete answer to this suggestion is that without power to enforce its decrees the new world organization would be absolutely useless. This was one of the objections to the League of Nations. Its opponents said that it was without power to enforce its decrees. Under the charter the new organization can call on all its members for sufficient force to enforce its decrees. Whether this organization accomplishes its purpose or not, there certainly could be no accomplishment of the peace objectives of the world without power to enforce decrees. The world has recognized this, and is trying to save future generations from a repetition of the sacrifices this one has made of its present assets and its future acquisitions. To maintain peace we must be able to protect peace.

However, the opponents of the Charter say that it means a surrender of sovereignty. It is pretty hard to understand what is meant by such a charge. If sovereign states dare not agree among themselves together to accomplish something which otherwise would require the unassisted efforts of each of them, it is high time that some new principle in government be put into operation. The United States is not surrendering any sovereignty. It is entering into a great plan by which it will be obligated to furnish a portion of the peace force of the world.

If we had been united with the other 50 nations, can anybody imagine any breach of the peace, which would have been as costly to this Nation as the present World War has been? Could any person conjecture, think of, or suggest any way by which we could have lost by combining with other nations, in comparison with what it has cost us in money, blood, and suffering to go it alone, or with the other nations with which we are united?

The United States is not surrendering any sovereignty. In such efforts it will have the aid of 50 other nations. This is not a surrender of authority or of sovereignty; it is an acceptance of aid from other nations in the protection, not alone of the remainder of the civilized world, but in the protection of ourselves.

We can no longer have any serious contention that any combination of forces of the world can be ignored by the United States. The consequence is that we shall participate in the suppression of any difficulty which arises threatening the peace of the world. So why not have help in that suppression?

We have the right under the plan of voting in the Security Council through our member to block positive action on the part of the organization without the assistance of any other power. Where is the surrender?

Again, the opponents of the charter object to the United States and each of the other of the five great nations having the right of veto. That objection coming from Americans is the most surprising I have ever heard. In other words, as an abstract proposition, they reason that each of the 51 nations should have the same right as any other nation as to whatever action might be taken. They argue that a nation with a population of less than a million, with no navy, no effective army, no airplanes, and with no real risk to itself, should have the same force and power with reference to the decisions of the organization as should the United States, the United Kingdom, Russia, China, or France. In other words, we should be placing our peace in the hands of any particular government, no matter how small, or how small its risk, if we did not have the veto power. This indeed would be a surrender of sovereignty.

Fortunately, the small nations of the world have not made such silly demands on the great powers, but have recognized the justice of the arrangement made, and have signed the Charter with a full understanding as to the veto power in each of the five great powers.

The opponents of the Charter say that the United States has no constitutional authority to delegate to any representative of the United States the right to take action without congressional authority in each case. President Roosevelt made the suggestion that a provision of this sort would be comparable to a policeman who saw a burglar entering the second-story window having to go back to consult the town council before arresting the intruder. Such a suggestion is simply an attempt to have the United States admit that it has no power to participate in any organization with sufficient mechanism, intelligence, and force to preserve peace.

But the opponents tell us that reservations must be made to the Charter. In other words, the United States should now set the precedent of amending the charter after the delegates from all over the world have returned to their homes. If the United States has the right and considers it wise to attempt amendments after agreeing to the charter as written at San Francisco, then 50 other nations will have the same right and the same opportunities to amend the charter in the various ways which might occur to them as being desirable.

The reservation plan killed the League of Nations by preventing the United States from becoming a member. The

reservation plan, if adopted by the Senate of the United States, would kill the United Nations Charter. This may or may not be the object of the suggestion, it certainly would be the result.

However, the most usual claim is that the charter is, so far as the United States is concerned, unconstitutional. It is astonishing how constitutional lawyers are developed at every crossroads in the United States at any suggestion of a plan which would preserve the peace of the world.

The House of Representatives on September 21, 1943, adopted what was known as the Fulbright resolution, which placed the House of Representatives on record as favoring the creation of appropriate international machinery with power adequate to establish and maintain a just and lasting peace. The United States Senate on November 5, 1943, adopted a resolution placing the Senate on record as desiring that the United States join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority, with power to prevent aggression, and to preserve the peace of the world. Each of these resolutions contained the words "through its constitutional processes." If these constitutional authorities are correct in their statements that it is impossible for the United States to delegate any authority to participate in the enforcement of peace, then both the House of Representatives and the Senate have been guilty of silly and futile resolutions.

The suggestion that the Constitution of the United States must be amended to participate in establishing or maintaining peace is to say that the United States is incapable, under its present Constitution, of participating in any effort of the world to prevent its own suicide. These opponents do not deny that the President can, without a declaration of war by Congress, use our armed forces to suppress insurrection, repel invasions, and protect the lives and property of American citizens anywhere in the world. The President has used our armed forces in foreign countries 76 times without the formality of a declaration of war by Congress. The objectors admit that the President could use the armed forces for this purpose, but say that the Senate cannot ratify a treaty which provides for the use of armed forces in the preservation of peace without a return to Congress.

However, the opponents tell us that even if all other objections are overcome, the World Charter will not prevent war. It is difficult to prove that this agreement will prevent war. The gift of prophecy, or the ability of the seer to look into the future and tell what might happen, would be needed for that purpose. It would seem that the peace of the world would be in better hands, however, if 51 nations provided an armed force to preserve the peace, to maintain the peace, than if the 51 nations and other nations were each to prepare for war on its own and without any agreement among themselves. All must admit that the Charter represents an honest effort toward universal peace, and further that it is an intelligent Charter which can prevent war if intelligently and honestly administered.

Mr. President, it is interesting to listen for some alternative to the United Nations Charter. Many of those who oppose the charter recite all the evils of the world at this time and charge them to the world charter, which is not yet in force. We had an illustration of that on the floor of the Senate. Conquests made by various nations are charged to the world Charter. The overrunning of Latvia, of Estonia, and of Lithuania seem to be charged to this world charter. Whatever Great Britain or Russia might have done by conquest or colonization is charged to the world Charter and used as an argument against its ratification, or I suppose was intended as an argument in opposition to its ratification. I have heard of no real argument in which an alternative is suggested to the Charter. There is no alternative except world pandemonium.

The same sort of argument is used against the charter that was used by the isolationists against preparation for war. In all of the preliminary preparations for war by the United States we were told by the isolation group that war would result. We were never told by them what would result if the defense measures should not be taken. At this time all sorts of dire predictions are being made by those who are really opposed to the ratification of the Charter as to what will happen if the charter is ratified. A couple of days ago the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] devoted approximately 3½ hours picking out every imaginable calamity which may result to the world after the charter is ratified. He seemed to be setting out the various reasons why no one should vote for its ratification. He devoted 1 minute to telling us why he should ignore his own advice. How many of these calamities are to happen if his advice is followed or if the advice of the isolationists is followed can only be estimated. It would appear that the opponents of the charter are attempting to enumerate the misfortunes of the world in order, after ratification, to make the spurious claim that the charter was the cause of the misfortunes which it preceded. The world can well afford to pay a tremendous price in labor and money to prevent one war. That one war may mean practical extermination of the human race. We have heard the troubles of Poland, of Finland, Estonia, and of Lithuania injected into this discussion. We have never heard how many of the countries mentioned would be benefited by a failure to ratify this treaty. We have never heard how many of the countries mentioned would be benefited in the slightest either in respect to men or money or in respect to elimination of international difficulties. The only argument used is that by failing to ratify the United Nations Charter we might possibly put ourselves in an isolated position so that we would not be under obligation to participate in the struggles of civilization for survival. But we do participate. So why is that a valid argument? I think it is quite generally recognized that no great international catastrophe can happen in which the United States will not be interested directly or indirectly.

Two ghastly failures at keeping out of world wars stand as a reminder that isolation is a failure, and has ceased to be an objective to any large segment of the American people. They recognize its impossibility and impracticability. The question now is what shall a world in turmoil do. We are told the world is in turmoil. We are told that there are evil conditions which should be remedied, but how a policy of isolation or do-nothingism can remedy them has never been suggested on the floor of the Senate or any other place I have been, or in any publication I have read. People everywhere recognize its impossibility and impracticability.

Shall we close our eyes and refuse to see? The opponents of the charter hold before us first Russia and then the United Kingdom, apparently with a view to appealing to the prejudice which fits the particular person addressed. If the person addressed is anti-Russian, the charter is particularly favorable to Russia. If the person addressed is anti-United Kingdom, the Charter is represented as being particularly beneficial to the United Kingdom.

The history of the progress of the war has been one of defense against the opposition of stand-patters, isolationists, and reactionaries. There has been determined objection to every improvement, economic, moral, and religious, in the history of the world. It would not be a particularly satisfying thought if objectors did not rise today to fight in the United Nations Charter. We should think that perhaps it was not of sufficient importance to arouse their ire. Their opposition is a compliment to the probable success of the United Nations Charter.

The record of war, its destruction of mankind, its suffering, its loss to civilization, make it advisable that some effort be made. This is the greatest attempt ever made at preserving peace. Let us not lightly cast it aside or detract from its possibilities. It represents the greatest effort at preserving peace ever agreed upon by mankind. Let civilization, christianity, and patriotism combine to aid this epic-making Charter. Objectors have fought all other improvements, all other defenses of civilization. Why should not they fight the world Charter? By the terrific punishment of world wars by the sacrifices of the lives of millions, by the sacrifice of private savings of millions of people, civilization has been driven to the position where it is determined to override obstructions and obstructionists.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to be excused for 2 hours, as I have a conference with the Assistant Secretary of War on matters involving North Dakota.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from North Dakota is excused.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, the Senate of the United States has before it for decision the problem of whether it will advise and consent to the ratification of the Charter of the United Nations with

the Statute of the International Court of Justice thereto annexed. In this connection I am impressed with the soundness of three fundamental propositions.

The first of those propositions is that international peace and security are essential to the welfare of the world. This proposition needs no demonstration other than a bare mention of the frightful carnage of war. Destruction of vast quantities of property, breaking of home ties, absence of loved ones in the conflict, wounds and death to vast numbers of men, women and children indiscriminately, distress, sorrow, devastation, famine and a multitude of other attendant ills are the familiar products of present-day warfare. The gigantic stores of material wealth which are destroyed are appalling. Far more shocking, however, is the thought of the years of useful human lives which could have been devoted to productive enterprise, but which on the contrary have been forced to be employed in destructive effort. Who is there who can estimate what books would have been written, what music would have been composed, what social betterment would have been produced, what architectural achievements would have been attained, or what other products of the mind and ability of the millions of individuals who have suffered untimely death would have been brought forth had not their lives been extinguished by the ravages of war? Who can adequately describe or comprehend the intensity of the apprehension, fear, and even agony through which millions of anxious mothers, fathers, wives and other loved ones have passed in the travail of anxiety for those who have been far away from home, engaged in the mighty struggle of the nations of the world? Who can know the sum total of mind and genius which have been exterminated or dulled in the mud, blood, and butchery of battle? Who can compute the loss which has been occasioned by the tragic disability of mind and nerves which has shattered the lives and mentality of untold numbers of those who have fought in behalf of their respective nations?

With tragedy and losses—material, mental, and spiritual—such as these, who is there to question the proposition that international peace and security are essential to the welfare of the world?

The first of the propositions which I today present requires no further proof.

The second of the propositions which I present to the Senate is that the organization to be known as the United Nations, the International Court, the statute of which is an integral part of the United Nations Charter, and the provisions for the operation of the United Nations and the court constitute a reasonable and practical means to employ in the endeavor to maintain international peace and security.

Surely no one who has considered the proposed plan can fail to have been impressed by the intelligent thought and vast quantity of skillful work which have been utilized in the drafting of the charter. Surely no one can question the logic of the obligations which are assumed in the Charter. Every member of the organization solemnly covenants that it will settle its international disputes by peaceful means in such a manner that international peace, security, and justice are not endangered. Every member binds itself to fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by it in accordance with the charter.

Unto the General Assembly are given valuable functions of discussion, consideration, and recommendation, and the right to call the attention of the Security Council to situations which are likely to endanger international peace and security. Upon the General Assembly is placed also the duty of initiating studies and making recommendations for the purpose of promotion of international cooperation in political, economic, social, cultural, educational, and health fields, as well as for the further purpose of encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification and for assisting in the realization of human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Under the Charter it becomes the duty of the parties to any dispute the continuance of which is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security, first of all to seek a solution by negotiation, inquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, judicial settlement, resort to regional agencies or arrangements, or other peaceful means of their own choice.

To the Security Council is given the power of investigation of any dispute, or any situation which might lead to international friction or give rise to a dispute in order to determine whether the continuance of the dispute or situation is likely to endanger the maintenance of international peace and security. Upon the Security Council rests the duty to determine the existence of any threat to the peace, breach of the peace, or act of aggression, and to make recommendations or decide what measures shall be taken in accordance with certain provisions of the Charter to maintain or restore international peace and security. The Council may call upon the parties concerned to comply with such provisional measures as it deems necessary or desirable. The Council may furthermore decide what measures not involving the use of armed force are to be employed to give effect to its decisions, and may call upon the members of the United Nations to apply such measures. The Council may further take such action by air, sea, or land forces as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security. The members of the United Nations, in order to contribute to the maintenance of international peace and security, undertake to make available to the Security Council, on its call and in accordance with a special agreement or agreements, armed forces, assistance, and facilities, including rights of passage, necessary for the purpose of maintaining international peace and security.

Among the exceedingly important agencies provided in the charter is the International Court of Justice by which it is contemplated that justiciable controversies may be heard and determined.

Nothing in the Charter precludes the existence of regional arrangements or agencies for dealing with such matters relating to the maintenance of international peace and security as are appropriate for regional action, provided that such arrangements or agencies and their activities are consistent with the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

The United Nations, with a view to the creation of conditions of stability and well being, agree to promote—

(a) Higher standards of living, full employment, and conditions of economic and social progress and development;

(b) Solutions of international economic, social, health, and related problems; and international cultural and educational cooperation; and

(c) Universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all, without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion.

Former President Hoover declared that—

> If we are to have lasting peace we cannot rely wholly upon stopping quarrels. We must set in motion those forces which would build for peace.

The Economic and Social Council constituted by the Charter is an agency designed to set in motion forces which will build for peace. That council may make recommendations for the purpose of promoting respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all.

There is created a plan of trusteeship for the administration and supervision of territories now held under mandate, territories which may be detached from enemy states as a result of the Second World War, and territories voluntarily placed under the system by states responsible for their administration.

Surely it cannot be doubted that the authors of the Charter, in adopting plans and methods such as those which have thus been detailed, have selected sensible and practical means for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The Charter does not, however, in my opinion, assure that war will never again occur. No agreement that can be devised by man can conclusively guarantee to effect that result. This proposed organization does, however, constitute such a plan toward the prevention of war as reasonably prudent men will generally agree is sensible, equitable, and practical. Moreover, with the realization, which the present war has brought, of the horrors of modern warfare and the conviction that has come to mankind that united international effort must be made if peace is to be maintained, there is strong reason to believe that mankind will exert itself with sincerity, industry, intelligence, and increased determination to make this plan succeed. Though the plan is not proof against the ambitions of nations or the criminal intent of individuals, it nevertheless reduces in large percentage the probability of future aggression and world war, and to that extent increases the probability of security and peace.

The final proposition to which the attention of the Senate is directed is that even if the Charter could be improved,

it is nevertheless the most complete and effective agreement upon which it was possible to obtain unanimity of opinion by the 50 nations of the world which cooperated in its preparation. It is unnecessary to emphasize, more than has thus far been done, the difficulties attendent upon securing agreement by peoples of diverse interests, traditions, religions, customs, ambitions, and historical background. It is remarkable that the present Charter, even with provisions which may be imperfect, could have been agreed upon by persons representing so great a diversity of viewpoint. In view of the difficulties of preparation of a document upon which 50 diverse nations can agree, the observation of President Truman, "It is between this charter and no charter at all," is sound and convincing.

In light of the facts that—

First. International peace and security are essential to the welfare of the world;

Second. The Organization to be known as the United Nations, its International Court, and the provisions for the operation of the United Nations and the Court constitute a reasonable and practical means to employ in the endeavor to maintain international peace and security; and

Third. Even if the charter could be improved, it is nevertheless the most complete and effective agreement upon which it was possible to obtain unanimity of opinion by the 50 nations of the world which cooperated in its preparation, it is my intention to vote in favor of the Senate's advising and consenting to the ratification of the charter of the United Nations with the Statute of the International Court of Justice thereto annexed.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, having already spoken once during this debate, I hestitate to impose upon the Senate further. However, I should like to add just a few words for the record.

One of the most persuasive arguments so far presented to this body in favor of the adoption of this charter was the address of the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER]. That exhaustive account of the double-dealing, the hypocrisy, and the aimless futility of the efforts of the world's leaders to secure peace during the past 25 years, demonstrates conclusively that the old pattern of diplomacy and international politics is bankrupt and hopeless. When his excellent history of the efforts for peace is considered together with the results of those efforts, to wit, the present World War, unequalled in all history in its ferocity, cruelty, and senseless destruction, how can anyone fail to agree that something new, some new method of handling our international affairs is imperative. I think the Senator from Montana has rendered a great service to the Nation in demonstrating so thoroughly and so conclusively the utter futility of trying to solve the problems of this world and the world of the future with the tools and methods of the nineteenth century and before.

The lesson to be learned from these experiences of the past is that those old methods lead only to wars progressively more destructive, until now it is certain that another one is likely to destroy what western peoples are pleased to call civilized life. Those of us who saw the pictures and heard the inmate of Buchenwald on Wednesday in the caucus room had a glimpse of what that will mean. If those old methods lead only to war, then it is pertinent to inquire if this charter adds anything new to those old methods. I think it does. That new element is not fully developed but it is accepted in principle and can be expanded as confidence among the nations develops through experience and consultation. This new element, although it is new in international relations, is as old as civilization itself in other fields of human affairs. It is simply that in order to have freedom and peace we must have compulsion. Compulsion in itself does not give peace with freedom. But we do know that there is no freedom and peace for the individual except when the individual is subject to rules of conduct based on justice, commonly called laws. There can be no freedom from the fear of war or war itself until there are rules of conduct created by agreement and backed by compulsion.

It has seemed to me that it has been very difficult to discuss this question, because constantly we refer to international law as if there were in existence a law among nations in the same sense we use law in domestic affairs. It is my view that there is no international law, because there is no compulsion behind any of the rules or customs which have been adopted in conferences or by conventions and no compulsion of any kind is provided.

Mr. President, compulsion is inherent in this charter. As I see it, one of its greatest virtues. It is true that the veto power of the Big Five on the Security Council limits this compulsion. It is also true that the jurisdiction of the Court is optional. But the important thing is that the principle of compulsion is accepted. The limitations are necessary because there is too much suspicion and distrust in the world and we, along with others, are not yet ready to go further. Nevertheless the best minds of 50 nations have agreed that this is the direction toward peace and order in the world. The distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has emphasized over and over the importance of the consultative process which this charter creates. I agree that it is only through this process that we can hope to develop decent rules of conduct. If we are persistent and wise we will recognize the opportunity for this beginning to grow into a system of law based on justice for all peoples. The alternative to such approach is the perpetuation of the same confusion and futility which were so ably and convincingly presented to us by the Senator from Montana.

Mr. President, the fundamental characteristic of our former approach to the problem of peace was defense. Because of this defensive attitude the democracies were at a fatal disadvantage relative to the Fascists. We advertised our inability to adopt a positive attitude by such shibboleths as neurality and nonintervention, which encouraged our enemies to believe that we would never take preventive measures. It is my own view that had we followed this defensive policy to its logical conclusion we would not today be victorious over the Nazis. If we had not taken preventive measures such as the transfer of destroyers and the adoption of peacetime conscription, at least the struggle would have been more difficult, if not disastrous.

This is a curious and paradoxical policy for us to have developed, because in all other activities in which, as a people, we have been so successful, we have been positive and bold in our approach. Once we were in a war our strategy has been to attack. The dominant characteristic of our great business leaders has been boldness and daring. Conservatism in the sense of timidity and reluctance to try new methods certainly did not accompany the creation of our great industrial system.

In politics the founding fathers of this country were revolutionaries. The American Revolution was the most daring and the most successful the world has ever seen. Washington, Jefferson, Madison, and Hamilton were not conservatives nor were they defensive in their strategy. In 1776 the idea that all men were entitled to an equal opportunity for life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness was much more radical and unorthodox than anything contained in this charter. Because we have enjoyed those principles so long we have come to accept them with little consideration of their history. We have frogotten that they were revolutionary; that they constituted an aggressive and bold attack upon the status quo of autocratic authority, of privilege by birth, and the system of master and slave which prevailed in so much of the then existing world.

Mr. President, one of the provisions of this charter which encourages me to believe that this organization may develop the means to prevent war rather than to defend against the consequences of an existing war, is article 39. When it says, "The Security Council shall determine the existence of any threat to the peace, and shall decide what measures shall be taken to maintain or restore international peace and security" it gives this Council the authority to take preventive measures which may be, in fact, preventive war. This is a complete reversal of the former approach in which we felt compelled to wait until the war was under way before we took countermeasures. These measures, it is assumed, will be taken only after a thorough investigation, and will be based upon well-established principles of conduct. This, it seems to me, is an important step in the right direction. We all agree, I believe, that in social life preventive measures are more human and more effective. The objective of modern medicine is to prevent diseases and not merely to cure them. The objective of article 39 is to prevent major armed clashes, and not wait until the outbreak of hostilities has become inevitable.

In viewing the history of the years between the two great world wars, particularly the history of the few years immediately preceding the outbreak of

the present war, it has seemed to me that the inability to adopt any preventive measures was one of the greatest obstacles to the preservation of peace. It has always seemed strange and sad to me that the democracies felt compelled to wait until an overt act of aggression had taken place. Subsequently, after the aggression had started, there was no alternative to war.

Mr. President, the very fact that the power to which I have referred exists, will be in itself a deterrent to war. I believe that the steps which would otherwise be taken by prospective, or potential enemies or aggressors can be prevented if this power shall be exercised. If ever the conviction can be created that preponderant power is available and will be used, there, of course, will be no necessity to use that power, except possibly in isolated and minor cases. Under such circumstances there could be no reasonable chance of success by the aggressors. This is the real objection of preventive war.

In conclusion, Mr. President, I believe that by adopting the principle of compulsion, and the principle of the preventive use of that compulsion, this charter is on the right road toward peace. These are new elements. They represent a method of dealing with international conflicts which was not available during that dismal and disastrous period of the world's history when the present world struggle had its genesis.

Mr. BROOKS obtained the floor.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Illinois yield to the Senator from Oklahoma?

Mr. BROOKS. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma.

Mr. MOORE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	O'Daniel
Andrews	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gurney	Overton
Ball	Hart	Pepper
Bankhead	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hayden	Robertson
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Saltonstall
Briggs	Hoey	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Burton	Kilgore	Taft
Bushfield	La Follette	Taylor
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	McCarran	Tobey
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Carville	McFarland	Tydings
Chandler	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	McMahon	Wagner
Connally	Magnuson	Walsh
Cordon	Maybank	Wheeler
Donnell	Mead	Wherry
Downey	Millikin	White
Eastland	Mitchell	Wiley
Ellender	Moore	Willis
Ferguson	Morse	Wilson
Fulbright	Murdock	Young
George	Murray	
Gerry	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. BROOKS. Mr. President, I have heard it repeatedly stated throughout the discussion of the United Nations Charter that it is a most important document. It is an important document indeed, for it reverses to a large degree the historic course followed by our American Government in foreign policy.

The Atlantic Charter was a most important document. It was subscribed to by 44 nations in the midst of the world's most destructive war. It, too, stated high hopes, ideals, and lofty ambitions, and yet it has been violated right and left. In fact, there is little evidence anywhere that the world is improved in any respect because of its being. It stands as proof positive that pleasant words and pretty phrases do not create living realities any more than steel, stone, and stained glass of themselves create a sacred sanctuary, a shrine, or a synagogue.

In presenting the United Nations Charter it is urged that the American people must take the leadership in preventing aggression and preserving peace. We took the leadership with the Atlantic Charter, and in fact, we are about the only Nation on earth that has given vitality and life to its words and declarations by subsequent action. We wish a finer fate for the United Nations Charter.

Mr. President, we have led the way to stop aggression, we have sent more millions of men, more billions of money, more tons of material, more thousands of miles from home than any nation on earth. We still pursue that course and we are increasing the tempo of our action as we pour our men, money, and material out across the vast Pacific in steady stream. At the same time, we led the way by resolutions adopted in both Houses of Congress, by platform declarations adopted by both political parties for the foundation of this present Charter. Both of the conferences that brought it into being were held within the confines of our land, first, at Dumbarton Oaks, and second, the San Francisco Conferences. During all the time these various steps were being taken, our soldiers, sailors, ships, and supplies were streaming out of America to the western front in Europe and to the approaches of distant Asia. More than 1,000,000 of our young men and women have laid down their lives, spilled their blood, or are missing in action in our magnificent war effort thus far. Where on earth was there ever a nation that went so far or gave so much to stop aggression and pave the way for peace?

During all these deliberations when the delegates were assembled on our pleasant, peaceful shores, we were speeding millions in men and billions in supplies to feed, sustain, and support the very lands from which these important delegates had come.

Our President played a most dramatic role. He was the principal actor in this world drama. He flew to the stage of the Conference to address its closing session; he carried the signed charter by air back to Washington and personally presented it to the Senate and urged its prompt ratification without change.

During all this time the American people, who are the most peace-loving people of the earth were being literally drenched with propaganda portraying the glories of the future of this Charter. In speeches, verse, and song, in cartoons and pictures, by the press, newsreels, and movies, the steady rain of impressive portrayal fell upon the American people by day and by night. This was in America.

What the head of any other government will say or do about it, what the unfortunate and uninformed people under their domination may think of it or have a chance to do about it is a matter of pure conjecture.

But as for us, wth the fastest striking Army, Navy, and Air Forces in the world, with our vast lend-lease, with the UNRRA, with our Export-Import Bank, the American people have bled and paid and led the way.

Whether or not the cursed course of power politics in Europe can ever be diverted to peaceful paths is still unknown. They have in Europe today more hunger, more hate, than ever before and the destruction in places is truly terrifying.

Surely they must know by now that throughout history each war has increased in its barbaric intensity. Surely they know that the modern blitzkrieg machinery developed by Germany so successfully to destroy cities and overrun most of Europe soon became obsolete and could not withstand the terror of the blitzkrieg machinery which we developed to meet and defeat the German hordes and drive them back across France, Belguim, and finally to totally destroy their factories, to blast and burn their cities, and bring that warring nation completely to its knees. Surely they know that each war starts where the last war left off. Surely they should know that sane people everywhere should try to truly cooperate to make all war to cease.

The American people have been told that the United Nations Charter is the foundation for the action that will bring this ultimate result. I have listened to the fervor with which its proponents have presented it. I wish I might share their enthusiasm. I truly share their hopes.

Mr. President, having met the soldiers of Europe's historic hate in death's grip face to face in the front line in World War I, and having seen the awful consequences of this present war in France, England, Belgium, and in Germany, having visited the battlefields, having ridden through the ruined cities, examined the concentration camps, and visited the prisoner-of-war camps in Germany as well, having visited the hospitals abroad and at home, having talked with GI Joes and generals in all those places, I found three outstanding thoughts, hopes, and desires:

First. They wanted to win this war.

Second. They wanted to come home to their loved ones and their beloved America.

Third. They did not want this ever to happen again.

To these three aspirations I am completely committed.

First. I have and will give unqualified support to all those in the service as they

meet their tragic responsibility in the name of their country, even as I wished to have that same unqualified support when I was serving humbly in the same cause in the front line 27 years ago.

Second. I shall use my full strength and influence wherever it may be extended to bring them home at the earliest possible moment.

Third. I shall use my every effort to preserve America's strength and greatness and help direct its cooperative effort to prevent another world war.

This charter, signed as it was by representatives of various countries, many of whose national existence was being subdued under the sustained attack of neighboring hostile governments, is only the frail framework that some day may house a sturdy structure for enduring peace.

Too many people in America already feel that the mere ratification of this charter will bring about these ultimate results.

Too many sincere American people have fallen victims to the wishful thinking that there will never be another war, merely because they say there must never be another world war.

The first test will not come, Mr. President, with the signing of the charter or its ratification, but with the terms of peace both in Europe and in the Pacific.

Unconditional surrender was a great slogan for war, but peace, based upon justice, is the absolute essential for the future happiness of mankind.

Merely to use the word "justice" in the terms of the written document will not suffice. It is the sense of justice, the will for justice, the desire to do justice, that will form the cornerstone of a future better world. Unless the words are translated into fundamental reality after the shooting stops throughout the world all the conferences, all the oratory, all the propaganda will result in utter disillusionment and complete despair.

We in America know these things and we know more. We know that this is the last time that America can spill its blood, spend its treasure and resources, all over the world in another deadly world war.

When we enter this solemn pact of security we must do so with the full knowledge of its frailties and absolute necessity of our stern, stubborn stand for peace based upon justice for mankind at the conclusion of this war.

I listened with intense interest as I attended the hearings on this charter. There were several features that gave me great concern.

I was much concerned about the ability of this organization to commit us to enforcement action without our consent. I am assured by the report—

> No United States forces can be employed, no enforcement action of any kind against a nation breaking the peace can be taken without the full concurrence of the United States through its delegate on the Security Council.

I was deeply concerned as to how much authority we are to give to the appointed delegate to determine the use of our armed forces and to commit us to our future course. That is left for subsequent congressional determination and I shall insist that the historic constitutional powers of the Congress to declare war be strictly preserved.

I was concerned with how much we were limiting the purposes and objectives of our historic Monroe Doctrine and I am slightly relieved by the printed assurance—

> That it is the policy of this Government to further implement the provisions of this charter by negotiating a treaty with the other republics of the hemisphere not later than autumn of this year which will give a permanent form to the Act of Chapultepec. This act specifically provides that an attack on one American republic is an attack against all and calls for immediate collective measures against the aggressors.

I was concerned about our right to determine for ourselves what we should do in relation to the postwar strength of our Navy, Army, and Air Corps. The charter only provides that—

> the Security Council is to prepare plans for a system for the regulation of disarmament—and every country, including our own, will be free to accept or reject them according to its conception of its national interest.

Mr. President, future generations will carry the burden of our national debt caused by the expenditures made in our day for the creation and development of the finest and fastest striking armed forces in the world. We have today an air power that is greater than all the other combined air powers in the world. We have today a navy larger and more effective than all the other ships on earth combined. We have, although not the largest in numbers, the most mobile and hardest hitting army on the face of the earth. They have all been necessary to stop the aggressors of the world and they should never be disbanded until we have had proof positive by action and not by words alone that the major powers of the earth trust us, want to work with us, and intend truly to help establish and maintain peace based upon justice. The recent reports that Russia is now to develop a new navy is not too reassuring.

I was concerned with the terms of the charter in relation to its trusteeship provisions, but am reassured by the committee's printed statement—

> No island in the Pacific occupied by the United States could be placed under trusteeship without this Government's consent and therefore only on terms agreeable to the United States.

These distant islands now fortified, after being torn inch by inch and foot by foot at such bloody cost from the treacherous, fiendish Japanese, must remain constantly in our complete control under the advice and guidance of our military and naval experts to the extent that they believe they are essential not only for the protection of America, but the peaceful policing of the Pacific.

I was deeply concerned about any provision that might prevent our full determination as to the extent of our participation in the event that in the distant future, for reasons which seemed justified and adequate to the American people, we felt that we should withdraw. The committee assures us—

> that any member has the right to withdraw, no power is vested in the organization to compel a member to continue its participation in the organization or to penalize it for its action.

We would hope, of course, that this organization would be a living organization for peace and peaceful settlement of disputes and no one should enter upon the obligations with a hidden desire to withdraw. I hope, if and when the charter is finally accepted and ratified by the other nations, as well as our own, that there will never be necessity for withdrawal. But I believe it essential that we should have that definite right in the event we thought it to be in the best interest of our country to do so.

The International Court of Justice lacks much power, but it is a step in the right direction, and we can hope and work to have it become truly an International Court of Justice to which the people of the earth may submit their differences for determination. I say again, in changing our traditional course, we can hope fervently and sincerely that the world may be spared the awful destruction and death that would be the inevitable result of the next war, taking up where this one left off.

Now that we are by constitutional process about to change our historic policy whereby we are to become intimately interested in any and every action that may disturb the peace and security of the world, I suggest that we take another historic step and create an extensive school for the education, training, and preparation of a diplomatic service to represent the views and interests of the United States, in the future, throughout the world. We have had great success by training the men of our Navy in the Naval Academy and the leaders of our Army in the Military Academy. Up to now they have adequately led our armed forces when our diplomats had blundered and our statesmen had failed, resulting in war.

Now that we are to try world-wide cooperation to prevent war, we should establish this school, choosing young men of character, intelligence, stamina, and stature, teaching them to know their country and to train them at Government expense to represent our Nation's viewpoints and protect our interests. We have Government schools where men are trained to make it their life duty to defend us on land or sea or in the air. We should have a Government school to train young men to represent us in our quest for peace and prosperity.

Mr. President, I have not in the past and I will not now yield to any man in my love of country, or my genuine hopes for its peaceful existence.

Most authentic veterans that I know are extremely peaceful men.

Four years ago, on the floor of this Senate, when I was trying so desperately to keep our beloved country at peace and out of this present war, I quoted the words of another veteran of the last war.

I quote this again in my fervent hope that we may avoid another one:

Have you seen men come from the line,
Tottering, doddering, as if bad wine
Had drugged their very souls;
Their garments rent with holes and caked with mud
And streaked with blood
Of others, or their own;
Haggard, weary-limbed and chilled to the bone,
Trudging aimless, hopeless, on
With listless eyes and faces drawn
Taut with woe?
Have you seen them aimless go
Bowed down with muddy pack
And muddy rifle slung on back,
And soaking overcoat,
Staring on with eyes that note
Nothing but the mire
Quenched of every fire?
Have you seen men when they come
From shell holes filled with scum
Of mud and blood and flesh,
Where there's nothing fresh
Like grass, or trees, or flowers,
And the numbing year-like hours
Lag on—drag on,
And the hopeless dawn
Brings naught but death, and rain—
The rain a field of pain
That scourges without end,
And Death, a smiling friend?
Have you seen men when they come from hell?
If not—ah, well
Speak not with easy eloquence
That seems like sense
Of "war and its necessity!"
And do not rant, I pray,
On war's "magnificent nobility!"
If you've seen men come from the line,
You'll know it's peace that is divine!
If you've not seen the thing I've sung—
Let silence bind your tongue,
But, make all wars to cease,
And work, and work for everlasting peace!

Mr. President, when my name is called, I shall vote "yea."

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MURRAY in the chair). The Senator from Pennsylvania is recognized.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, as the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT] said on the opening day of this debate, I, too, am sorry that the Senate is so nearly unanimous in favor of ratification of this Charter.

True, I would hate to see a repetition of the disaster of 1919. I want this charter ratified, not because it is perfect but because it is the best one which 50 nations could devise at this time.

But, as we all know, it has faults. It will undoubtedly require future changes and amendments to keep it abreast of world conditions. Whole concepts of it, in my opinion, are in need of drastic alteration when and if the world becomes ready for the changes. Those changes—and I pray they may some day be realized—would remove big power controls and place the issues of war and peace more completely on the basis of right and decency.

In those respects this charter does not go far enough. Yet, I am sure there are some among us who hold an opposite view—that the charter goes too far away from isolationism.

In other words, there is room here for a fight. I share with many other Senators who have already addressed the Senate on this Charter disappointment that opponents of the theory of international joint action for peace are not flying their battle flags now, but are instead apparently waiting for future opportunities to make flank attacks when their purposes will be less obviously—but perhaps more effectively—served.

Last fall I told the people of Pennsylvania that I thought there would be a bitter Senate fight over ratification of any instrument for collective action toward world peace. I told them that was why I wanted to be here in the Senate, to lend my voice to the cause of international cooperation. I think they believed me; and that is perhaps one of the main reasons why I am here. I know I believed it when I said it.

The divisions over such issues as the reciprocal trade agreements bill and Bretton Woods confirmed my fears that the basic cleavages still existed here.

But on this—the key instrument—there is no battle; and it is something of a let-down. More important, however, than the let-down is the disturbing evidence that this near unanimity here does not represent near unanimity of conviction.

For myself, I would be more than willing to forego any floor fight on the charter if I thought that every Member who will vote for ratification will so with the desire for a strong, successful world organization functioning under this Charter.

I know that the overwhelming majority of the people of America do have such a desire. Undoubtedly, however, there are others who advocate ratification not because of conviction but for reasons of expediency. They do not want to see an international organization really function successfully because such an organization would discredit finally and completely the creed of narrow nationalism and of political and economic isolationism.

Half-hearted support for this Charter from sources with unspoken reservations is more a menace to its success than their outright opposition. It fogs the air. At the first sign of disagreement in the Security Council or the Assembly, and there are bound to be such incidents—I look for inevitable reproaches from these sources. They will, I am sure, be careful to cloak themselves in blamelessness. "We advocated this experiment," they will say, "now look at it. It does not work."

But, Mr. President, it will work. All of us here who vote to ratify must at the same time pledge our full efforts to make sure that it works. Otherwise the vote will be a sham. We must stand ready to give it the tools to work with, to fortify it with economic as well as moral, military, and political strength. Therefore I urge any Senator who is not ready to make such a pledge to vote against ratification.

Nearly 4 years ago the Senate voted declarations of war against the Axis aggressors. I know that no Senator had any mental reservations then. Senators were not voting that way only because the rest of the people knew it had to be done. There was in that vote a determination on the part of each Senator—since revealed in other actions—that we must win. Each, in voting for a war forced upon us, was intent to do his own utmost to bring about victory.

The Japanese attack upon Pearl Harbor and the subsequent declarations of war against us by Germany and her satellites were but part of their joint plan for world domination. We were the final objects of their attack. The sting and humiliation of the insult to our national honor inspired white-hot anger at their insolence, their arrogance, their folly. We were united as this country has seldom been united in unswerving determination to meet a fierce challenge.

Can we not have some of that determination, that single-mindedness of purpose, in anything but war? Is it not just as important to prevent the killing of our people as it is to avenge it?

As I view it, Mr. President, the question today is not merely whether we will vote to give this thing called international cooperation a chance, but, rather, will we vote it the tools to do the job and work from here on in—work as we have worked to wage and win wars—work to build a world force, under God, to sustain righteousness and banish the seeds of war?

A vote for the Charter, Mr. President, is not enough. We must be ready to put muscles on the bones, transfuse blood into the veins, give it a heart which feels compassion.

I look in the future for frequent criticism here on the Senate floor of actions and policies of the new United Nations Organization. In fact, I look forward to those criticisms. I believe we cannot have too much criticism—if—if, that is, our criticism stems from the same motives which have characterized criticism here of our war effort—the desire to make it better, to speed the realization of its basic goals.

On the other hand, I think we should put on notice those who would attack this world organization from other motives—from the desire to weaken and destroy its effectiveness, breed suspicions among its members, encourage defiance of its principles, and ultimately bring it down in a morass of discord.

Mr. President, if we here think this Charter is good and should be ratified—and nearly all of us do—then I think we should consider in only one light those who would try to subvert it. We should consider them in an odious light—as a new category of criminals against mankind. Mr. President, I call them peace criminals; and I believe that when their purposes and identities become clearer, they will be even more despised than the war criminals of today.

Mr. President, we should be prepared to prevent as well as to punish crimes against the peace, just as we are preparing now to give the war criminals their just retribution.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BANKHEAD in the chair). There are on the

list which has been submitted the names of a number of Senators who, it is understood, desire to speak on the pending question.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, if no other Senator cares to speak on the pending matter, I am ready for action on the treaty.

Mr. BURTON. Mr. President, I am sure there are several other Senators who wish to speak on this question, and I hope we may hear from them before action is taken on the treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. I hope the Senator will have those who wish to speak come into the chamber.

Mr. BURTON. I shall be glad to examine the list of those on my side of the aisle who still wish to speak.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Unless other Senators wish to speak, it will be proper for the Senate to proceed to take action on the treaty.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Aiken	Green	O'Daniel
Andrews	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Austin	Gurney	Overton
Ball	Hart	Pepper
Bankhead	Hatch	Radcliffe
Barkley	Hawkes	Revercomb
Bilbo	Hayden	Robertson
Brewster	Hickenlooper	Russell
Bridges	Hill	Saltonstall
Briggs	Hoey	Shipstead
Brooks	Johnson, Colo.	Smith
Buck	Johnston, S. C.	Stewart
Burton	Kilgore	Taft
Bushfield	La Follette	Taylor
Butler	Langer	Thomas, Okla.
Byrd	Lucas	Thomas, Utah
Capehart	McCarran	Tobey
Capper	McClellan	Tunnell
Carville	McFarland	Tydings
Chandler	McKellar	Vandenberg
Chavez	McMahon	Wagner
Connally	Magnuson	Walsh
Cordon	Maybank	Wheeler
Donnell	Mead	Wherry
Downey	Millikin	White
Eastland	Mitchell	Wiley
Ellender	Moore	Willis
Ferguson	Morse	Wilson
Fulbright	Murdock	Young
George	Murray	
Gerry	Myers	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-one Senators answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. McMAHON. Mr. President, the wrack and ruin of much of the earth's civilization; the millions of the dead; the tortures of the maimed; and the starvation of millions of the world's peoples; the ultimate fate of millions of yet unborn, counsels and demands the ratification of this charter. I am confident we will announce by our verdict that we are determined to cooperate with the peoples of the earth to maintain the peace.

When Eve tempted Adam and Adam succumbed, they predestined the peoples of the earth to work out their salvation by the sweat of their brow.

And so, man's pursuit of happiness in times of peace, in what has been called this vale of tears, has through the centuries been difficult and burdensome. But in times of war, the attainment of happiness becomes impossible.

Therefore, the highest objective to be sought by all governments should be the promotion of the peace, the happiness, and contentment of its people. When the representatives of the Governments of the earth convened at San Francisco to write this charter to maintain the peace, they were fulfilling the highest purpose for which governments were created.

I admit that the Nations of the earth have, in great part, been impelled to undertake this expedition by the realization that mankind's destruction is surely guaranteed by man's creation of ever newer and ever more destructive engines of devastation, unless their use is restricted and restrained. But I like to think, Mr. President, that there is over present in the hearts of our people and in the hearts of the peoples of the earth another and higher motivation than simply that of fear. I dare to hope that mankind has come to a keener and brighter realization that man is created in God's image and that to promote and foster war is not only to commit the greatest crime against man, but also to wage war against the Supreme Being Himself.

I realize that this document which we are now considering is not perfect. No creation of man can attain that attribute, but, Mr. President, this is a glorious recognition of the fact that men everywhere are conscious of the absolute necessity for peace.

A nation whose national will and purpose are bent and determined on war is dedicating its destiny to the work of the devil. A nation whose national will and purpose are bent and determined on peace is dedicating its destiny to the service of God. Man was endowed by his Creator with a free will. If the free wills of the peoples of the earth is exercised for the keeping of the peace under this charter, peace will reign.

During the campaign in Connecticut last fall, I happened one night to have an engagement to address a meeting in a small hall in one of our cities. As I arrived to keep the engagement, I was just in time to hear a young soldier introduced. His breast was covered with medals awarded for extraordinary valor. He was home on furlough. He spoke undramatically and haltingly. He was embarrassed. He was not used to public speaking, but he poured out a message from his heart, and this is what he said:

> I have been through Hell. I have had 60 missions over Germany. I have been wounded. The Government is giving us good planes and good guns and good food and clothing. But, men, it just ain't no good. I know why we are fighting this war. We had to fight it and we are going to win it. I have only two hopes: That when I go back, I live to come back, and above all, see to it that my three kids don't have to go through what I have been through.

As I listened to this cry from an anguished heart, I thought that this boy voiced the sentiments of our millions who have gone to battle. And I recalled very vividly what the voice of a prophet—Woodrow Wilson—said shortly before he died in 1924: "And now it will have to all be done over again at 20 times the cost in blood and treasure." Well, that prophecy has come to pass grimly and inexorably. We Senators are given a glorious chance to do our part to see that that prophecy is not twice fulfilled. There are men who stood on this very floor and made fun of Woodrow Wilson's statement that to deny and defeat the League of Nations was "to break the heart of the world." The leader in derision was the then senior Senator from Massachusetts who stated:

> The hearts of the vast majority of mankind would beat on strongly and steadily and without any quickening if the League were to perish altogether.

He further said:

> If it were destroyed the people who would lie awake in sorrow for a single night could easily be gathered in one very large room, but those who would draw a long breath of relief would reach to millions.

Mr. President, no further comment on this statement is needed. This Nation has discovered at a burdensome cost how false the Senator spoke and how clouded was his vision.

It is seldom, Mr. President, that a man is given a second chance in his lifetime to correct a great mistake. It is even more seldom that that chance comes to a nation. We have paid for that opportunity in countless billions in money, and above all, in the lives of hundreds of thousands of the flower of our youth. If I mistake not the sentiment of the Senate, we are not going to miss this chance. It will probably be our last.

A great American said that this was now one world. We are at last recognizing and implementing that concept by our present disposition and course.

I close, Mr. President, by quoting with profound hope two lines of the last public address that Woodrow Wilson made as he took that great swing around the country in 1919, which resulted in his collapse. He said:

> There is one thing the American people always rise to and extend their hand to, and that is the truth of justice and of liberty and of peace. We have accepted that truth and we are going to be led by it and it is going to lead us, and through us the world, out into the pastures of quietness and peace, such as the world never dreamed of before.

Mr. BALL. Mr. President, I am sure it is no surprise to my colleagues that I intend to vote for ratification of the United Nations Charter. In fact, I would be willing to go a great deal further than does the charter in the direction of strong international organization for peace.

On March 16, 1943, the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], and myself introduced a Senate resolution dealing with this subject. Mr. President, I think a rereading of the text of that resolution belongs in the RECORD of this day. It is as follows:

> *Resolved*, That the Senate advises that the United States take the initiative in calling meetings of representatives of the United Nations for the purpose of forming an organization of the United Nations with specific and limited authority:
>
> (1) To assist in coordinating and fully utilizing the military and economic resources of all member nations in the prosecution of the war against the Axis.

(2) To establish temporary administrations for Axis-controlled areas of the world as these are occupied by United Nations forces, until such time as permanent governments can be established.

(3) To administer relief and assistance in economic rehabilitation in territories of member nations needing such aid and in Axis territory occupied by United Nations forces.

(4) To establish procedures and machinery for peaceful settlement of disputes and disagreements between nations.

(5) To provide for the assembly and maintenance of a United Nations military force and to suppress by immediate use of such force any future attempt at military aggression by any nation.

That the Senate further advises that any establishment of such United Nations organization provide machinery for its modification, for the delegation of additional specific and limited functions to such organization, and for admission of other nations to membership, and that member nations should commit themselves to seek no territorial aggrandizement.

Mr. President, I think it is clear that my colleagues and I were prepared at that time, and I think we are still prepared to go considerably further in granting specific authority and power to an international organization than does the charter before us. Furthermore, Mr. President, had a United Nations Council exercised administrative authority over occupied and Axis territories, such as Greece, Italy, Poland, Bulgaria, and Roumania, I believe the doubts and fears which many of us have over what is happening in those areas today would not be quite so great as they are.

And so, Mr. President, I have only one general criticism of the United Nations Charter—it does not go far enough in its grant of authority and power to the international organization.

I have even heard it said that this charter is the League of Nations Covenant with all the Lodge reservations written into it. That is not true, of course, because this Charter envisages a far stronger organization than did the League Covenant. Nevertheless, the comment does underline the many safeguards to national sovereignty imbedded in the Charter, which the Senator from Michigan has pointed out.

But it is true that the Security Council will be relatively impotent until member nations ratify a second agreement establishing the quotas of military force which each will hold available to the council on call. I believe the discussion of this point on the floor yesterday and the day before made it abundantly clear that the President alone cannot make this second agreement effective, that it must come back to Congress for approval, either as a treaty or a joint resolution.

It is my view that even if the Senate ratified this military force agreement as a treaty, it would still require legislation by both Houses before our constitutional processes would be fulfilled. I do not see how either an executive agreement by the President, or the ratification of a treaty by the Senate alone could supersede or repeal clause 14 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution, which vests in Congress—including both Houses and the President—the power to make rules for the Government and regulation of the land and naval forces.

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

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In any event, assuming that it was done by treaty in the first instance, a treaty could not do more than set up a bare formula, which in turn would have to be supplemented.

Mr. BALL. It would have to be supplemented by legislation.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Does the Senator agree to that?

Mr. BALL. I agree absolutely. I do not believe that the Senate and the President alone could take away from the other House its authority under the Constitution to participate in the regulation of our armed forces.

That being the case, it would seem the simpler procedure to approve the military force agreement by joint resolution of both Houses, since that procedure will have to be followed in any event. Furthermore, it is my conviction that under clause 10 of that same section of our Constitution, giving Congress power "to define and punish felonies committed on the high seas, and offenses against the law of nations," the Congress would have power, with or without the United Nations Charter, if it so desired, to authorize the President to use specific components of our armed forces for joint international policing activities against outlaw or aggressor nations.

But the point I wished to make was that the strongest power granted the United Nations in the pending Charter is ineffective until that second agreement is ratified.

It is also true that by ratifying this charter the United States does not accept the jurisdiction of the Court of International Justice, although we become parties to the statute of the court. To accept its jurisdiction will require one or more additional treaties, subject to ratification by the Senate.

I see the Senator from Michigan is on the floor. I discussed privately with him the question as to what ratification of the treaty would mean insofar as acceptance by the United States of the Court's jurisdiction was concerned, and I understand he has taken the matter up with the legal adviser of the State Department, and can say exactly what their interpretation at least is of our relationship to the Court once we have ratified the Charter. I wonder if the Senator from Michigan would like to make a statement on that point.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am very happy to respond to the Senator's inquiry. In order to avoid any possibility of misunderstanding, I submitted the Senator's request to Mr. Green H. Hackworth, the legal adviser of the Department of State. I felt that he had a right to speak with particular authority on the subject inasmuch as he was also the representative of the American delegation on the committee at San Francisco which dealt with the Court statute.

I shall not take the Senator's time to explore the full response of the State Department, but I think I can exemplify the response by confining my answer to the specific question I asked as to how we would accept the compulsory jurisdiction, which I understand is the Senator's question. The answer is as follows:

If the executive should initiate action to accept compulsory jurisdiction of the Court under the optional clause contained in article 36 of the statute, such procedure as might be authorized by the Congress would be followed and if no specific procedure were prescribed by statute, the proposal would be submitted to the Senate with request for its advice and consent to the filing of the necessary declaration with the Secretary General of the United Nations.

The memorandum which I have discussed in somewhat similar detail various other hypothesis, and I suggest as a complete answer to the able Senator's question that the complete memorandum from the State Department be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of his remarks. I ask unanimous consent that the memorandum be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of the Senator's remarks.

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

(See exhibit A.)

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Minnesota yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the distinguished Senator from Minnesota that I am very happy to hear his remarks about the World Court and its jurisdiction. I am also pleased to hear the remarks of the Senator from Michigan just made with regard to the jurisdiction of the Court.

I wish to say to the Senator from Minnesota that I have been at work for some days on a speech on the charter which will be limited to a discussion of the World Court and the jurisdictional problems inherent in it. At the time I make my remarks tomorrow I intend to offer to the Senate a resolution dealing with the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court insofar as this country is concerned. I hope the resolution will be a matter for business early after the recess, because I think that if we really mean to keep faith with the Charter, if we really mean to carry out what so many have said on the Senate floor during the past few days, we must agree to compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court. The Charter is, after all, only one of the vehicles, one of the first steps, in the development of a great world organization for the preservation of permanent peace. To keep faith with the charter, in my judgment, we will have to subject ourselves at an early date to the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. I shall discuss that question at some length tomorrow.

Mr. BALL. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I think I agree, in the main, with his position. I hope the United States will accept the jurisdiction of the Court. It would seem to me that the sooner we can develop in the world a body of international law which is accepted by all nations, and particularly all the great powers, and which is enforceable, the sooner the need to worry about military quotas, forces, and stopping aggression, and all the other things about which we have worried, will gradually disappear.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Will the Senator yield further?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I think the Senator will find, upon inquiry, that a very large number of nations have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the existing court. I am trying to think of the number. I think it was somewhere in the neighborhood of 40.

There was a very substantial opinion at San Francisco among all delegations, very generally, favoring compulsory jurisdiction. It was the attitude of the American delegation that inasmuch as each time this question has heretofore been submitted to the United States Senate the question of compulsory jurisdiction has always been a stumbling block, and there has always been a lack of willingness on the part of the Senate to go that far as yet, it would be unfortunate to write the court statute itself on a compulsory basis at the present time, but that rather we should leave its development to evolution, inasmuch as the whole process of world peace itself is finally dependent upon evolution in the spirit and attitude of the peoples of the earth. So we joined at San Francisco in maintaining the optional clause in order to be perfectly sure that at least this one needless hurdle would be removed from Senate consideration of the charter.

Mr. BALL. I thank the Senator from Michigan. As I understand the full text of the memorandum which he has inserted in the RECORD, it holds that in ratifying the charter the United States does not accept jurisdiction in any specific instance, even if our delegate on the Security Council wanted to refer a question to the court which involved the United States and might result in some liability of the United States. Before permitting our delegate to vote for that submission, the President would have to obtain the authorization of the Congress, even in a specific case.

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

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I should like to ask the Senator from Minnesota a question, or at least to bring his attention to an issue which arose during the hearing before the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations. I share with the Senator his great interest in the gradual development of an international code of law, and on the occasion of the hearing I asked Mr. Hackworth what process should be used that international law might be codified and put into effect in any degree in view of the following provision in the charter:

> The General Assembly shall initiate studies and make recommendations for the purpose of promoting international cooperation in the political field and encouraging the progressive development of international law and its codification.

In response to that Mr. Hackworth, at page 161 of the hearings, referred to the interesting steps that have been taken in the past. He said:

> I suppose that the Assembly might follow the procedure followed by the League of Nations, which in 1927 undertook the codification of three topics of international law, namely, the responsibility of states toward aliens, territorial waters, and nationality.

Then I discussed with him how such an agreement as might be reached might actually be brought into effect, so that it could become the basis of the Court's decisions and of the jurisdiction of the Court. My question was:

> The thing I was essentially interested in is, assuming for the moment that they did get together and make a recommendation on these three or more subjects, how was that made effective and binding on the Court?
>
> Mr. HACKWORTH. Only by the treaty process, which in our case would have to have the approval of the Senate.

I then asked:

> It would have to be done by a multilateral treaty, and it would not be through action of the United Nations?
>
> Mr. HACKWORTH. That is correct.

I believe he has there recognized that there is in the Charter encouragement for the initiation and development of steps leading toward a code of international law. There may be evolved, as a result of that initiation, the possibility of a multilateral treaty for the establishment of a code of international law. I find in the charter, and I trust the Senator from Minnesota does also, a definite encouragement for the gradual development of a code of international law.

Mr. BALL. I thank the Senator from Ohio, and I agree with him that the more steadily we move in the direction of building an acceptable and established body of international law, the better.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator again yield?

Mr. BALL. I yield.

Mr. MORSE. I do not desire to trespass on the Senator's time, but I think the Senator from Minnesota and the Senator from Michigan are raising one of the most vital points involved in this historic debate. It involves a point to which I think we will have to come back time and time again during the evolutionary period which must follow the ratification of the treaty.

I want to say, so the senior Senator from Michigan will know exactly my position in regard to the matter, that I am in complete agreement with the position the American delegation took in San Francisco as to the jurisdiction of the World Court. I think in regard to the jurisdiction of the World Court issue, so far as the San Francisco Conference is concerned, the position of our delegation was absolutely sound. The jurisdiction issue should not at this time become confused, so far as extending jurisdiction is concerned, with action on the treaty. Yet, I think we need to keep in mind that if we are going to evolve a really workable world organization for the preservation of peace by way of resort to reason rather than military force, then this country, along with other countries, must be willing to subject itself to the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court. It is in regard to that problem that I have prepared the resolution which I shall submit to the Senate tomorrow for debate and action, I hope, following the summer recess.

Mr. BALL. I thank the Senator from Oregon. I think that not only would the acceptance of jurisdiction of the Court require another treaty to be ratified by the Senate, but as, if, and when, under the Charter and the encouragement given in the Charter the nations agree on the codification of various phases of international law, those particular codifications would have to come back to the Senate in the form of a treaty to be ratified.

Mr. President, to resume the thread of my few remarks, I pointed out that the great power of the Security Council will not be truly effective until another agreement is entered into and comes back to the United States Senate and is approved. We do not accept jurisdiction of the Court of International Justice until another agreement, at least one, perhaps many, have been approved.

Mr. President, the trusteeship chapters of the United Nations Charter, although stating better objectives than proposed in the League mandate system, still do not make a single dependent area in the world subject to the fine principles and purposes enunciated. Whether any area of the world is subsequently made subject to those purposes and principles is left entirely to the discretion of the nations which now or subsequently may control such dependent areas, and will again be the subject of later agreements among the nations.

And finally, although I see nothing in the Charter to prevent it, there is no direct provision for the United Nations ever assuming general control of the policing of the defeated Axis nations.

Mr. President, I believe the horrible destructiveness of modern war, the clear evidence that another great war probably would destroy our kind of democratic civilization, would have justified the nations, ourselves included, in going much further than they have gone in pooling their resources, in delegating power to the United Nations in the interest of establishing and maintaining international law, justice, and peace.

By these few remarks, and pointing out some of the respects in which the Charter is not effective until later agreements have been made, I do not mean to criticize the work done at San Francisco. I believe, and I have said so repeatedly, that the delegates at that Conference achieved far more than we had any right to expect, considering that the cement of common danger which helped so mightily to hold the United Nations together was already beginning to crumble when they met, as our inevitable victory over the Axis drew nearer. The overwhelming support of the Charter, both here in the Senate and by the people of America, is the best evidence of what a great service the United States delegation, including our two distinguished colleagues, rendered our country and the world at San Francisco.

Mr. President, I believe these shortcomings I have pointed out, if they can be called shortcomings, which, after all, can be remedied in time, are overshadowed completely by three great virtues which I see in the Charter.

First of these is the power of the Assembly, aptly termed by the Senator from Michigan tomorrow's "town meeting of the world," to debate any and all subjects or situations which in the mind of any member affect the peace or stability of the world, and to make recommendations regarding any of them not being actively considered by the Security Council. The distinguished Senator from Michigan was our representative on the commission which drafted the chapters on the Assembly and was, I believe, largely responsible for broadening its powers beyond the very narrow limits proposed in the Dumbarton Oaks documents. In so doing, I believe he performed one of the most valuable and far-reaching tasks accomplished at San Francisco.

In these days of war, when a handful of individual leaders must meet in secret to make world-shaking decisions, it is easy to underestimate the tremendous influence which world public opinion, mobilized in such a forum as the Assembly will provide, can exert on all nations, great and small, in the interests of justice and peace. In my opinion, it will prove an exceedingly strong deterrent to any temptation which the five great nations may feel to play power politics within the United Nations Organization, and it also offers the greatest hope of speedy rectification of the injustices that are bound to follow in the wake of this greatest and most sanguinary of all wars.

The second great virtue of the United Nations Organization, and the place where it makes the greatest advance over the League Covenant, is in its power to act against future aggressors through the Security Council. Members of the League undertook almost the same solemn obligations as are provided in this charter for military action against aggressors. But the action was left to each individual nation, the action to be an individual affair. Actually each nation would have had to go to war to fulfill its obligation. And in the two cases where article 10 was actually invoked by the League, not a single nation fulfilled that obligation. Partly, I believe, that failure was due to the fact that there was neither assurance of, nor machinery for, simultaneous joint international action against an aggressor. The pending Charter remedies that. Instead of the United States, England, France, Russia, and all the other members having to each individually declare war on an aggressor in Asia, Africa, or Europe, they act collectively through the Security Council, using the previously assigned quotas of national forces.

That concept of the organized world community doing a policing job on international outlaws to maintain the peace is written into international law for the first time in this Charter. True, it is still hedged about and limited by the veto given to each of the five permanent members of the Council. Perhaps that is, for the next decade or two at least, our surest guaranty that the forces we assign to the Council will be used only for policing and not to involve us in war. For the next couple of decades at least, with the Axis disarmed, only a clash among two or more of the five nations having permanent seats on the Council could cause a major war, and with the veto power such a war could not occur through the Security Council. But even with that restriction, I believe that the gradual development and expansion of this principle of joint international action by the organized world community offers our greatest hope of stopping or preventing future wars.

Mr. President, the third great virtue in this Charter is the Economic and Social Council. The mere day-to-day meeting and working together of representatives of many nations, discussing common problems, is bound to improve international understanding. And the constructive accomplishments which may and should flow from the Council's activities, in the form of greater economic stability and improved standards of living throughout the world, should, over the years, bind the nations more tightly and more permanently together than the possible danger of future war can ever bind them.

Perhaps I should add a fourth virtue—the almost unanimous support which this Charter enjoys here in the Senate, in the United States, and throughout the world. The desire and demand of the peoples of the world that this machinery for peace be made to work offers our best hope that it will work.

Both the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] have emphasized that no one can guarantee the success of the United Nations Organization in preventing future great wars. All it gives us is a chance.

Mr. President, I believe it gives us a good chance. The machinery is strong, the purposes and principles just and democratic. It is true that we cannot guarantee its success. But, Mr. President, the support which the United States through its Congress and executive branch, springing from the people, gives to the purposes, principles, and actions of the United Nations may well determine whether it succeeds or not. We dare not let it fail. Another great war might and probably would destroy our kind of free society. This may be our last chance, as a nation of free people, to meet this great challenge. We must not fail.

EXHIBIT A

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 23, 1945.

Memorandum for Senator VANDENBERG:

In your letter dated July 19 regarding the interpretation to be placed upon certain phases of our relationship to the Statute of the International Court of Justice prepared at San Francisco you requested answers to the following three questions:

"It is a fact that the Court can take no jurisdiction over the United States or any of its problems without our consent. Who gives the consent and how?

"It is also a fact that the Security Council, in seeking peaceful settlement of disputes, is required by the Charter to consider recourse to the Court. If such a proposal in connection with a dispute to which we might be a party should confront the United States, who would give our consent and how?

"It is also a fact that the Court's statute permits us, at our option, to accept mandatory, general jurisdiction of the Court. Who would make this decision and how?"

1. The establishment of the International Court of Justice does not in anywise change our constitutional situation as regards arbitration or judicial settlement of legal disputes. The Court would merely be substituted in the cases submitted to it for an arbitral tribunal. We would be under no obligation to submit cases to the Court unless we should accept compulsory jurisdiction under the optional clause of article 36 of the statute.

2. In cases of pecuniary claims submitted to arbitration, where there is no general treaty or convention governing the matter, the Executive has taken the position over a long period of years, that if the claim is one against a foreign government and there is no likelihood of a resulting international obligation on the part of the United States, the agreement to arbitrate need not be referred to the Senate. This has been based on the proposition that since the Executive has the authority in the conduct of international relations to settle such claims through the diplomatic channel without reference to the Senate, he can similarly adopt arbitration as the method of settlement. There is a long line of precedents for this method of procedure.

If, on the other hand, the claim is against the United States or the arbitration might result in an international obligation on the part of the United States, the agreement to arbitrate is submitted to the Senate on the theory that the Executive should not, acting independently, incur such an obligation.

3. The three questions raised may best be answered in the inverse order, as follows:

A. As to the third question, if the Executive should initiate action to accept compulsory jurisdiction of the Court under the optional clause contained in article 36 of the statute, such procedure as might be authorized by the Congress would be followed and if no specific procedure were prescribed by statute, the proposal would be submitted to the Senate with request for its advice and consent to the filing of the necessary declaration with the Secretary General of the United Nations.

B. As to the second question, a proposal or recommendation by the Security Council that a case, to which the United States is a party, be submitted to the Court, would require, to be carried out, a voluntary submission by the United States and the manner of making such a submission is discussed in paragraph C, following.

C. As to the first question, if there is a treaty in force between the United States and the other country providing for arbitration, the procedure stated in the treaty would be followed. If there should be no treaty and if the complaint were one by the United States and also if the decision of the Court could result in no international obligation on the part of the United States, the practice (referred to in paragraph 2 above) that has been followed by the Executive over a period of years in numerous cases might be followed with respect to the Court, since the Court would merely be substituted for an arbitral tribunal. The action would be based upon the theory that the matter was one which the Executive would have the authority to adjust through the diplomatic channel, and that the Court would merely implement the diplomatic process. Of course, if the Congress should by statute prescribe a different procedure it would be followed.

If, on the other hand, the complaint were against the United States, or even though the complaint were by the United States and the decision might result in an international obligation on the part of the United States, such procedure as might be authorized by the Congress would be followed and if no

procedure were prescribed by statute, the agreement to submit the case to the Court would be referred to the Senate for its advice and consent.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I am anxious to see the question before the Senate brought to a final vote. Therefore I shall refrain from any general discussion of the treaty.

I should like to call attention to some particular features of the Charter which have received generally very little notice, and I dare say have been regarded generally as of little consequence. The Security Council as established in this Organization may well fail. Other branches of the international organization provided in the Charter may well fail. Indeed, all of them may well fail to accomplish the purpose which all of us hope may be accomplished. But there are some things in it which ought not to be passed by lightly.

As one who has spent a long time at the bar and in the study and administration of the law, I naturally attach great importance to the court to be established as the chief tribunal of the international organization under this treaty. Men talk about codifying international law, and about establishing and announcing international law. International law will never be codified in the sense that we make a code of our domestic statutes; but it will finally become a great force for world betterment, through the continuous application of the principles of law, through the continuous and consistent interpretation of the law of nations to be found in charters, treaties, and the established laws of nations which have been recognized from time immemorial by the enlightened countries of the globe.

Surely no American should scoff at international law, because time after time our own Supreme Court has recognized the law of nations, and has given effect to the law of nations, which is but another term for international law, and has applied the principles of international law in the adjudications made by our own courts.

But particularly, Mr. President, the provision of the charter which impresses me greatly is the organization of the Assembly, which has been variously described by newspaper writers, commentators, and others as simply a debating society, simply a place where those who have no controlling influence or vote on the important decisions necessarily involved in the preservation of the peace and security of the world may meet and speak. I have been very much impressed by this feature, and I have gone back and read a little English history. Particularly at this time, it is perhaps helpful to know what the Commons has really become in the history of the British people and in the history of the world.

Yesterday the results of the election in Great Britain were announced. But what did that connote? What significance is to be attached to the recent announcement of the results of the election held in England some time ago? The majority of the House of Commons really represents the British Empire, that great empire which Webster long ago declared stretched over the earth, and upon which the sun never sets.

The leader of the majority party in the House of Commons becomes in effect the ruler of the British Empire. Long ago it was declared by a great British historian and jurist that even the King of England would be compelled to sign his own death warrant if the Commons should decree it. A great man has fallen in Britain, a great man who revived and bolstered the moral courage of the British people and of nearly all of the free people of this earth in that dark hour when the Axis Powers stood in battle array across the narrow channel which separates French territory from British territory. He was the head of Commons. Now another has been elected to speak for the British people, to hold in his grasp the vast British Empire, one of the five great powers given permanent seats on the Security Council under this Charter.

So, Mr. President, I should like to read to the Senate a brief statement about the House of Commons. Bear in mind that I am thinking of the Assembly in this world organization. I now read from the History of England by the eminent British historian, G. M. Trevelyan:

In the course of Henry III's reign it became an occasional but not an invariable practice to summon to this great assembly two or more knights elected in each shire court to represent the county. This was not to create a new assembly, or to originate Parliament; it was merely to call up some new people to the plenary session of the old curia regis. Neither was it a party move either of the King or of his opponents; both sides felt that it was best to know what the "bachelors" were thinking. It was a natural evolution, so natural as scarcely to attract notice. For two generations past, knights elected in the shire court had transacted local business with the King's judges and officers. It seemed but a small step to summon them collectively to meet the King among his judges and officers at some central point. Moreover, representatives from individual shires and boroughs had long been in the habit of attending the King's curia to transact the business of their community. To us, with our knowledge of all that was to come, the step of summoning them collectively and officially may seem immense. But in the medieval world the representation of communities was a normal way of getting business done, and its application to the central assembly of the realm was too natural to cause remark. When the wind sows the acorn the forester takes little heed.

Then and for long afterward the summons to Parliament was often regarded as a burden, grudgingly borne for the public good, much as the companion duty of serving on a jury is still regarded today. Communities, particularly boroughs, often neglected to send their representatives; and even the elected knights of the shire sometimes absconded to avoid service. Doubtless it was galling, when you looked round the shire court to congratulate the new member ironically on his expensive and dangerous honor, to find that he had slipped quietly on his horse and ridden for sanctuary, leaving the court to choose you in his stead. "The elective franchise" was not yet a privilege or a "right of man." In Edward III's reign, the borough of distant Torrington in Devon obtained by petition the "franchise" of not being required to send members to Parliament; for the payment of members' expenses then fell on the communities that sent them up.

Nevertheless the presence of the knights of the shire strengthened the authority and aided the counsels of the Parliament of magnates. The government found it convenient and advantageous to enforce the presence of the "communities" or "commons" of the realm through their respresentatives. And so in the year of revolution after Lewes, Simon de Montfort summoned not only the knights of the shire, but for the first time two representatives from each of the chartered boroughs.

That, Mr. President, was in the far year 1265.

He probably knew that the burghers would be of his faction, and he was the first of our rulers to perceive that the general position of a party government could be strengthened by calling representatives of all the communities together and talking to them.

Thus was the assembly made up.

It was a form of "propaganda," over and above any financial or judicial use that was made of the assembly. We learn from the writs that the burghers were summoned, but we do not know how many came, or what, if anything, they did. That particular Parliament was a revolutionary assembly to which only those barons were summoned who were of Simon's party, but it set a precedent for the summoning of burghers which was imitated in the more regular Parliaments of Edward I.

I now invite the attention of the Senate to the concluding and impressive lines written by this historian:

The English Parliament had no one man for its maker, neither Simon nor even Edward. No man made it, for it grew. It was the natural outcome, through long centuries, of the common sense and the good nature of the English people, who have usually preferred committees to dictators, elections to street fighting, and "talking shops" to revolutionary tribunals.

So, Mr. President, that is the historical picture of how the House of Commons commenced in that distant year 1265. The representatives from the counties or parishes were merely brought up to talk. They had no vote. They only counseled. The weight of the counsel depended upon the ability and wisdom of the men who were invited or who were assembled to talk. Yet in the process of evolution the King of England has become but a figurehead. The House of Lords has almost disappeared from any respectable part in the Government of England, save as a court in which law may be interpreted and announced. The House of Commons is the heart and center and substance of the British Empire. The leader of that House is the Prime Minister, next in importance historically to the King, actually of first importance in all the realm where English jurisdiction and English law live.

So I believe that the Assembly created by the charter is the common meeting ground of the nations of the earth which shall support this world organization. There small nations may be powerful. Indeed, those who followed the deliberations of the San Francisco Conference could not have failed to note that, although Australia is but one of the members of the British Commonwealth of Nations, and from the standpoint of its population is a relatively small country, her spokesman at San Francisco exerted not a little influence in shaping and controlling the decisions of the San Francisco Conference.

Here, whatever else may be said, is at least one division of the world organization, created by this charter, in which democracy lives, in which it breathes, in which it moves, and in the course of time it may become the great strength of the organization itself. Indeed, Mr. President, it may become the great center of the strength of this world organization on which so many hopes are now depending.

Mr. President, it may well be that in the course of time the stone which many of the builders of world organizations have rejected is now, in this Assembly, become the head of the corner. Here men can give expression to their views, to their thoughts, to their voices, and to their aspirations.

The Anglo-Saxon race and all other races which have been transplanted to our shores have a distinct and special mission to perform on this earth, namely, that of giving political government to mankind. No reader of history can be indifferent to that fact.

And so, without discussing the charter as a whole, or even attempting to do so, because I believe the hour is fast approaching when we should vote upon it, I wish to express my firm belief that in the establishment of the Court as the high tribunal to which we may ultimately give compulsory jurisdiction as the leader of the peoples, and through whose consistent and continuous application of the law of nations a great code of international law may be built up, and through the Assembly of the United Nations Organization, as set up in the charter, the smaller nations and, indeed, all peoples may one day be able to make themselves felt in the affairs of this earth.

Mr. President, as was said long, long ago of political institutions, they were not made with the mountains, they are not one with the deep; men, not God, designed them; and men, not God, must keep. If this charter lives, and if what we hope comes out of it only in part, it will be worth infinitely more than we can now estimate.

I am aware, Mr. President, that the dream of perpetual peace is an illusive dream. For more than 3,500 years of recorded history mankind has enjoyed not more than 300 years of unbroken peace. And yet the world moves, and, as Emerson long ago said in one of his matchless philosophical discussions, "All history is a decline of war, though a slow decline."

The great English-speaking peoples, and every branch of them, certainly have a great contribution to make in setting up the political machinery, the organization to which the world may confidently look for a better day.

Mr. President, all of us have pledged ourselves to our individual constituents, and to our general constituency. As we have met men and women whose sons, brothers, and husbands have paid the full price of devotion to duty, we have pledged ourselves to the cause to which we stand committed in this war, and have promised to do everything within our power to see to it that the honored dead shall not have died in vain. Almost every man in public life has given expression to that thought, to that hope, to that determination. Can we do less than to accept this step toward the solution of the problems which have resulted in armed conflict, and which have drenched the earth in blood through all the long period of recorded history? The very soil of all Europe is red with blood. The fields in many parts of the earth are white with the bones of men who have died in war.

I have not wanted to examine this Charter for microscopic defects. They exist beyond all doubt. There may be many inconsistencies in it, and much evidence of conflicting philosophies in the obvious effort to reconcile the thought so as to bring forth and preserve this Charter. But I have not examined it for the purpose of criticizing it, nor for the purpose of discovering any of its weaknesses. Experience will demonstrate all its weaknesses. Operation under it will demonstrate all its shortcomings. But if it is, as I believe it to be, a real step toward the solution of the problems of the world which have constantly resulted in war, with all its strains of evil, suffering, and of death, it is worth our while.

I know that every man in this body has not only pledged himself to his own individual constituents but to the larger constituency of the country—indeed, he has made the pledge in the presence of all mankind that he was highly resolved that those who have paid the last full measure of devotion in two great world wars within our lifetime shall not have died in vain.

And they have died, Mr. President. Our best men have died on the earth; the blue waters have swallowed them up; from the flaming skies they have gone down to death—to win this war and to make possible a better world for another generation of Americans.

We promised them something. I am sure that every Member of the Senate means to keep that promise and to go all out in an effort to make that promise good. Many of us are slow to promise. The slowest among us to promise are often the quickest to perform. But when I think of the great host of American youths who have been taken from our midst all over this land I can think only in the terms of those beautiful words:

> They shall not grow old as we that are left grow old.
> Age shall not weary them, nor the years condemn.
> At the going down of the sun and in the morning we will remember them.

America has a great opportunity. The Senate of the United States has one of the greatest opportunities in its long and glorious history to register its wholehearted and unanimous approval of this step toward peace, toward security, toward the better world of which we all dream.

Mr. President, the dream may not come true, but who is there to say that many of the dreams that have inspired the true and genuine lovers of men in every age and in every land may not in our time take form and substance? Who is there to say that in the majestic flow and sweep of the centuries this forward step may not make it possible for young men in our America and in every land where people are peace minded to be spared the suffering and the consequence of wars like unto the one through which we are now passing?

I should like to say that I attach great importance to the Court, and I attach far greater importance to the Assembly of the United Nations set up under this charter. No man living can tell what may come out of it for the good and for the happiness of mankind.

Mr. TOBEY. Mr. President, those of us who were fortunate enough to have been in the Senate Chamber during the last 15 minutes and to have heard the truly wonderful address by the Senator from Georgia have been moved to our very souls. Applause at the end of his speech was manifestly out of order, but there is a way to express our deep feeling to the Senator; and so I ask, Mr. President, as a token of our esteem, our appreciation, our affection, and our sympathy for the great Senator from Georgia, that the Senate rise.

(Thereupon, in conformity with the suggestion of Mr. TOBEY, Senators rose and stood in silence.)

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, along with every Member of the Senate, and with those who occupy seats in the galleries, I have been deeply moved by the speech of the great and good Senator from Georgia.

> God so loved the world that he gave his only begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in Him should not perish, but have everlasting life.

In camps all over the world it has been my privilege and my high honor to visit with American soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen. I have watched them prepare themselves for the missions of death. I have expressed to them how humble I felt in their presence. I have always felt that, except for fortuitous circumstances and the grace of God, there stood among them Ben Chandler and Dan Chandler, and if my girls had been boys they too would have gone side by side with the sons of WALTER GEORGE, JOHN MCCLELLAN, ALBERT HAWKES, LEVERETT SALTONSTALL, Admiral HART, and others who have offered and paid for the peace and security of their beloved country their last full measure of devotion.

Mr. President, perhaps I should not speak at this hour, because I do not claim to be an authority on the Charter. I have not the honor of being a member of the Committee on Foreign Relations. However, it may be possible that my voice will not again be heard in this forum. I should like just one opportunity to say to you, Mr. President, whose love and affection I possess and cherish, how grateful I am to Almighty God that I have been privileged to serve for a season with you, and what a profound respect and admiration I have for the Senate of the United States. I have only one regret, and that is that I could not have been a better servant of the people of my country. I have no other regrets.

Mr. President, this is a fateful hour in the world's history. I am grateful to Almighty God and to the people of my beloved Commonwealth, that I am permitted as a Member of the Senate of the United States, to take part in these important deliberations. When this debate is concluded, I shall, as a representative of the people of Kentucky, have the honor of casting my vote in support of the mighty efforts that are presently being made to reestablish the peace of the world.

As a citizen of this Republic I am proud of the record made by the American delegation at San Francisco. The delegation was appointed by President Roosevelt, who was familiar with the failings of the Versailles Treaty, perhaps occasioned by the fact that there were no members of the American Congress present to take part in the deliberations on that treaty. Our late President appointed on that delegation two Members of the Senate, the able chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. CONNALLY] from this side of the aisle, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], a stalwart member of the committee from the Republican side, and Governor Stassen, of Minnesota, a brilliant young naval officer who represented the viewpoint of men who are daily offering their lives in the rough war in the Pacific against Japan. Along with Mr. Stettinius and other members of the delegation, I believe that the Senator from Texas is entitled to the thanks of the American people for bringing this Charter to the floor of the United States Senate.

Perhaps Woodrow Wilson is entitled to the credit for first proposing a world-wide organization to enforce peace, inasmuch as this organization first took form in the so-called Fourteen Points of Woodrow Wilson and the League Covenant. Failure of the United States to become a member of the League of Nations perhaps foredoomed its failure, and certainly placed the United States on the outside of any world-wide organization which sought to keep the peace of the world.

During the course of my remarks on this important subject I shall undertake to compare some of the provisions of the San Francisco Charter with the provisions of the League Covenant. I believe that a comparison will rather definitely show that the charter is greatly superior to the League Covenant which was presented for ratification to the United States Senate following the Peace Conference at Versailles after World War I.

As an American Senator during the past 6 years I have had an opportunity to observe the conduct of the foreign affairs of this country by the late President of the United States. Historically, traditionally, and constitutionally, the power to conduct the foreign policies of the people of this country is vested in the President of the United States. He functions through his Secretary of State, who can be removed by the President at any time. I have supported the foreign policies of President Roosevelt during the past 6 years because I sincerely believed that under all the circumstances the policies which he advocated were best for the American people.

If it can be said that those policies brought on the war or contributed to the war, and that during the war we have suffered more than a million casualties and placed upon the people of our beloved country a debt of more than $300,000,000,000, then it should also be said that in doing this we have successfully stopped the menace of German aggression and we are well on the road to victory against Japan.

Furthermore, Mr. President, no bombs have fallen on the homes of the American people, whereas no other nation on the earth has escaped having its cities and towns virtually destroyed by the wrath of war. This policy has brought the American people through the war without having bombs rained down upon them from the skies. It is my firm conviction that if we had not gone into the war when we did, we most certainly would have been forced into it later and, if later, to our very great disadvantage. We have cooperated with our allies for war, and this cooperation has greatly contributed to the winning of the war. If we are now determined to cooperate for peace and to use the same efforts for peace that we have so successfully used for war, then it may be possible to prevent a recurrence of this frightful menace to humanity.

The most important question confronting mankind is how to make arrangements for the nations of the world to live in peace. Unless such an arrangement is made, civilization as we know it may some day be wholly destroyed.

I am deeply indebted to Mr. Serge Fligers, of the British Reuters News Service, for a point-by-point comparison of the new charter with the old League Covenant. I think it will definitely show that the Charter was drawn up by men who were familiar with the bitter lessons of Versailles and Geneva, and that while the League Covenant had been consummated by a crippled coalition of victorious powers, the present Charter emerges as an instrument independent of a peace treaty and founded upon the absolute defeat of totalitarianism. The United Nations Charter, Mr. President, is a great step forward toward the establishment of permanent peace.

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

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, but he is referring to the League of Nations Covenant as having been drafted by the powers at Versailles. My information is that the Covenant of the League was drawn up and completed in 11 days. It required 9 weeks for the San Francisco Conference to perform its duties, because of the great care and meticulous attention to all the various features of the instrument.

Mr. CHANDLER. I thank the Senator from Texas. The Senator was temporarily absent from the Chamber when I commended him for the courageous and fine work which he has done on behalf of the Senate and on behalf of the American people, and the care and good judgment which were used in the consideration of the treaty, resulting in the treaty being reported to the Senate in such fine order.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, during the course of my remarks, I shall quote rather freely from Mr. Fliegers and from the Charter.

In the preamble of the charter we read:

> We, the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war—

This is the first time in the history of international conventions that the ordinary common man rather than the state, is made the subject of a world organization. The preamble to the Covenant was in these words:

> The high contracting parties—

And there is never once the mention of an individual, but instead refers to states, nations, and governments.

The new charter is the first official international declaration of human rights to reaffirm faith in the dignity and value of the human persons, in the equal rights of men and women, to promote social progress and better standards of life in larger freedom, to practice tolerance. No mention of these ideas were made in the League Covenant. The phraseology in the Covenant was legalistic. There was talk of the acceptance of obligations not to resort to war, by the establishment of the understanding of international law as the actual rule of conduct among Governments. This Charter before the Senate is a declaration of human rights. Membership in this organization is open to all peace-loving states. The words "peace loving" did not appear in the League Covenant, neither was it mentioned in any previous international agreement from the Holy Alliance in 1915 to the Hague Conventions of 1899 and 1907.

The General Assembly, under the charter, may recommend new members to the organization, but the Security Council makes the final decision with respect to whether any country really qualifies as a peace-loving country. The membership requirements of the League of Nations was restricted to any fully self-governing state. There is no such provision in the Charter. This would not preclude a country with limited sovereignty to joint the new organization in the future. The organization under the charter, which is set up for the maintenance of peace and security, is composed of an Assembly, a Council, a Secretariat, and an International Court of Justice. There are also councils which have to do with economic and social matters, as well as a Council of Trusteeship.

The Secretariat under the Charter has administrative departments of a government and corresponds in a general way to the Secretariat of the old League of Nations. The employees of the Secretariat shed their individual nationality and assume allegiance only to the international body and not to any particular nation. It is significant that this group

of people are destined to become the first true world citizens. It is possible that this organization may at some time in the future become the nucleus of a world federation of peace-loving people, composed of men and women of all races, creeds, and colors.

During conversations with Mr. Churchill in England in 1943, he suggested to a delegation of American Senators the possibilities of common citizenship between the British and American people. He suggested that an American citizen might be eligible for a seat in the Parliament and that a British citizen might also seek membership in the Congress of the United States. The Senators who were present will recall that he was asked whose seat he wishes to occupy in the Senate of the United States.

The old League of Nations created a Secretariat that merely functioned as mouth pieces for individual governments.

There is in the charter an authorization that the Secretary-General has the right to bring to the attention of the Security Council at any time any threat to the peace of the world. The League Secretary had no such powers.

I want the Senator from Texas to know that I believe this is a comparison which perhaps should be made, and the comparison is definitely in favor of the instrument which he and his colleagues have brought to the Senate.

I repeat, the Secretary General, under the charter before us, has the right to bring to the attention of the Security Council at any time any threat to the peace of the world. The League Secretary had no such powers.

The General Assembly may discuss any and all questions within the scope of the charter and it may make recommendations to members of the United Nations or to the Security Council on such questions. This gives the broadest possible opportunity for the discussion of matters of interest to the representative nations of the world. The Assembly may discuss maintenance of world security, disarmament, regulations of armament, or any other matter which they consider of world importance, but they cannot take any definite action concerning major world problems. They may, however, make recommendations to the Security Council. The Council controls enough military and economic power to make any of its decisions stick. The Council can take action on the recommendations of the Assembly, or it can improve and revise the recommendations of the Assembly. The new Assembly is a democratic organization—even more democratic in its organization than the Congress of the United States, due to the fact that not only can any member of the Assembly or the Security Council bring up matters for discussion in the Assembly, but an outside state—one not a member of the Organization—can also bring up matters for discussion in the Assembly, but an outside state—one not a member of the Organization—can also bring up matters for the consideration of the Assembly. The public sessions of the Assembly will be broadcast to every corner of the civilized world, and the widest latitude is given for full discussion of problems. The Assembly cannot recommend any definite course of action, but it may be a powerful force in focusing public opinion to a point where desirable actions are forthcoming.

In the old League of Nations the Covenant specified: "The Assembly or the Council may deal at its meetings with any matter affecting the peace of the world," but there was an overlapping power between the Assembly and the Council. Frequently these two bodies argued with each other and questioned each other's authority to take ultimate action. In many instances, such as the rape of Ethiopia by the Italians, the action came too late. In the case of the charter, there is no duplication of power. If the Security Council decides that an international dispute necessitates immediate action, it can take such action without engaging in any debate with the Assembly members. One of the most important functions of the Assembly is "that it shall promote international cooperation in economic, social, cultural, educational, and health fields and assist in the realization of human rights and basic freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

Mr. President, certainly the basic freedoms will not have less opportunity under this charter. It is my belief that the prospects for their advancement and development are infinitely better because of what we are undertaking to do here.

The framers of the charter have displayed great wisdom and understanding, and this is shown by this declaration. It is recognized that by promoting the material welfare of the people, the fundamental causes of war may be eliminated. Actions were heretofore taken by the Senate of the United States to eliminate political frictions and replace those frictions by a friendly, economic, and social cooperation of all the people of the world.

With reference to trusteeships, the General Assembly will have the final say over all dependent territories which are considered by the Council not to be of strategic or military value. The Assembly will have general supervision over such nonstrategic dependent areas and will advise them with reference to ultimate self-government.

Each member of the General Assembly in good standing is entitled to one vote. On all important questions a two-thirds majority of those present and voting will make a decision with respect to the case at bar. The so-called important questions are election of Trusteeship Council members, admission of new members to the United Nations Organization, expulsion of members, suspension of rights and privileges of members, and questions relating to trusteeship and budgetary matters. All other questions shall be decided by the Assembly by a simple majority.

Mr. President, I now desire to discuss briefly the Security Council, and then a word or two with respect to trusteeship agreements. The Security Council is to be composed of five permanent members. The permanent members are the United States, the United Kingdom, Soviet Russia, China, and France. Mr. President, it is the first time in the history of the world that five great powers have united in a single international organization, pledged to the prevention of war. The United States never became a member of the League of Nations, and the League of Nations Council became purely an Europeon affair, with a few other nations playing minor roles.

In this charter the United States and Soviet Russia are now firmly bound to the other United Nations; and with these two nations pledged to use their energies to prevent war, we have achieved for practical purposes something not heretofore attained in the history of man. The five permanent members of the Council have the veto power. Article 4 of the League Covenant provided:

> The Council may name additional members of the League whose representatives shall always be members of the Council.

There is no such provision in this Charter; and thus, because of the veto, there is an effective way of preventing the situation in which Germany or Japan might claim at some future date permanent membership in the Security Council. They may obtain it some time, but there is no way, no provision, and no right on their part to claim it.

There are to be elected six nonpermanent members of the Security Council. These members are to be elected by the General Assembly. The permanent members of the Council have no dictatorial authority over the Organization, but they are a group of strong nations and they are entrusted with the responsibility of keeping the peace of the world. They are to act in these matters in accordance with the purposes and principles of the United Nations. The Council is, therefore, the executive organization which is dominated—hear me, Mr. President—which is dominated—it does not dominate, but it is dominated by the spirit of the whole Organization. The Senator from Texas realizes how important that is. It is dominated, Mr. President, by the spirit of the whole organization.

The Council, in my opinion, is strictly bound by the law of the charter and by the preamble and the purposes of the charter. Erroneous impressions have been stimulated throughout the world, seeking to create the feeling that the Big Five, through the veto power given to permanent members of the Council, will control the Organization. A comparison of this question with that provided in the old League of Nations is interesting. Article 5 of the League Covenant says in part "decision at any meeting of the Assembly or of the Council shall require the agreement of all the members of the League represented at the meeting."

In effect, there was established in the League veto power on behalf of each of the 58 nations who were members of the League at the outbreak of the war. The charter reduces that veto power by 10 times in the new Security Organization. Instead of 1 of 58 nations being able to stand up and block the entire world's action with respect to peace, only 1 out of 5 of these strong and powerful nations has the power to veto a decision of

this Organization, and these 5 are committed to fight for the peace of the world.

Mr. President, the Charter provides that nonpermanent members of the Council cannot immediately be reelected after their terms expire. The League of Nations had no such provision, and nonpermanent members of its Council were chosen from a group of eligible nations who were often reelected. When the first election takes places under the charter, nonpermanent members will be elected to seats on the Council for 2 years, and in certain cases for only 1 year.

Mr. President, the world is weary of war. The world cannot stand another war. The peoples of all nations earnestly desire peace, and it has been arranged in this Charter for the Security Council to control the armament policy of all nations. Through its military staff committees, definite plans for international regulation of armaments will be worked out and its orders will be enforced by the Council. The old League of Nations never possessed such strength of action. Article 8 of the League said:

> Members of the League recognize that the maintenance of peace requires the reduction of national armament to the lowest point consistent with national safety.

The Council provided for in this charter has the power and the means to enforce its direction with respect to disarmament. The Security Council provided for in the Charter is to be on the job 24 hours a day, and it is to be in operation continuously. The requirement of the League of Nations was that "the council shall meet from time to time as occasion may require, and at least once a year." Hear me, Mr. President: That provision was "at least once a year." The Security Council provided for in the Charter, I repeat, is to be on the job 24 hours a day, and keeping peace is a full-time job.

Military sanctions as applied by the League Covenant were never able to provide successful and effective military action against aggressors. Article 16 says:

> It shall be the duty of the Council to recommend to the several governments concerned—

Fifty-eight of them—

> what effective military, naval, or air forces the members of the League shall severally contribute to the armed forces to be used to protect the Covenant of the League.

The charter, on the other hand, provides that "the Council may take such action by air, sea, or land as may be necessary to maintain or restore international peace and security." I say to the Senator from Texas that that is a strong provision. It is vastly stronger than the one which was originally contained in the old League of Nations Covenant.

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

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Allow me to say, since the Senator has been discussing the Security Council, that I had the honor of being a member of the committee of the San Francisco Conference which dealt with the Security Council. I gave a great deal of attention to trying to preserve the strength, dignity, and influence of the Security Council because I regarded it as being one of the cardinal agencies or influences of the entire organization.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator did a grand job when he insisted upon preserving the strength of the Council and the strength of this provision, because if it were weak, no nation could avoid war. There are two ways by which a nation can get into a fight. One is by being so weak that every other nation knows it can be whipped. The other is by being so strong that it goes out and looks for trouble. We were once weak, and because we wished to avoid war we thought we could avoid it by merely wishing. But this Council may take such action, Mr. President, by air, sea, or land, as may be necessary in order to maintain or restore international peace and security.

So the provisions of the Charter clearly establish for the first time in history a world military force, under a joint staff, which can be put into action at a moment's notice in order to extinguish the first fires which might set off another world conflict.

The use of force to prevent war, and the power to use such force, is vested in the Security Council. No nation or group of nations has the right or the authority to use force without the authorization of the Council. This Charter, Mr. President, outlaws war as an instrument of national policy. It gives to the Council supreme authority to provide military action for the enforcement of peace. No nation will hereafter use force in the claim that it is being used for the purpose of keeping the peace of the world. The League of Nations did not outlaw the use of such force. Article 15 of the League reserves "the right to take such action as they shall consider necessary for the maintenance of right and justice if both parties to a dispute do not accept the unanimous decision of the Council."

Mr. President, I do not have the time, and it would not be well to discuss each provision of the Charter during the course of my remarks. Many of the important matters to which reference has been made have heretofore been covered adequately, and are quite clear to all Members of the Senate.

There is, however, one matter which is very close to the hearts of the American people, and which I desire briefly to discuss at this time. I refer to the question of the possession of islands and territories outside the continental limits of the United States of America. Many of those places I have visited personally. Many of those island places were won after a hard fight, and after the lives of gallant boys were lost. Many of them had originally been placed under the so-called mandate system which was fathered by General Smuts of South Africa. After the last war certain areas which were being considered in the negotiations for peace were mandated to the Allies, or to nations then friendly with the Allies. The United States did not accept any territory as a possession or as a mandate. The historic policy of the people of the United States of America has been—and I have referred to it before—"take and abandon." If trouble comes, and it becomes necessary in order to protect the interests of the American people, we move in and take possession of territories which, in the hands of the enemy, would be a danger to the people of the United States. Then, as soon as the trouble has passed, we leave and someone else comes in. When trouble returns we must go back and have our men killed all over again in repossessing the territory. As I have already said, the historic policy of the American people has been "take and abandon." President Truman has declared, just as the American people declared after the First World War, that as a result of our victory we covet no territory or possessions of any other country in the world. So, when we make that kind of a declaration we cannot be quite certain that we will get anything, because every other nation understands what our policy has been.

Some nations, notably the Japanese, took possession of islands which had been mandated under agreements, and fortified them contrary to the agreements. Our representatives were not allowed even to visit those islands. We had no idea of the extent of the work which had been done in fortifying those possessions against the American people until our boys had to go into places like Tarawa, Iwo Jima, Okinawa, Kwajalein, and others. Then we found out. Those islands had all been fortified contrary to the original understanding. The mandate system, as originally established, had meant a protectorate. It did not mean absolute possession and control. However, in 25 years it ripened into possession absolute, and the only way by which it could be challenged was by force of arms. In those areas barriers were set up against our peacetime trade, and a situation developed which was entirely contrary to the policy and purpose of the American people.

Mr. President, in my opinion it would be a serious mistake——

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield.

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. I should like to ask the Senator a question. Is it true that all the islands which the Senator named were mandated islands?

Mr. CHANDLER. No.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Does the Senator believe that many of the places which were fortified by the Japanese were not mandated islands?

Mr. CHANDLER. I did not undertake to say that they were all mandated islands, and I did not undertake to distinguish between the ones which were mandated and the ones which were not. Some of them were mandated, and we lost many lives in undertaking to repossess them.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The breach of trust with reference to the islands which were mandated was quite bad enough without adding to those islands the places which the Japanese rightfully possessed and fortified to which the world did not object. The mandate theory was established with the idea that there should be an idealistic guardian appointed for backward peoples or for backward territories so that their

people could grow up into a condition of self-government. There was also a breach in the League covenant. Japan was one of the original signers of the League, and Germany became a signer later.

Mr. CHANDLER. I understand. The United States did not accept any possessions as mandates. So certainly we did not violate any mandate. Japan did violate a mandate, and the point I want to make plain is that I think it would be a serious mistake in the future if the American people failed to be entirely realistic with respect to the islands we have taken, with great loss of life, whether mandated or not.

The mistake will not be made by Russia. Russia would not permit another power to control an island or a possession which would subject her to the danger, in the hands of an enemy, of bombing raids against her cities and towns and against her people. Russia would certainly move in quickly and control such a situation. So in the case of our country, if an island were in the hands of a weak, friendly nation which was unable to defend it—and we have many weak friends among the nations which could not support their possessions when the showdown came—I believe we should be in a position to control those places so as to obviate the loss of the lives of American boys in retaking them and to prevent an enemy obtaining them as bases from which to bomb the women and children of our country, and destroy our cities and towns.

The American boys who are out in the Pacific, and who have fought for the islands we have taken, want this protection for our defense, because they think they fought for it. I believe it would be very foolish if we failed to enter into a realistic arrangement which absolutely guaranteed that we would be strong enough in any island possession, or in any other possession, sufficiently close to the United States so that in the possession of an enemy there could be bombing raids against the cities and towns of the United States, and we should not fail absolutely to control in force the territory of any weak nation which could not defend it if trouble came.

Mr. President, I hope no mistake will be made as to my view, because I visited these places, I know the terrific cost in the lives of American boys in taking them. Australia could not have been saved except by the forces of the American people. Australia is a country of 7,000,000 people, isolated and wide open to the Japanese. The Australians were magnificent and heroic in their efforts, but they would have been absolutely futile if they had been left solely to their own devices. Should we leave Caledonia, a French possession, and New Zealand, a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, the Fijis, the Samoas, partly British mandate and partly American? Should we leave any of those places in such a condition that in the future if trouble comes to Australia, for instance, our boys will have to go there and fight again to defend Australia from some enemy? I do not know that that will happen, but it has happened before, and in being realistic we must answer. We had to go thousands of miles to the south and transport munitions and materials because the Japanese figured out that in the Gilbert and Marshalls they could cut off transportation, and if they had moved a little quicker, God knows they might have done it. I hate to think what would have been the fate of Australia and what would have been the cost to us of trying to recover it. We might have done it, but the cost would have been tremendous.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. CHANDLER. I yield.

Mr. THOMAS of Utah. The Senator will never be misunderstood about what he has been discussing, but he has made such a splendid argument for the moral aspects of the Charter it seems to me he has given us a chance to point out its moral significance. Ultimately there will be a moral-significance, a legal significance, and a new international-law significance, as he pointed out, in regard to war. If, for instance, the right to make war is placed in an international organization, as the Senator has pointed out, new types of morals in regard to the use of force will develop.

Since we are discussing islands, it seems to me it is a good idea to point out that we ourselves have different obligations in regard to the islands we have taken. If we take an island which has been mandated and take it away from a country which has not been true to the mandate, we still have a moral obligation to the mandatory power, as trustees of the conscience of the world. But if we take an island which belonged to another country, then of course there is a difference. I know that the Senator wants to find out the differences, because we do not want to make again the mistakes which have been made in regard to these things.

Mr. CHANDLER. No. Our position has been made clear by the President of the United States because he has said we do not want anything. The other nations understand that. That certainly means that we will not get anything, because other people are not voluntarily giving territories and islands away.

If that holds good—and God knows I hope it will, but it has not held good so far in any other place in the world—I do not want suspicions and doubts created. Any lingering suspicion I have is based on the hope that the American people, men, women, and children, in cities and towns, will not be destroyed by incendiary bombs, as have been other cities and towns that I have personally visited and seen.

Every American Senator wants to prevent such a thing if possible, and we have prevented it. We have suffered more than a million casualties. We have piled up an enormous debt, and made the greatest commitment in men and materials ever made by any country, but our people have not suffered from bombings. That entirely justifies the action we have taken as a government. God knows I do not want any such things.

This covenant speaks of the rights of human beings. The old League Covenant talked about the dignity of nations and self-governing states. We are talking about human beings who wish to be associated with others, the ones with whom they want to be associated, and no nation is more anxious or willing than we to see that that association is the kind they want and is under the proper auspices.

I have the greatest faith that these five strong powers with such additional members as are hereafter permitted to join the Security Council, will use the power and resources they have, which can be applied instantly and without debate, and no Senator and no citizen will object to my being in dead earnest about the ultimate Organization of our nations.

In the international trusteeship agreement under the Charter, members of the United Nations are obliged to recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of the dependent territories are paramount, and the United Nations accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost their well being, their progressive development, and eventually their self-government or independence.

Under the mandate system the League never intended to recommend the establishment of full independence for the countries under their supervision. In article 22 it says:

> The tutelage of such peoples should be entrusted to advanced nations who by reason of their resources, their experience, or their geographical position can best undertake this responsibility.

Thus, it can be readily seen that the charter is much superior to the League in this respect, as it recognized the obligation of strong nations to promote the well-being and the human rights and interests of dependent territories and peoples.

There has been considerable discussion in the Senate with respect to the procedure to be followed in commiting the United States to the use of force, if the use of force becomes necessary under the terms of the Charter. There is nothing in this charter which limits the power of Congress to pass upon the use of force. It is my view that we have committed ourselves by the adoption of this Charter, and we have in good faith pledged our resources to fight for peace and that the Congress, immediately after the ratification of this Charter, should adopt a concurrent resolution, giving the President the power to use our armed forces in order to fulfill any obligation that may arise under this Charter. This delegates the right to use military power until such power is checked by a majority of the Congress, and this check can be invoked at any time prior to the formal declaration of a state of war. It is my opinion that a concurrent resolution should be used and not a joint resolution. If a joint resolution were used it could not be repealed without the consent of the President, because in the event of a Presidential veto two-thirds of both Houses would be required to pass the joint resolution over his veto. By adopting a concurrent resolution, Congress would immediately notify all the peoples of the world and the people of this country that the President can instruct our delegate in the

Security Council to put our forces immediately into action where our interests are affected and where disputes between two powers threaten the peace of the world. This would be a legislative direction which would greatly broaden the power which the President now exercises under the Constitution, and would give notice to everyone that we intend to keep the peace of the world.

The President of the United States, under his constitutional authority, has always had the right to use the troops of the United States where he felt that American interests needed protection. In the latest and most notable case, President Roosevelt ordered the American troops and they did actually occupy the country of Iceland in July 1941. And so, the authority for the President to engage in skirmishes has always been recognized. The authority to declare or recognize the existence of a state of war has always remained in the hands of the Congress of the United States.

No supporter of this document claims perfection for it. It may be amended. It may be altered. It may be changed, but it represents the ideas first expressed to the world by Woodrow Wilson—an association of nations, working together to insure peace.

We have avoided many of the mistakes that were made in our attempts to establish peace in the days of Wilson. Mr. Roosevelt was perfectly familiar with those failures. The naming of United States Senators and Members of the House of Representatives to consult and to help in the preparation of the Charter has given confidence to the Members of the Senate and to the people of the country, with respect to its provisions. We have implemented the Charter by joining in a world bank under the Bretton Woods agreement. We are associating ourselves with food conferences, to undertake to help feed the starving millions of the world. In this the peoples of the world have pinned their faith and hope for a just, for a realistic, and for an enduring peace. Finally, of course, the ultimate security and effectiveness of this Organization must rest on the good will of the five great powers. They have borne the heavy blows of the enemy during the war. They have survived this terrific ordeal of fire. They have been bruised and beaten and their people have bled and suffered. Will the memory of the sufferings of their people inspire in them the determination to keep the peace, now that an opportunity is again offered?

The American people are familiar with the broadcasts from London by Edward R. Murrow, whose familiar salutation was always "This is London." He says:

> The price of victory has been high. We don't yet know just how high—how many twisted minds and bodies, how much loss of faith and hope. The first task is to bury the dead and feed the living. The formal declaration of victory will not return the wandering millions to their homes, or provide food for the hungry, or clothes for the ill-clad. The economy of Europe is in shreds. The political structure is unstable. There is still danger of famine and plague. Unknown millions have lost everything—even their very countries. There is bitterness and suspicion and very little unquestioning hope or belief that wars have ended and that a new, easier, and freer world is certain.

He goes on to say, Mr. President:

> Europe is tired—almost to death. She has escaped destruction by the narrowest margin. The period of convalescence will be long. The old hatreds will emerge. The war was longer and harder than most people thought possible. The same will probably be true of the period of reconstruction.
>
> Victory confronts us with a problem without parallel and with an opportunity purchased at great price. Perhaps we should remember, even tonight—

This was the night of the V-day celebration in England—

> in the midst of the celebration, that the suffering will continue for many years. And that unspeakable crimes are still unpunished, and above all else that power carries with it great responsibility. We have the power. Europe has no doubt that America is mighty in battle, and today our Nation, which was created by men who wanted to leave Europe, is the center of the hopes and some of the fears of millions who are in Europe today.

Mr. President, our people left that continent in search of peace, in search of happiness, in search of freedom, and now from across the ocean millions of people place their hopes in the leadership of the American people. When will peace again come to this earth? Only when Almighty God shall judge among the nations; and in Isaiah 2, chapter 2, verse 4, it is written:

> And He shall judge among the nations, and shall rebuke many people; and they shall beat their swords into plowshares, and their spears into pruning hooks; nation shall not lift up sword against nation, neither shall they learn war any more.

Millions of the people of the world are dead. Other millions are homeless and starving. We have expended more than a million casualties. Many of them the finest and brightest youngsters that have ever been raised by the American people. We have expended billions of dollars of our resources. We have cooperated with our allies for victory. Is it not possible, with these frightful lessons before us, to cooperate just as actively and just as determinedly for peace?

Mr. President, the boys of the windswept North, the boys of the sun-kissed South, whose fathers and grandfathers followed Grant and Lee in the battles of the War Between the States, all emerged in this great war as true sons of the flag. All have advanced against a stubborn and brutal enemy, never turning back. This is our finest generation, Mr. President, and this is our finest hour.

"Lord God of hosts, be with us yet, lest we forget."

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. Mr. President, I wish to compliment Members of the Senate who have addressed themselves to the subject before the Senate. They have done so with great ability and with evident earnestness. I wish to compliment the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] for the energy which they displayed at the San Francisco Conference in helping to write the so-called United Nations Charter, which is now before the Senate for ratification.

It is acknowledged that its purpose is to authorize the United States Government to join at some future date with the representatives of other governments in formulating rules and legislation for the purpose of outlining the duties and responsibilities of the body of international representatives who will operate under the organization created by the Charter. I am referring, of course, to representatives from member nations of the United Nations Organization.

We do not know at what time the results of the labors of the organization to be created in the future will come back to the Senate. The purpose, however, is to form an organization to formulate rules and regulations which will be the basis of a new code of international law by which the various signatory governments agree to abide.

The ostensible purpose of this international organization is to promote peace and, where peace cannot be promoted, to enforce it.

The pages of history are filled with arrangements among the states of the world for the purpose of doing away with war. These arrangements always appear as an afterthought of the victor nations who impose their will on the vanquished, in the hope that peace will then insure the spoils of victory. But history also records that the victor powers, either singly or collectively, are always the architects of the peace-enforcing agency and the peace settlements to be enforced. But the pages of history are barren of peace settlements imposed by the victor on the vanquished which were rooted in the principles of honor, decency, and justice.

This Charter, following on the heels of this historic pattern, is bound to perpetuate the so-called peace arrangements made or to be made by the three big powers for Europe, Africa, and Asia. At present we do not know what they are or will be. I challenge any Senator to deny that these settlements, whatever they may be, will again be imposed upon and affect for ill the vanquished, neutrals, or allies. Then where is the hope of peace, with history again repeating itself?

It is unnecessary to record, one by one, the tragic settlements of history to sustain this charge.

But here, today, we are confronted with something unique in history because we are now asked to produce enforcement machinery for a peace treaty which, so far as we know, has not been written, and we know not when its contents, when written, will be released. The final peace agreements are still in the womb of secret conclaves of power politics of the three great powers. After they are revealed they will not come under the jurisdiction of this world organization.

Can anyone be so simple minded as to believe that this organization, if and when established, can be more effective in righting the provisions of treaties which are conducive to international friction and injustice and ultimately to war than was the League of Nations following the last war? I am not talking about the Charter. I am talking about the organization which is to be formed.

The failure of the League of Nations to maintain peace has been propagandized to be due to the failure of the United States to enter the League of Nations when, as a matter of fact, the failure of the League to make adjustments and settlements of international controversies was forecast by President Wilson's most loyal and close advisers at the time the Versailles Treaty was imposed upon the vanquished powers.

President Wilson, in good faith, based his hope on the League of Nations for revision of treaties, but the League's policy was controlled by the five great victor powers whose power politics would not tolerate readjustment. They were foreseen at the time, not only by the President's close advisers, but by Members of the United States Senate.

These things were all foreseen and predicted by men having knowledge of diplomatic history and power politics and, as I said, the close counsellors and advisers of Mr. Wilson saw them immediately upon the signature of the treaty. I shall quote what they said at the time, as recorded in the archives.

Mr. Robert Lansing was Wilson's Secretary of State. He attended the Paris Peace Conference as a commissioner to negotiate peace. His views concerning the treaty at the time of his conversation with Mr. Bullitt are expressed in his memorandum of May 8, 1919, as follows:

My views concerning the treaty at the time of the conversation with Mr. Bullitt are expressed in a memorandum of May 8, 1919, which is as follows:

"The terms of peace were yesterday delivered to the German plenipotentiaries, and for the first time in these days of feverish rush of preparation there is time to consider the treaty as a complete document.

"The impression made by it is one of disappointment, of regret, and of depression. The terms of peace appear immeasurably harsh and humiliating, while many of them seem to me impossible of performance.

"The League of Nations created by the treaty is relied upon to preserve the artificial structure which has been erected by compromise of the conflicting interests of the Great Powers and to prevent the germinating of the seeds of war which are sown in so many articles and which under normal conditions would soon bear fruit. The League might as well attempt to prevent the growth of plant life in a tropical jungle. Wars will come sooner or later.

"It must be admitted in honesty that the League is an instrument of the mighty to check the normal growth of national power and national aspirations among those who have been rendered impotent by defeat. Examine the treaty and you will find peoples delivered against their wills into the hands of those whom they hate, while their economic resources are torn from them and given to others. Resentment and bitterness, if not desperation, are bound to be the consequences of such provisions. It may be years before these oppressed peoples are able to throw off the yoke, but as sure as day follows night the time will come when they will make the effort.

"This war was fought by the United States to destroy forever the conditions which produced it. Those conditions have not been destroyed. They have been supplanted by other conditions equally productive of hatred, jealousy, and suspicion. In place of the Triple Alliance and the Entente has arisen the Quintuple Alliance which is to rule the world. The victors in this war intend to impose their combined will upon the vanquished and to subordinate all interests to their own.

"It is true that to please the aroused public opinion of mankind and to respond to the idealism of the moralist they have surrounded the new alliance with a halo and called it 'The League of Nations' but whatever it may be called or however it may be disguised it is an alliance of the Five Great Military Powers.

"It is useless to close our eyes to the fact that the power to compel obedience by the exercise of the united strength of 'The Five' is the fundamental principle of the League. Justice is secondary. Might is primary.

"The League as now constituted will be the prey of greed and intrigue; and the law of unanimity in the Council, which may offer a restraint, will be broken or render the organization powerless. It is called upon to stamp as just what is unjust.

"We have a treaty of peace, but it will not bring permanent peace because it is founded on the shifting sands of self-interest."

Mr. President, I continue to quote from Mr. Lansing. I do it for the purpose of recalling the experience of the past, because what he said about that treaty was simply a repetition of history up to that time. He said:

In the views thus expressed I was not alone. A few days after they were written I was in London where I discussed the treaty with several of the leading British statesmen.

Mind you, Mr. President, that followed immediately after the signing of the Treaty of Versailles. I read further:

I noted their opinions thus: "The consensus was that the treaty was unwise and unworkable, that it was conceived in intrigue and fashioned in cupidity, and that it would produce rather than prevent wars." One of these leaders of political thought in Great Britain said that "The only apparent purpose of the League of Nations seems to be to perpetuate the series of unjust provisions which were being imposed."

Mr. President, F. A. Voigt, editor of the English magazine The Nineteenth Century and After, made some very significant statements. He is the editor of a very important, conservative, and well-edited periodical which we find in our library here. It is one of the great, informative journals which is written in the English language, I think. He wrote the following some years after the League was formed:

The League would have been even more dangerous to the world's peace and to every conception of justice, whether human or divine, if the articles of the Covenant had not been qualified so as to enable the signatories to elude the tasks which the underlying principles would else have imposed upon them. Two attempts were made to render the League more perfect, and therefore more dangerous—the Treaty of Mutual Assistance, in 1923, and the Geneva Protocol, in 1924. Under the latter, an "aggressive war" was to be declared "an international crime." But a deed does not become a crime merely by being called so. Nor have any of the attempts to distinguish between aggressive and defensive warfare or "to define the aggressor" been successful. In some wars it is clear who the aggressor is—in 1914 and 1939 it was Germany. But it is not always so clear. There have been in the past, and there will be in the future, wars in which there can be no final answer to the question: Who is the aggressor?

The more zealously men apply themselves to the abolition of all wars, the less successful will they be in averting this or that war, the more will wars be brought on that might otherwise have been averted, the more will men promote the transformation of small wars into bigger, of local wars into general wars, for every attempt to universalise peace can but result in delocalising war.

The victor powers, because of secret diplomacy and private interests, as represented in the League Council, failed to act in the Manchurian crisis against Japan, after being called upon to act by the Government of the United States, through our former Secretary of State, Henry Stimson, because the imperial powers of the League Council did not find it to their interest at that time to act.

Again, when Mussolini invaded Ethiopia, the British Government violated its agreement with the French Government, previously made, giving the "go" sign for Mussolini to take Ethiopia as indemnity for the wrongs he claimed Italy had submitted to at Versailles.

On every major crisis, following the last war, the big powers disagreed.

According to the provisions of this charter, again the Big Five are going to be above the laws which they are going to make and which they are going to enforce.

Then what can we do when the big powers disagree? Mr. President, the holy alliance was an alliance of three great powers. For a certain length of time they agreed, but later they had another war. An interesting feature will appear when the great powers prove unable to agree. At the moment all can be brought into line by the hope of getting their hands on the American Treasury, except possibly Soviet Russia. What will this mean when American money is no longer freely ladled out to a penurious and begging world?

Have we, through our diplomacy and our participation in international politics, become so enmeshed that it is now impossible for us to maintain our political independence on a basis of justice and peace, or are we now at the end of the rope as an independent nation? Are we now to decide we must join a world superstate for our safety and our economic welfare? If that decision is now to be made, let us walk carefully. I do not believe we have come that far.

Where are we going—toward a renewal of our faith in ourselves, or to the novel experiment of subordinating the independence of action of one of the last free peoples on earth to a world superstate?

Mr. President, on July 4, 1776, the Declaration of Independence from European politics was adopted by the Continental Congress at Philadelphia. Because it appears that an increasing number of Americans have forgotten the wellsprings of this inspired document, because so many Americans have never understood the burning hatred of tyranny and oppression that moved our founding fathers to dare an unknown future to quench their thirst for liberty, I wish at this time to recall the central inspiration of this document. They enumerated the wrongs from which they had suffered; and I think it is wise to bear that in mind, because there are hundreds of millions of people in the

world today who are suffering the same wrongs:

When in the course of human events, it becomes necessary for one people to dissolve the political bands which have connected them with another, and to assume among the powers of the earth, the separate and equal station to which the laws of nature and of nature's God entitle them, a decent respect to the opinions of mankind requires that they should declare the causes which impel them to the separation.

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. That to secure these rights, governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed.

Mr. President, when we think of Europe, Asia, and Africa, it is well for us to bear in mind our original declaration of political faith, where it originated, and the nature of the doctrine which was stated at the time.

I continue reading:

That whenever any form of government becomes destructive of these ends, it is the right of the people to alter or to abolish it, and to institute new government, laying its foundation on such principles and organizing its powers in such form, as to them shall seem most likely to effect their safety and happiness * * *.

The history of the present King of Great Britain is a history of repeated injuries and usurpations, all having in direct object the establishment of an absolute tyranny over these states. To prove this, let facts be submitted to a candid world. * * *

He has dissolved representative houses repeatedly, for opposing with manly firmness his invasions on the rights of the people.

Mr. President, that has taken place all over the world during recent years, and it is still taking place.

I continue:

He has obstructed the administration of justice, by refusing his assent to laws for establishing judiciary powers.

He has made judges dependent on his will alone, for the tenure of their offices, and the amount and payment of their salaries.

He has erected a multitude of new offices, and sent hither swarms of officers to harass our people, and eat out their substance.

He has kept among us, in times of peace, standing armies, without the consent of our legislature.

He has affected to render the military independent of and superior to the civil power.

He has combined with others to subject us to a jurisdiction foreign to our Constitution, and unacknowledged by our laws; giving his assent to their acts of pretended legislation.

For taking away our charters, abolishing our most valuable laws and altering fundamentally the forms of our governments:

For suspending our own legislatures and declaring themselves invested with power to legislate for us in all cases whatsover.

He has excited domestic insurrections amongst us. * * *

In every stage of these oppressions we have petitioned for redress in the most humble terms. Our repeated petitions have been answered only by repeated injury. A prince, whose character is thus marked by every act which may define a tyrant, is unfit to be the ruler of a free people.

Mr. President, for a moment, let us look at the world as it is today. The world now lies before our eyes shattered, and bathed in blood. Europe, Africa, and Asia have been turned into a vast chamber of horrors where, over the past decade, men have been engaged in the single pursuit of torturing and annihilating their fellow men. It is obvious to anyone who reads the handwriting on the wall of history that mankind must declare a moratorium on the development of its science of destruction until man's conscience catches up with his murderous skills. But since no society or collective State possesses a corporate conscience, this pressing challenge can only be met by free men living in a society which guarantees their inalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness. The men and women of America want to join hands with the other peoples of the earth to create the means by which humanity may banish the curse of war forever from the earth. But I submit, Mr. President, that the American people are determined to reserve to themselves the right of intelligent and creative participation in the determination of this venture.

Yet today we in America confront a new phenomenon in America's philosophy of government.

There are in our midst those who openly confess their belief that Bill of Rights democracy has been over-emphasized in this country; that economic democracy is all that matters. And under the guise of such labels we are being lured away from a constitutional representative government into the embrace of an ancient tyranny masquerading in a modern dress. It must be that such economic and political modernists have either forgotten or are contemptuously disregarding the roots from which America has grown. These men can find no facts in a hundred and fifty years of American history to refute my claim that America was born of the determination that, were it humanly possible, a new Nation, under God, should be forever free from entanglements in the ancient tyrannies of the Old World. Our Constitution was set up as a specific safeguard against any remote possibility of returning to tyranny.

Mr. President, I should have no grave misgivings about this Charter were I convinced that it meant the strengthening and the perpetuation of political, economic, and social environments in which the mind and conscience of free peoples remained in control of their destiny. Even this modern phenomenon in America's philosophy of government would not in itself have induced the gravity of my apprehension were it not for the fact that the ambiguity of the provisions of this document admit of such wide, varied, and conflicting interpretations. It was Tennyson who once remarked:

Words, like nature, half reveal and half conceal the thoughts within.

I am frank to confess that this new philosophy of government which, under the guise of modernity, would again lay the hoary hand of tyranny upon us, coupled with the ambiguities of this document, place every member of this august body in the lamentable position of being unable sincerely either to attack or to defend this document. I challenge any Member of the Senate to define to me the unequivocal meaning of its specific intentions and provisions.

We do not know what it means, except that we are told, and we believe, that when ratified it will give authority to the formation of a new international organization which, it is said, will be used for the enforcement of peace.

Without attempting to be facetious, I may say that even the plainest and most definitive provisions of this Charter, which Dr. Felix Morley dubs a "constitutional monstrosity," fades into a vague oblong blur amid the shadows of the restricting qualifications and contradictions of the document as a whole. I had received hundreds of letters supporting this document before it was written. Yet, Mr. President, in all seriousness, what is this Charter which is being offered to the peoples of the world as a guaranty of future peace? Who among us here can honestly say that as a nationalist, an isolationist, an interventionist, an internationalist, or a perfectionist, that he really knows what it means, what it guarantees, against whom its sanctions are directed, or how it will prevent war?

Mr. President, we are told we must be realists to understand this Charter, that since it would be unrealistic to expect the strong to admit any sanctions against the misuse of their strength, the hope of peace rests upon the continuing accord of America, Britain, and Russia. But if this is the case, what is the Charter really for? Specifically against whom is this mighty structure of the United Nations, elaborated at San Francisco, directed? Who among the small and weak nations is so wicked and so blind that a revolutionary technique, which actually revives the oldest of tyrannies, is required in America to curb them? Is it Switzerland, or Sweden, Ireland, or some other little country which just did not understand that one must go to war in order to be admitted into the select company of the peace-loving nations of the earth?

Mr. President, the members of this new organization have sworn never to resort to the use of force against one another. Surely the combined might of the Big Three is not needed to enforce the fulfillment of these sacred oaths. And certainly the word of the small nations should no more be doubted than the word of the Big Three. Can it be that this organization is directed solely against our late and present enemies? Are these measures for mobilizing the armed might of the world absolutely necessary only to grind into finer dust the reeking ruins of prostrate peoples?

Mr. President, is this United Nations Charter basically the projection into the peace of the wartime alliance of the victor powers? I wonder if the American people know how our founding fathers felt about the alliances. I wonder if they know what George Washington meant when he said in his Farewell Address:

Why, by interweaving our destiny with any part of Europe, entangle our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition, rivalship, interest, humor, or caprice? It is our true policy to steer clear of permanent alliances with any portion of the foreign world.

Mr. President, in the December 1943 issue of the Reader's Digest Mr. William Hard writes in his article on American internationalism that only three times in our history has America joined an alliance. He wrote:

In the course of our history we have given three outstanding permanent commitments to foreign countries. The outcome of all three has been extremely embarrassing and distressing.

A. In 1788 we signed with France a treaty of alliance. It was the only alliance treaty that we ever signed. We promised to guarantee forever against all other powers the French possessions in America. In 1798, by a simple act of Congress, without French consent, we repealed and repudiated it.

B. In 1882 we signed a treaty with Korea whereby we undertook to take diplomatic steps if any third country should deal "oppressively" with Korea. In 1905 Japan dealt with Korea certainly "oppressively" by conquering it; and in 1910 it further dealt with Korea certainly oppressively by annexing it. Did we take any diplomatic steps against Japan? Absolutely none. On the contrary we were the very first government to recognize the Japanese conquest of Korea by withdrawing our diplomatic legation from Korean soil and by thus proclaiming to the world that Korea, our ally, had ceased to exist as an independent country.

C. In 1846 we signed a treaty with Colombia whereby we undertook to guarantee the sovereignty of Colombia over the Isthmus of Panama. This commitment was in full force and vigor in 1903. In that year there was an artificially concocted revolution on the Isthmus. Did we then help Colombia to restore its sovereignty over the Isthmus? We did the reverse. We used our armed forces to prevent Colombia from itself restoring its sovereignty over the Isthmus. For doing so we ultimately paid Colombia an apologetic indemnity of $25,000,000. We acknowledged that in changed circumstances we had violated a commitment given in circumstances long gone by.

But, Mr. President, I cannot honestly say that this charter is just a bare military alliance. On February 14, 1945, I read Mr. Harold Callender's description of the deep misgivings of the French statesmen on this very point when he wrote:

Two peace systems seem to be taking shape. The first is a coalition of great powers to beat, disarm, and watch over Germany, and also to exercise a kind of general, if not generous, tutelage over the smaller liberated nations—this being the interpretation of the Big Three's declaration on liberated Europe. The second and more nebulous system will be the Dumbarton Oaks structure, deprived of any possible menace for any great power, but useful in restraining the small nations and in satisfying the universalism of the Americans, who shy at power politics, and the idealism of the unrealistic Anglo-Saxons generally.

Is this an attempt to fuse the despotism of arbitrary power with the laborious, involved, and yet essentially free and independent processes of democratic procedure in a world organization? I do not know. I honestly admit my mind is even further confused on this subject by all the emphasis that is being placed on the desperate necessity for the United States to remain armed to the teeth.

Why all this force in the world? Why all this unadulterated and unbridled might? Do the American people know what this means? Do they realize that we must provide for three separate military establishments out of our treasure and our blood? Do we not have to provide hundreds of thousands of troops to occupy the enemy countries? Is not that force, separate and distinct from a second military police power which we must provide, equip, and maintain to patrol the world? Surely these forces which are serviced in the interest of this world organization cannot be identified with a third military organization which my colleague, Senator CONNALLY, warned America would not be sufficient for our protection unless we maintained the most powerful navy on the globe. What else did Undersecretary of War Patterson mean when he said this peacetime establishment must rest on universal—

military training, resources capable of swift mobilization, and engineering and scientific developments serving military needs. * * * The peace-loving nations cannot again let their armies become impotent.

What else did Secretary Forrestal mean when he said:

We must maintain and increase the tremendous margin which we now have. * * * In peace, even more than in war, scientists owe to their nation an obligation to contribute to its security by carrying on research in military fields.

What did General H. H. Arnold mean when he warned:

The United States will be the first target of the next world aggressor. We must be prepared to overcome the enemy in the air before he strikes.

Do we or do we not have three mutually contradictory realities which the framers of this document have tried to reconcile within its provisions? Do we not have nationalism, a military alliance based on power politics, and a sop thrown to internationalism—all scrambled up on the pages of this document? In any event, it is interesting to know the background of traditional American policy as described by Cordell Hull on September 15, 1936. He said:

At times there has been criticism because we would not depart from our traditional policy and join with other governments in collective arrangements carrying the obligation of employing force, if necessary, in case disputes between other nations brought them into war. That responsibility, carrying direct participation in the political relations of the whole world outside, we cannot accept, eager as we are to support means for the prevention of war. For current experience indicates how uncertain is the possibility that we, by our action, could vitally influence the policies or activities of other countries from which war might come. It is for the statesmen to continue their effort to effect security by new agreements which will prove more durable than those that have been broken.

Whatever this document is, we are informed it has brought together the basic conflict of ulterior purposes and selfish interest of the nations into one glorious union blessed by the rite of holy matrimony.

Mr. President, is it not true that all the initiatives for the support of this international organization to which we are about to be wedded like those for the companion pieces designed at Bretton Woods were furnished by the Government of the United States? Is it not true that the great bulk of the resources which made victory possible were furnished by the United States? And is it not equally true, Mr. President, that the bulk of the resources required to start and maintain these immense undertakings on their careers must be furnished by the United States?

Mr. President, I wonder if any Member of the Senate body honestly believes that the average American citizen has even the slightest notion of the extent to which we are involved in a financial race with disaster. Mr. President, where the welfare of humankind is at stake there can be found no such creature as a penurious and stingy American. But is it not true that we are committing ourselves to economic and financial undertakings which would bring the whole world crashing down upon our heads? Were a faltering domestic borrow-and-spend philosophy to interrupt for a moment the international pump-priming program to which we are committed by this charter, and its companion pieces, such as Bretton Woods, UNRRA, and so forth, and whatever other organizations the United States taxpayers' Treasury and natural resources must supply, the whole world would plunge into financial chaos. It is perfectly obvious, is it not, that if the United States, as the world's milk cow, should run dry, not only these novel international experiments would die for lack of nourishment, but so would men's hopes that they should see any such thing as the "four freedoms" extended to supply their most desperate necessities?

It is at this point that another very serious question comes to my mind. Much has been said about the right of withdrawal from this organization. Mr. Dulles thinks the right is inherent in the document. Why, then, Mr. President, was it left out of the Charter? Is not its omission a future basis of dispute and controversey? Is it not possible that the withdrawing nation may be denounced as an aggressor? Would this not be especially dangerous for the United States even if we had a veto? Involved as we will be in tremendous financial, economic, military, and political commitments, would not the other nations of the earth be justified in branding us an aggressor for the breaking of these commitments which a withdrawal from this organization would entail? We all know, from our reading of history, what happened to South Carolina when she thought she could secede from the Union.

Mr. President, the position of America today as the richest, the most industrially productive, the most powerful nation on earth has not endeared us to the world. No such nation ever endeared itself to its sister nations by promiscuously squandering its inheritance. Are we not in the same position today that Russia found herself in as the initiator and inaugurator of the Holy Alliance in 1820? On July 5, 1820, our Secretary of State, John Quincy Adams, wrote:

The Emperor Alexander may be considered as the principal patron and founder of the league of peace. His interest is the most unequivocal in support of it. His empire is the only party to the compact free from this internal fermentation which threatens the existence of all the rest. His territories are

the most extensive, his military establishment the most stupendous, naturally the most obnoxious to the jealousy and fears of his associates, and his circumstances point his policy to a faithful adhesion to the general system, with a strong reprobation to those who would resort to special and partial alliances, from which any one member of the league should be excluded.

Furthermore, Mr. President, is it utterly inconceivable that America's entanglement in the economic systems of a rapidly expanding state-controlled monopoly or cartelized trade could not be brought under a controlled plan of world economics? Might not our production have to be planned for world market requirements? Will not standards of every sort be imposed upon us gently but firmly by those among our own people who will always have an interest in "going along"? As long as our tax laws permit corporations, perhaps foreign-owned and certainly foreign-dominated, to flood our press and radio with noisy political propaganda deductible as an advertising expense, the cost of influencing public opinion in this direction would not be an insurmountable obstacle.

Certainly, Mr. President, this trend toward a collective state, which is being openly and insistently agitated in this country, will not be hindered by the continuation of the production of armaments and the incorporation for the first time in our history of peacetime compulsory military training into our economic and social structures respectively. These things are the food on which fascism flourishes. But then again, Mr. President, I am not certain. I do not know what the cost will be. If some one of my distinguished colleagues would be able to tell me exactly where this country stands financially as regards our unheard of war debt, our obligations to our own people, and the simply staggering contracts to which we have been committed financially and economically in the postwar world, I should be better able to make up my own mind as to the cost.

Mr. President, the question of what our participation in this world organization will cost us brings us immediately to a consideration of the nature of the political commitments which this tremendous economic and military and financial outpouring of American treasure and blood is to underwrite. Does any one of my colleagues even pretend to know what the peace treaties are going to be? Are we again, as in the case of the last war, going to be parties to the imposition of a status quo in Europe, Africa, and Asia? Or would somebody have the courage and faith in the Big Three to deny this? It seems to me that a legitimate construction would be placed on this Charter, vague, rambling, and conflicting as its provisions are, to the effect that our one world, like all of Gaul, either has been, is being, or will be divided into three parts.

Certainly it contains the ingredients of a world divided into three spheres of influence. And that possibility is not lessened by the fact that within each sphere there is, as the dominant power, one of the three great powers of the earth.

Mr. President, do I read the charter wrongly when I find that these nations who are to protect the other nations of the world, have with great anguish of spirit divided the nations of the world into three groups? At least they so conceived this necessity. The other members of this organization over which the Big Three are to throw their protecting wings have taken a solemn oath never to resort to force in the settlement of any dispute among themselves, and have sworn to remain within the law as laid down in the charter whatever that law may be.

Of course, we all understand that the law laid down in the charter is something entirely different from the law to which I am referring, which is coming back from the Conference which is to legislate for the International Organization. The third group of nations has been quarantined for an indefinite period in the hands of the victor nations without the slightest recourse to the protection of any law of God or man.

Are we not perhaps by promising to enforce in advance a peace whose terms we do not know, actually preventing a just peace settlement which could endure? For if our allies know in advance that the United States will go to war either to help them to perpetuate injustice and enable them to keep other people in subjection, or to save them from the future consequences of the enmities and hatreds they will arouse or perpetuate, will we not encourage them to ride roughshod over the weak and thus sow the seeds of yet another world conflagration? Mr. President, the tragedy of Versailles, which was brought about by just such practices as I have been questioning, drew the resignation from the Department of State of Mr. William Bullitt. On May 17, 1919, Mr. William C. Bullitt wrote the President as follows:

MY DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: I have submitted today to the Secretary of State my resignation as an assistant in the Department of State, attaché to the American commission to negotiate peace. I was one of the millions who trusted confidently and implicitly in your leadership and believed that you would take nothing less than a permanent peace based upon unselfish and unbiased justice. But our Government has consented now to deliver the suffering peoples of the world to new oppressions, subjections, and dismemberments—a new century of war. And I can convince myself no longer that effective labor for a new world order is possible as a servant of this Government.

Russia, "the acid test of good will," for me as for you, has not even been understood. Unjust decisions of the conference in regard to Shantung, the Tyrol, Thrace, Hungary, East Prussia, Danzig, the Saar Valley, and the abandonment of the principle of the freedom of the seas make new international conflicts certain. It is my conviction that the present League of Nations will be powerless to prevent these wars, and that the United States will be involved in them by the obligations undertaken in the Covenant of the League and in the special understanding with France. Therefore the duty of the Government of the United States to its own people and to mankind is to refuse to sign or ratify this unjust treaty, to refuse to guarantee its settlements by entering the League of Nations, to refuse to entangle the United States further by the understanding with France.

That you personally opposed most of the unjust settlements, and that you accepted them only under great pressure, is well known. Nevertheless, it is my conviction that if you had made your fight in the open, instead of behind closed doors, you would have carried with you the public opinion of the world, which was yours; you would have been able to resist the pressure and might have established the new international order based upon broad and universal principles of right and justice of which you used to speak. I am sorry that you did not fight our fight to the finish and that you had so little faith in the millions of men, like myself, in every nation who had faith in you.

Very sincerely yours,

WILLIAM C. BULLITT.

Mr. President, if this is typical of the revulsion of men who knew the terms they were underwriting, would not the revelation of secret agreements secretly arrived at, which accompanies all personal parleys in power politics, shock the conscience of the world? Would anyone lay a great wager that no secret agreements were reached at Teheran and Yalta? Or that at this very moment secret understandings are not being reached in Potsdam? President Wilson said he did not know of any secret agreements among the Allies until too late—at least this is what he said on his return to Washington from the Paris Conference. Are there to be no secret agreements, or are we underwriting by the provisions of this charter, if carried out by supplementary legislation, peace settlements which our conscience will repudiate when they are bared to the world?

And this brings us to another conundrum. We are committing ourselves to the use of force without being provided a single specific description of situations that are to warrant the use of armed intervention. Is it not significant that this document contains no intimation of a definition of aggression? Mr. President, this is not as though the conferees at San Francisco had no precedents in international law to go by. It is quite possible that such a definition has no place in this charter. It may come from the international body which is to legislate under the authority of this treaty, if and when ratified by the various governments.

What is wrong with the definition of aggression signed on July 3, 1933, in Moscow by Russia, Poland, Estonia, Latvia, Turkey, Persia, and Afghanistan at a convention for the definition of aggression which Russia sponsored and in which is found the clearest and most precise definition of what constitutes aggression that is found in the history of international relations? Article II of this remarkable treaty reads as follows:

In accordance with the above, the aggressor in an international conflict, with due consideration to the agreements existing between the parties involved in the conflict, will be considered the state which will be the first to commit any of the following acts:

1. Declaration of war against another state;

2. Invasion by armed forces, even without a declaration of war, of the territory of another state;

3. An attack by armed land, naval, or air forces, even without a declaration of war, upon the territory, naval vessels, or aircraft of another state;

4. Naval blockade of the coasts or ports of another state;

5. Aid to armed bands formed on the territory of a state and invading the territory of another state, or refusal, despite demands on the part of the state subjected to attack, to take all possible measures on its own territory to deprive the said bands of any aid and protection.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ELLENDER in the chair). Does the Senator from Minnesota yield to the Senator from North Dakota?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. Will the Senator give the date of the agreement between Russia, Estonia, Latvia, and the other countries?

Mr. SHIPSTEAD. July 3, 1933.

On December 28, 1933, President Roosevelt declared that one of the practical steps the nations of the world might take to eliminate the threat of aggression would be:

A simple declaration that no nation will permit any of its armed forces to cross its own borders into the territory of another nation. Such an act would be regarded by humanity as an act of aggression and as an act, therefore, that would call for condemnation by humanity.

The President went on to say:

If such an agreement were signed by a great majority of the nations on the definite condition that it would go into effect only when signed by all the nations, it would be a comparatively easy matter to determine which nations in this enlightened time are willing to go on record as belonging to the small minority of mankind which still believes in the use of the sword for invasion and of attack upon their neighbors.

As recently as March 8, 1945, the nations of the Western Hemisphere were willing to tackle the problem of defining aggression when, in the act of Chapultepec, they inserted at the very beginning of the document the following definition:

Every attack of a state against the integrity or the inviolability of the territory or against the sovereignty or political independence of an American state shall * * * be considered as an act of aggression against the other states which sign this act.

Would I not be justified in being deeply concerned over the fact that this Charter, so far as I can make out, defines neither the specific conditions for which we would use this force or against which we would use it, when Mr. Stalin has long been on record to the effect that:

Words must have no relation to action—otherwise what kind of diplomacy is it? Words are one thing, actions another. Good words are a mask for concealment of bad deeds. Sincere diplomacy is no more possible than dry water or woolen iron.

Mr. President, is it not entirely possible that without a definition of aggression the veto right of the Big Five will give them the power to freeze indefinitely the status quo power relationship? Since the real intercourse between nations is never static, will not the relative strength of the presently large, medium, and small powers change and outmode arrangements based on the present overwhelming superiority of American and Russian strength? Would it not be a grievous embarrassment for the American people to find themselves in the position of suppressing rebellion against tyranny all over the world? Is not the very effort of five nations to enforce peace, with power to call on the quota of others, only another name for the enforcement of their will? And, is not the fallacy of collective security and of the philosophy of enforcing peace revealed in the fact that with the mightiest military machine of all history Russia knows perfectly well it is no threat to her unless we use it against her? Have the American people yet to learn that in spite of all the pious talk to the contrary, peace cannot be enforced without creating war?

Mr. President, as I understand the provisions of the Charter on this point, in general they mean that the concept of neutrality has been destroyed. The old tradition of international law that has been built up among the nations over the past 400 years has been wiped out. Rather than quarantining the area of conflict through the recognition and the application of neutrality, henceforth there is to be no sanctuary for any individual or nation from the horrors of another titanic conflict.

But some may say this interpretation is open to criticism. I do not know. This much I do know, however: The philosophy now prevalent in our midst that we must be prepared for perpetual intervention in the future presents us with an alternative to war which amounts to the betrayal of the legitimate interests, concerns, and integrity of whatever small nations are caught in the path of the expanding spheres of influence of the Big Three.

If this Organization is to be held together without a world conflict, it must perpetuate the existing relations among the victor powers. This can never be done unless the present organized campaign of hatred toward our enemies is adopted as an instrument of national policy by this Government, while at the same time we whitewash our allies. Was it not George Washington who warned how a resort to such a policy would degrade and foul the honor of this Government? George Washington said:

Excessive partiality for one foreign nation, and excessive dislike of another cause those whom they actuate to see danger only on one side, and serve to veil and even second the arts of influence on the other. Real patriots, who may resist the intrigues of the favorite, are liable to become suspected and odious; while its tools and dupes usurp the applause and confidence of the people, to surrender their interests.

Mr. President, would not this be the lowest, most despicable form of appeasement known to man? Would it not lead to the sacrificing of the interests, possessions, and the independence of the smaller nations? Would we not be compelled to indulge in the kind of horse trading Mr. Felix Morley described in the March 14 issue of Human Events in which he said:

Agreement among the Big Three has been reached, and so far sustained by the most primitive method of negotiation known to mankind—that of swapping. The underlying principle is emphasized rather than concealed by the fact that the control of nations and peoples, not the possession of marbles and lollipops, is being bartered. The question is whether such primitive procedure holds promise of durability for the time when considerations more ethical than those involved in military victory again claim the attention of mankind. For if one moral stands out above another in the awful doom of Hitler, it is that mere physical power settles nothing.

The debate today, Mr. President, is not one between isolationists and internationalists. For good or ill, that debate was ended in 1941. The United States, by participation in this war and by adherence to the formula of unconditional surrender, has assumed responsibilities in Europe and Asia which she cannot now repudiate. In liberating Europe we have devastated Europe. By annihilating the German state we have created a vacuum in Europe. The peoples of Europe must be helped to recovery, and the vacuum will be filled either by our democratic concepts or by totalitarian ones. Having sacrificed so many lives and poured out so much treasure to win this war, would it not be senseless to disinterest ourselves in the peace settlements and throw away the fruits of victory?

The question at issue is whether this charter is real or "phony"; whether it is in truth an instrument to secure international peace and justice, or a cynical imposture bred by hypocrisy out of power politics.

Nowadays, I know, a new word has been invented to throw at those who insist on examining the various specious remedies recommended for the world's diseases. That word is "perfectionist." A mouse or an elephant is not a woman, and one is not being a perfectionist but a realist in announcing the fact that neither a mouse nor an elephant is a woman.

Curiously enough, it is yesterday's interventionists who now tell us that we should not concern ourselves with the shape of things to come in Europe or Asia so long only as we go along with our great Russian ally. Many of them now seem to have lost their former burning zeal to do away with tyranny, rescue the weak, and curb the strong.

Yet, having fought and won this war, we owe it to those who have died to make sure that they shall not have fought for no purpose. Nor should we either by acclamation or by default allow the peace settlement to be dictated either by vengeance or the greed of the victors, thus once again sowing the seeds of a new world conflagration.

Our difficult task and heavy responsibility is to use our power today to insure a just and lasting peace. We have assumed grave and heavy commitments. For that very reason, we should think seriously before assuming for the future responsibilities and commitments which we shall desire to repudiate when we cease to be blinded by the hatreds and passions spread by war.

We in the New World cannot and will not every 20 years redress the balance of the old by sending our sons to war. Would it not be a contribution to world thinking, as well as to American security, were we to define what we have traditionally meant by "intervention," and, in the light of this, redefine the responsibilities brought upon us?

Perpetual intervention means perpetual war. But perpetual appeasement, either of enemies or of allies, is surely not the only alternative to recurring wars to set the world aright—wars which, as the tragic history of the past 30 years now proves, are wars for democracy which always end by extending the area of tyranny. In 1914 most of the nations of Europe enjoyed representative government and civil liberties. Today practically the only democracies left in Europe are the non-peace-loving neutrals. All peace-loving nations went to war. The non-peace-loving nations are still democracies.

We have got to find a middle way between ever-recurring interventionist wars and allowing, by indifference or appeasement, the strangle hold of tyranny to engulf a greater and greater part of the earth.

I can both understand and support the arguments in favor of the Charter: That the world is now closer knit than ever before, and that now, if ever, is our opportunity to devise measures together with the other nations of the world to insure lasting peace. But I would ask you, Mr. President, whether the end we seek can be accomplished blindfolded or by obscuring the real issues. It would be the height of folly and an enduring shame should we, the Senate of the United States, either inadvertently or through carelessness or through shirking our duty to examine and reflect, give to the American people not the bread of peace they pray for, but a stone; not the substance of international cooperation, but the mirage of an unholy alliance of power and pelf to dominate and enslave the human race.

We have assumed responsibilities for which we are ill prepared and of which the American people are almost unaware. We are caught in a dilemma which requires that we reflect gravely, deeply, and without partisanship or cheap name calling. We cannot win security or peace or liberty for ourselves and others by casting peoples and principles either down the rat hole of appeasement or into the bloody maw of war. A better way must be found, and perhaps the lesson of the past 10 years can show it to us. It has often been argued, and the contention is hard to refute, that both Nazi Germany and Japan could have been stopped without war in the early stages of their aggression. There is similarly little doubt that Russia could be stopped from imposing her dominion over her small neighbors and acquiring the hegemony of Europe, by firmness on our part. If standing for principles means war, we had better face it now while the roused conscience of humanity is still alive and burning with the desire to lift forever the yoke of tyranny imposed on men from above, which even now continues to condemn them to hunger, fear, and the concentration camp.

Mr. President, we are told the American people are almost unanimous in their demand that we support this Charter without altering one iota of its principles, its provisions, or its structure. But, as God is my witness, we would betray them if we did not point out the implications of those provisions which we must implement through additional legislative actions which are now anticipated in the Charter.

If we were to provide that our representative was to sit on the Security Council endowed with all the powers and prerogatives of the representatives of the other powers, who do not represent a representative form of government, we should be compelled to grant him powers which no representative of any United States Government has ever known before.

This is no longer just a matter of technical constitutional hair-splitting. This is a matter in which every patriot and every lover of freedom is honor bound to insure that the full scope of the rights and privileges of a free people under a constitutional representative government is given play. We cannot permit our representative to sit on the Security Council endowed with equal powers with a totalitarian representative.

It would mean, first, that those who advocate granting unlimited power to our representatives are asking that they be empowered to get us deeper and deeper into a completely new American foreign policy, based on an expanding imperialism and its attendant militaristic economy—two ancient masters of misery with new technical, economic, political, and military weapons of destruction in their hands.

Of course, in such a situation as we now confront, this would mean a mad armaments race and a constantly expanding area of conflict among the Big Three. It would set in motion such forces in this country that our whole economy would have to be reorganized in order to back up the decisions and actions of our representative, who, with such power and authority, would be able at any time to plunge us into wars, little ones and big ones alike.

This treaty will undoubtedly be ratified by the Senate. As I understand it, will not the United States then be obligated to furnish troops whenever called upon to enforce the status quo?

In the official hearings of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee it is made plain that it was the opinion of the committee that the question of ratification of the agreements, when finally consummated, must be ratified, in treaty form, by the Senate of the United States. Upon that testimony and that verdict, the treaty was reported to the Senate by the committee.

We now hear strange voices in our legislative halls of a difference of opinion as to whether or not the agreements should be considered in the form of a treaty by the Senate or as a piece of implementing legislation by the Congress. It is also held by some Members of Congress that the United States delegate to the Executive Council, in ordering out troops, will act independently of the Congress and without its authority, but will be solely under the orders of the President. This view is held by some, on the ground that the President is a symbol of sovereignty, and so has the right to call the Army into war in foreign countries without consulting Congress. It is said that this has been done many times in history. If that doctrine is accepted, the President can take us into war at any time, and the declaration of war by Congress will be simply rubber-stamping the act of the President. Such a doctrine would indicate that many people believe that the Constitution can be changed by customary violation of its limitation of executive power. This, if adhered to, is dangerous doctrine.

No President should defy Congress as to appointees of the United States, or as to military forces.

The propaganda is that only a small force would be used, but a small war may easily and often does become a large war. As a matter of fact, every punitive or enforcement action taken by any part of the quota forces supplied to the Security Council will automatically become the start of an undeclared, universal war if these forces are not immediately successful. The control of the war power, as provided in the Constitution, must remain in the Congress if the United States is going to remain a republic.

Mr. President, the American people want to cooperate with other nations in peace to prevent another war. But I am absolutely certain they do not want America to set in motion the very forces that will destroy their freedom and their nation. They do not want America's honor dragged in the blood and filth of a vicious struggle for world power and world domination in which we become accomplices in the destruction of other people's freedoms. They do not want us to hasten the show-down between the West and the East in a war that will mean the end of our civilization. They do not want these things, I say, and they do not expect us to commit them and this Nation to such a suicidal future.

Certainly no one man ought to be burdened with the dreadful responsibilities now placed upon the heads of the states of the five big powers by this document unless they have the complete support of an intelligent and informed public opinion. The only other alternative is that which I have already pointed out, namely, the loss of our representative form of government here at home and the emergence of a collective Fascist state in our midst where the Government has been completely divorced from and rendered unaccountable to the people's sovereignty.

I therefore respectfully suggest for the serious consideration of my colleagues in the Senate and for the serious consideration of the American people that the following specific provisions be incorporated in the forthcoming enabling legislation which is to define the powers and duties of our representatives to this new United Nations Organization.

The public has evidently been uninformed of the fact that the United Nations Charter is not a document which establishes a police force. It only gives authority to the representatives of the signatory powers to form an organization, and write international law for what they call the enforcement of peace.

I suggest that our representative on the Security Council be subject to legislative as well as to Executive control, with the following specific instructions

to be made binding upon him in the exercise of his duties by legislative action:

First. The right of withdrawal is inherent in the very concept of sovereignty.

Second. Our representative shall take no positive action on any matter which violates the Monroe Doctrine.

Third. Every unit of American armed forces furnished the Security Council shall at all times and under all circumstances be completely under the control of the United States Government.

Mr. President, I would conclude with a statement of the specific provisions which I believe ought to be made binding on our delegate to the Security Council. I earnestly believe, and I have never been more serious in my life, that our delegate ought to be subject to legislative as well as Executive control or direction and answerable alike to the Senate as well as to the President. To the attainment of this end I submit three provisions which I believe this Senate ought to confirm in the forthcoming enabling legislation.

First. The delegate ought to be required to make monthly reports to a Senate committee created especially for this purpose.

Second. This committee ought to be composed of an equal number of representatives elected from and by the majority and minority parties, with no prejudice to the representatives of any other parties represented in the Senate.

Third. The delegate be required to have his instructions countersigned by a majority of this special committee, with the President's vote to be the deciding factor in the event of a tie where unanimity is required for any action in the Security Council by the provisions of the Charter.

Mr. President, I make these recommendations because I believe the time has come to clarify the issue before us, namely, whether when these subsequent agreements come before this body we are going to strengthen the hand of tyranny or of freedom here at home.

The recent election in England clearly reveals now where America stands. Having been saved by the United States from Hitler, England is now definitely moving to the left. The whole of Europe is moving even further to the left where Stalin waits with open arms. Unless America, too, moves to the left we shall find ourselves and our way of life alone in the world.

Even so, I cannot believe my senses when I hear Members of this Senate body shouting for the surrender of our warmaking power and what will amount to a large part of our treaty-making power to the President and his delegate on the Security Council. Surely, if these men do not want to trade on the credulity, the confusion, and the grief of the American people, to gain this end, they are in honor bound to warn the people that it is the abuse and misuse of this power already by the Chief Executive that has been largely responsible for our entrance into two world wars and their disastrous consequences.

For myself, in spite of the poignant pleas I hear from many of my colleagues that, having ratified this Charter, we do not welsh on the other nations of the world, I shall oppose the surrender of these powers to anyone.

Pray God history will record that in following the dictates of my conscience I have never welshed on the United States of America.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The treaty is before the Senate as in Committee of the Whole and open to amendment.

Mr. MORSE obtained the floor.

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

Mr. MORSE. For what purpose?

Mr. MURRAY. I intend to address the Senate very briefly on the Charter.

Mr. MORSE. I should be very much delighted to accommodate the Senator from Montana and let him speak on the Charter for a few minutes, with the understanding that I do not lose the floor thereby.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. CHANDLER. I object.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Objection is made.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to my good friend from Montana that I am very sorry I cannot extend to him the courtesy I should like to extend.

Mr. MURRAY. I thank the Senator.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, a point of order. The Senator wanted to extend the courtesy with the understanding that he would hold the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I do not desire to give up the floor.

Mr. KILGORE. Will the Senator yield to me to make a few remarks on the Charter?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Oregon yield to the Senator from West Virginia?

Mr. MORSE. I should be delighted to yield the floor to the Senator on condition that I would not lose my right to the floor, but my good friend the Senator from Kentucky has just raised an objection to a similar request made by the Senator from Montana, and if he is still in the same mood, I, of course, cannot extend the courtesy to the Senator from West Virginia.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator from Oregon yields to the Senator from Montana to make a speech, then the Senator from Oregon automatically loses the floor, and whether he will get it next will depend on recognition from the Chair.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I am greatly indebted to the junior Senator from Kentucky, because he is talking on exactly the point I rose to discuss.

Mr. CHANDLER. I am disappointed; I thought perhaps the Senator was to speak on Oregon lambs.

Mr. MORSE. I shall not disappoint the Senator. Before I conclude I shall discuss Oregon lambs, but having the floor in my own right, I shall proceed to discuss such subjects as I think should be discussed at this time.

Mr. MURRAY. If the Senator will yield, may I inquire how long the Senator will occupy the floor?

Mr. MORSE. I cannot make an estimate; I am sorry. I think it will be for some minutes.

Mr. MURRAY. I understand we are to recess at 7 o'clock.

Mr. MORSE. I shall be through by 7. [Laughter.]

Mr. MURRAY. That means, then, that I shall not be able to address the Senate today.

Mr. MORSE. I hope I may be able to finish in time so that the Senator can do so.

Mr. President, I wish to speak out of deep conviction on a parliamentary matter which I think is of great concern or should be of great concern to every Member of this body. It happens to deal with the point which the junior Senator from Kentucky raised.

I am aware of the fact that for some days past there have been those in the Senate who have not particularly appreciated my taking the time of the Senate to discuss a food crisis in America. Yet I submit that that crisis is so important to the welfare of every American consumer that every Member of the United States Senate could well afford to take time out from the discussion of the Charter to see to it that the necessary steps are taken to solve that food crisis.

There was apparently a desire on the part of some to discipline the freshman Senator from Oregon on the Republican side, so yesterday afternoon that discipline was administered. But time will tell who in fact was disciplined by the action that was taken yesterday afternoon, because I wish to point out to the Senate that a precedent was established yesterday. I think it of utmost importance we wipe from the books that precedent so far as its precedential value is concerned.

Mr. President, I am a freshman in the Senate, but I am not ignorant of parliamentary decencies and procedure, and I say that if the tactics that were adopted on the floor of the Senate yesterday afternoon are permitted to prevail, and if those tactics continue to be practiced on the floor of the Senate, then this tribunal, this forum, will cease to be a great open forum. The majority leader can stand up all he cares to, as he did this morning, and acclaim that this is still an open forum, but the record that was made last night shows that on that occasion the Senate of the United States ceased to be an open forum, and it ceased to be an open forum by parliamentary tactics which I say every member of this body should see are never repeated on the floor of the Senate.

Let me review the situation. I speak out of no personal animus or ill-feeling. I speak, Mr. President, out of the conviction that here is a forum which both the Democratic and Republican Parties must guarantee to the American people will always remain an open forum. If we start adopting parliamentary tactics which prevent any Member of the Senate from coming on to this floor and discussing any issue of concern to the American people, we shall be guilty of tearing down by such action the last great citadel in the world where untrammeled free speech is supposed to prevail. Yet the action taken yesterday afternoon on the floor of the Senate denied free discussion and full debate.

Let us see what happened. The Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] took the floor. The discussion shows that apparently he took the floor under a practice which has apparently grown up on the floor of the Senate under which it is possible for a Senator to take the floor, and then an understanding be reached that he will hold the floor over the night recess and have the floor at the beginning of the next day's session.

Mr. President, that is a courtesy practice, it is a practice which rests upon the granting of courtesy by the Members of the Senate, but since it rests on courtesy, then, Mr. President, courtesy should not be denied other Members of this body who want to take the floor and discuss a matter, as I wanted to discuss one yesterday afternoon when I asked the privilege of discussing the Oregon lamb problem for some 10 to 15 minutes.

I was told—the throttle was put on me—that if I would agree to discuss it for not more than 5 minutes, I would be given the floor. Let the majority leader tell me that this is an open forum in view of the procedure which was used against me yesterday afternoon. The Senate allowed them to get by with it.

Mr. President, throughout the day Members of this body on both sides of the aisle have told me that they seriously question the right under the rules of the Senate of the Senator from Delaware to hold the floor under the circumstances of yesterday. I think that matter should have been determined in debate last night, and I think it still should be determined, because I want to know why we were confronted with a strange form of cloture whereby debate can be cut off and time on the floor of the Senate can thus be farmed out.

I have noticed during my short stay in the Senate that this farming-out-of-time practice takes a variety of forms. Some weeks ago, under a limitation of debate rule, it was agreed that certain leaders on the floor of the Senate should be given the right to farm out the time consumed by Republicans and Democrats in debate. I serve notice now that so long as I am in the United States Senate I will never join in unanimous consent to any such arrangement again. I will never give consent to any arrangement whereby the majority leader and the minority leader, or any other leaders on the floor of the Senate, are given the authority by this body to parcel out the time which can be used in debate on the floor of the Senate. The Senate cannot be kept an open forum on the basis of any such procedures for the limitation of debate. Debate on the merits of issues must not be so limited.

In the discussion yesterday afternoon apparently the feelings against my discussing food problems of America were so intense on the part of some that the distinguished and very able senior Senator from Texas, as the RECORD will show, announced that he would move for a recess, but that he would refrain from pressing his motion for 5 minutes if I would limit myself to 5 minutes. That was such a great shock to me, Mr. President, that I could hardly believe my ears that a Member of this body would lay down such an ultimatum and say to another Member on this floor, who has equal rights with the Senator from Texas, that unless he would agree to limit himself to 5 minutes the Senator from Texas would move for a recess. Mr. President, I did only what any honorable man would do under those circumstances. I said in effect to the President of the Senate "Put that motion. I want to see if the Senate of the United States will throttle debate through such a procedure." And I was proud of the action the Senate of the United States took, because the motion of the Senator from Texas was defeated, as it should have been defeated, by men who believe in maintaining this body as an open forum. I hope that history will never record that such a motion as was offered yesterday prevails in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. President, after that motion was defeated, the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL] who had the floor apparently under the arrangement that he could keep the floor over night and have it at the beginning of the session the next day——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Oregon will suspend. The Chair will state to the Senator that his statement about that is entirely incorrect.

Mr. MORSE. I will be happy then to have the Chair's statement.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair recognized the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TUNNELL]. He was the first Senator who rose and was first to address the Chair, so far as the Chair knew. There are no arrangements made here.

Mr. MORSE. I will say to the Senate, and I will say to the distinguished President of the Senate, that the Senator from Delaware, as the RECORD will show, apparently addressed the Senate of the United States with the understanding that he was going to keep the floor and have it at the beginning of the session today. And no denial by anyone will change my view on that subject.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. MORSE. I yield to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I desire to propound a parliamentary inquiry to the Chair with regard to this matter. I was not present when the discussion took place on the floor but I read the RECORD, and I am surprised that any Senator would contend that he had a right to hold the floor and to farm out the time, and to limit another Senator to whom he yielded 5 minutes.

The question I should like to ask the Chair is this: Can a Senator obtain the floor, yield to another Senator for 5 minutes, and still retain control of the floor?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. He cannot——

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Without unanimous consent?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without unanimous consent. And there was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Well, there was no unanimous consent in the RECORD that I saw.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. There was no objection either. The Chair is undertaking to enforce the rules, the Chair will state to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. Yes; I understand that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has no desire to change the rules or to do anything but to enforce them. However, there has grown up a practice in the Senate, as the Senator knows, under which arrangements are made with the Chair to recognize this Senator or that Senator or the other Senator by a memorandum at the desk. That became intolerable. Senators were calling the Chair over the telephone and undertaking to make an arrangement of that sort. Therefore, the Chair announced that he was going to recognize the first Senator he saw on his feet. That is the rule.

The matters the Senator refers to were indulged in by unanimous consent. The Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] made the suggestion or asked unanimous consent that the Senator from Oregon be recognized for 5 minutes. The Senator from Delaware did not make that request at all. He did not undertake to farm the time out. The Senator from Delaware was perfectly willing for the Senate to recess until the next morning so he could start his speech. That is frequently done. It is a time-honored custom, after a Senator obtains the floor, to resume the next morning after a recess of the Senate. The Parliamentarian was sitting here and heard the whole discussion. The Parliamentarian advised the Chair as to what the ruling should be, and the Chair followed the Parliamentarian. That is the truth of the situation, and it does not make any difference who says that is not the truth. He will find it so in the RECORD.

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. I am glad to hear the statement of the Chair, and I think the Chair is using excellent judgment in not permitting lists to be prepared and speakers to obtain a priority on the time when they are going to be recognized. I think the Chair is very wise in setting aside that practice.

But the point that disturbs me as I read the RECORD is how any Senator could obtain the floor and yield for 5 minutes to another Senator without unanimous consent approval of the floor being awarded to him.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It was done precisely the same way that it was sought to be done here some few moments ago when the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], as the Chair recalls, asked the Senator from Oregon to yield to him, and the Senator from Oregon was willing to yield if he could do so without losing the floor. But when the request was made of the Senate, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CHANDLER] objected. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. KILGORE] made a similar request and it was objected to again. Therefore, the Senator from Oregon retains the floor.

Mr. CHANDLER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. CHANDLER. It is the repeated practice of the Senate, and has been for a number of years, that a Senator may yield to another Senator, who may make a speech, if there is no objection. That is done all the time.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If there is no objection, it is frequently done.

Mr. CHANDLER. The Senator who yielded can still continue to hold the floor. But if the request is made, as it was made a few minutes ago, it is almost invariably objected to, because a Senator cannot yield the floor to another Senator and keep the floor himself. There is no rule which permits a Senator to do that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. None whatever. It cannot be done except by unanimous consent.

Mr. CHANDLER. If the Senator who had the floor did not raise the question the chances are the question would not be raised by anyone else. But when a Senator raises it, then it usually results in an objection, because such a thing cannot be done under the rules.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is the situation plain to the Senator from Colorado?

Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado. That satisfies me. I simply could not understand from reading the RECORD what took place yesterday afternoon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair has no desire to take any part between Senators, but will deal exactly and equally between them.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. TUNNELL. I should just like to say that when the Senator has concluded I, as a matter of personal privilege, will make a statement as to what happened. I suppose the Senator from Calorado was not present yesterday afternoon, and I will make an explanation.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Chair referred to the RECORD, and I think it very important that we go to the RECORD. Therefore I shall proceed to read what happened last night, beginning on page 8091:

Mr. CONNALLY and Mr. MORSE addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Delaware yield, and if so to whom?

Mr. TUNNELL. I have no objection to yielding provided I may keep the floor.

Mr. CONNALLY. I assume the Senator from Oregon desires to talk about something other than the Charter. I think I have a suspicion of what he is going to talk about. I hope the Senator from Delaware will not yield to the Senator from Oregon unless it is stipulated that he is to speak only for 5 minutes or so, because we are interested in getting the Charter through the Senate; we have remained here until a late hour, and I do not care to remain and hear the Senator from Oregon expostulate on a couple of lambs out in Oregon. [Laughter.]

Mr. MORSE. May I make a comment regarding the remarks of the senior Senator from Texas?

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not have the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. TUNNELL. I have no objection to yielding for 5 minutes, provided I have unanimous consent that I retain the floor.

Mr. MORSE. I wish to say to the Senator from Delaware that my respect for his learning and judgment is so great that I should be delighted to remain here for several hours to hear him discuss the Charter, if he cares to do so, but if it is his desire to have the same permission given to him to take the floor now and retain it during the night's recess as was given last night to the Senator from Vermont, that is perfectly acceptable to me. There is nothing I could do about it, anyway, although I should like to hear the Senator tonight. But I should like to say to the Senator that I desire to take a few minutes; now—I think it is not particularly fair to limit me to 5 minutes on a matter of so great import as that I shall discuss, namely, the food crisis in America. It may take me a few minutes, I do not know how long, I do not think it will be too long, perhaps 10 or 15 minutes, to discuss the latest developments in this food crisis. I should like to ask unanimous consent that I be allowed, under the long-established practice of free speech which has prevailed in the Senate of the United States, to take the time, with the understanding that the Senator from Delaware will not lose the floor thereby, but will have it at the beginning of the session tomorrow.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I object to any consent being granted for more than 5 minutes on a subject alien to the discussion of the Charter. I ask the Senator from Delaware to yield to me.

Mr. TUNNELL. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I desire to make a motion that the Senate stand in recess. If the Senator from Oregon wants me to withhold that for 5 minutes, I shall not insist. Otherwise, I shall move a recess.

Mr. MORSE. It is perfectly obvious that if the Senator from Texas takes that position, under the rules, I must acquiesce, but I hope the country will take note of the fact that the Senate of the United States seeks to impose upon me a throttling rule, when I want time to put into the RECORD the latest information which has been made available to me. High officials of the Government this afternoon said they hoped I would put the evidence I have before me and my explanation of it into the RECORD, because it should be of assistance in solving the Oregon lamb problem.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator may put a wagonload of material in the RECORD in 5 minutes, but I do not propose to remain here to hear discussion on a matter alien to the pending business.

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

Mr. CONNALLY. I made a motion to recess.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Delaware yield to the Senator from Oregon to make a unanimous-consent request that he may have 5 minutes at this time?

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I think the Chair should put the motion of the Senator from Texas. I should like to know whether the Senate of the United States wants to deny me the right to put into the RECORD and explain such evidence which I think is of vital concern to every consumer in America in regard to the food crisis. If the Senator from Texas wants to block me on that point, let us have the motion put, and see whether or not the Senators present want to recess under those circumstances.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Texas that the Senate take a recess until 11 o'clock tomorrow morning. [Putting the question.] The Chair is in doubt. Those in favor of the motion will stand and be counted.

Mr. CONNALLY. Anyone who wants to remain and hear the Senator from Oregon is welcome to stay.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion is rejected.

Mr. CONNALLY. Very well, Mr. President. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Delaware has the floor.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I yield to the Senator from Oregon for 5 minutes. That was my understanding at the start, and I do not feel like remaining here 15 minutes.

Mr. MORSE. If the Senator wants to allow me only 5 minutes, I shall accept. I have no other choice.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Senator from Oregon will be heard for 5 minutes, on condition that the Senator from Delaware does not lose the floor.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. HICKENLOOPER. This is a rather strange procedure to me. I am somewhat mystified by it. I wonder if the custom of the Senate has been that one Senator may obtain the floor prior to adjournment and hold command of the floor overnight. May I ask, Is that a customary procedure in the parliamentary conduct of the Senate?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. It has been done. The Senator from Oregon has the floor, and is recognized for 5 minutes, under the unanimous-consent agreement.

Then, Mr. President, I discussed the subject of the Oregon lamb problem for 5 minutes. I submit that if anyone will read the RECORD he must come to the conclusion that I certainly was objecting to the procedure. If anyone wanted to protect me in my rights, there certainly was ample opportunity to protect me.

The point I wish to stress, Mr. President, is that in my judgment we must not countenance such procedure in the future if we are to maintain this body as a great open forum. We cannot do so if we permit a technique of that type to throttle a Senator and stop him from discussing an issue which he thinks is of vital importance to his country, irrespective of whether 95 other Members of this body think it of any importance.

This is the people's forum. This is the greatest forum in American democracy and in the world. If we injure or restrict the freedom of discussion in this forum, we strike a body blow at true democracy. This open forum is a great check against tyranny. I shall always rise and protest any attempt to throttle debate on the floor of the Senate.

Of course, if the Senate wished to deny me the right to discuss the question last night, a motion for adjournment or recess should have been passed. But upon the failure to get such a motion through, it was not fair, I care not what interpretation of the rules anyone wishes to make, to limit the junior Senator from Oregon to 5 minutes to discuss a matter of great importance to the people of my State, and incidentally of tremendous importance to the people of America.

THE FOOD CRISIS

As I have been discussing the food problem and the maladministration of the OPA in regard to it, I have been putting up a fight for the consumers of America. Whether Members of the Senate know it or not, I have been putting up a fight for 135,000,000 consumers in America. If any Senator will step over to my office and see the letters and telegrams coming in from every section of

the country, he will recognize that in increasing numbers the people of America are insisting that some steps be taken by the Senate to free from the Committee on Banking and Currency my resolution which has been resting there for some time past. They are calling upon the Senate to appoint a special committee to maintain an investigation of the policies, procedures, and regulations of the OPA.

What is wrong with that resolution, Mr. President? Why is it that the junior Senator from Oregon cannot get that resolution out of committee? Is it because the OPA has something to fear from such an investigation? If the OPA has nothing to fear, then, Mr. President, such a committee could be a great strengthening arm to the OPA. I think it is of great importance that the OPA be investigated. I believe that such an investigation might clear the minds of the American people on the question as to whether or not the flood of criticism of OPA which we are receiving have any merit in them.

I, for one, Mr. President, know that a great many of the criticisms of OPA have no foundation in fact.

Mr. President, let me repeat something which I have attempted to make clear so many times in my speeches on this question: I think it would result in an economic catastrophe in America if OPA were put out of business. I think it would be most unfortunate if we weakened on the line of economic stabilization. I happen to be one who believes that the OPA should be strengthened. I happen to be one who believes that price control must be maintained until the time when there is a balance between the purchasing power of Americans and civilian goods available for purchase. If we do not do it, if we do not maintain that control, if we ever let down on our price controls so that there is no check upon prices in this country, then we shall be faced with a runaway inflation and the American dollar will cease to have any real value. I know of nothing which would be more harmful to our people, to our economic system. Yes, Mr. President; I tell you that if it ever comes, if we ever have an inflationary spiral in this country in a runaway form, I know of nothing which will be more harmful to our political system itself, because such a runaway inflation will result in widespread unemployment, in misery, and in hunger, and under such an economic chaos I think we should have to look even to the security of our political structure itself.

So, Mr. President, I say that I, for one, believe that the Senate of the United States should put itself in such a position that it can answer with fact unfounded criticisms of OPA, and it also should put itself in a position, through such a committee as my resolution calls for, to correct the abuses which, in fact, do exist within the OPA. I have attempted to use the Oregon lamb case as a cause célèbre to illustrate the fact that abuses and maladministration and serious mistakes in judgment are made down at OPA. They are made with such frequency that there is a rising tide, of typhoon proportions, of criticism and dissatisfaction with OPA. I wish to do my part to stop those attacks on OPA. Mr. President, we cannot do it unless we, as a Senate, are willing, through a special committee, to get in there and find out the facts and see to it that the necessary steps are taken to eliminate the abuses.

So, Mr. President, I say that the committee I am calling for can be a great strengthening arm to OPA. I am at a loss to understand the opposition I find in the Senate to the creation of such a committee. I think the Administration should welcome it.

Mr. President, let me say—and I hope my Democratic friends will take note of it, because I am one who is always willing to stand on his record—that I think the adoption of my resolution and the creation of the committee it calls for would be a great aid to a great President now in the White House. I offer the resolution as a friend of the President, as one who believes that the resolution itself would be of great assistance to the President. I recognize that men can with reason have differences of opinion about the cause of OPA's difficulties, but I say that the people of America who through experience have been faced with many OPA abuses are entitled to have the Senate of the United States investigate and maintain vigilance over the OPA.

That leads me, Mr. President, and I wish those who are interested in changing procedures of Congress would give some consideration to the suggestion, to reiterate my belief that because of the trends which are taking place in our Government, because of the great increase in the number of our Government agencies and the delegation of more and more administrative power to them, much of which, when exercised, amounts in practical effect, if not in legal fact, to the exercise of legislative power—I say, Mr. President, that because of that trend in administration in our form of government, I think it is the duty of the Congress of the United States to maintain a much closer check upon our executive and administrative agencies.

I say that if we are going to maintain representative government in America, if we are going to make this Government responsive to the will of the people, then the representatives of the people in the Halls of Congress have a duty to maintain a much closer contact with, observation of, and vigilance over the administrative and executive agencies of this Government. If we are going to save representative government in this country, I think we must stop paying attention to these administrative and executive agencies just 1 month out of the year, namely, the month in which they are up on the Hill for new appropriations. I think we are going to have to analyze and study the actions of those administrative agencies 12 months out of the year. I think that is a responsibility of the Congress.

My resolution is just one little step in that direction. It is a resolution which is offered because in my judgment an emergency situation confronts the country. It confronts the country because the OPA, I think, is clearly demonstrating, week by week, more and more abuse, more and more inefficiency, more and more action which is not in the interest of the public.

Therefore, Mr. President, I think we cannot slough it off; we cannot evade this one. I think the people have the right to say to the Members of the Senate of the United States, "It is your responsibility to go into the criticisms and the charges that are leveled against the OPA, sift the truth from the falsehood, and take action on the truth." That is exactly what my resolution proposes to have done. I wonder if there really is anyone in the Senate of the United States who has any question that the very creation of such a committee would have a tremendous effect for good on the administration of the OPA. A few days ago I told Members of the Senate that I think I have at least a slight knowledge of the point of view and state of mind of people in our Government agencies; and I tell the Senate again that there is one language they understand, namely, investigation by senatorial or House committees. They know what that means. They know that the power of such committees to bring to light maladministration in Government is tremendous; and that power itself, like a gun behind the door—ready to be used, if necessary—is something which will guarantee to the American people the elimination of the abusive practices in OPA of which I complain.

So, Mr. President, I sincerely hope that the Members of this body will take me at my word when I say to them that I believe that it is of vital importance, before recessing tomorrow, to act on the resolution which has been resting in the Banking and Currency Committee. I had hoped that the committee would report the resolution to the Senate. Before we recess, Mr. President, I intend to move to discharge the committee, because I think it is perfectly obvious that it has so delayed consideration of my resolution that I am justified in saying that the resolution is being bottled up because the committee apparently does not want it to see the light of the Senate floor and allow a vote upon it to be taken.

What I hope to accomplish above all else is to arrest the attention of the Senate of the United States with reference to the OPA's practices in regard to the marketing of America's food supply, and point out that the communications which I have received today are simply cumulative of communications which have already put into the RECORD. Insofar as the Oregon lamb problem is concerned, I want to say that the action taken by the OPA has been helpful. It has at least made available to Oregon farmers a market at commercial and utility levels. But it has forced a reduction in price of good and choice lambs down to commercial and utility levels. That is not just. Not only that, but in carrying out the order of the OPA, if a butcher wants to buy 10 carcasses of lamb, I am informed that he must agree to buy five which are point free and five which require points. What is the re-

sult? The housewife is not going to come in and give valuable points for choice lamb when she can buy utility lamb without points.

As I said yesterday, Mr. President, the solution is simple. I do not want to believe the charges which are coming to me through my mail each day. I believe that someone is mistaken. I believe that someone is attributing motives to officials of the Government which, in fact, do not exist. But the charge is, nevertheless, that the reason for lifting the points on utility and commercial lamb, while not lifting points on choice and good lamb, is to force the producer of choice and good lamb to sell to the big packers in Portland. Of course, that happens to be the result, because the big packers have the federally inspected plants, and apparently are the only ones who can find a market for the choice and good lambs.

But do you not see, Mr. President, that they are forcing the farmers in the Willamette Valley, as well as in that entire area west of the Cascades, to sell their lambs at such prices as the big packers are willing to pay? That is the result. I for one, do not like to charge anyone with such motives. But I do believe, Mr. President, that when the result of the OPA order is pointed out over and over again, when one looks at the record which I have made in this case, and when one sees the uniformity of opinion which has been clearly expressed by experts in the livestock industry in Oregon, one cannot escape the conclusion that the order of the OPA which was issued last Friday—putting it in the most charitable language—is a stupid order. It should be changed. It would be very simple to change it, because OPA needs only to carry out the recommendation which the Secretary of Agriculture authorized my senior colleague [Mr. CORDON] to announce to this Senate last Friday afternoon.

Let me repeat that, Mr. President, because, as I have said, I think it is the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to back up that order and not back down on it. I think it is the duty of the Secretary of Agriculture to demonstrate that he is doing all within his power to prevail upon the OPA to put his recommendation totally into effect.

Mr. President, last Friday afternoon the Secretary of Agriculture called the senior Senator from Oregon [Mr. CORDON] off the floor to the telephone. As a result of that conversation the senior Senator from Oregon reported to the Senate that the Secretary of Agriculture had said to him, "I authorize you to announce to the Senate that I have just now, as of 4:30 this afternoon, recommended to OPA that the ration points be lifted on all soft lamb." He did not say "On commercial and utility lamb." He said, "On all."

Mr. President, I think it is fair when I say to the OPA and to the Senate of the United States, "Meet me on the facts. Just meet me on the facts." When a man builds up a case which is unanswerable, when he builds up a case on facts and evidence, and those in authority understand his problem and agree with him, surely, he has not reached a point in this Government where he cannot get action. Do not tell me, Mr. President, that we have reached a point in our Government where we cannot get an injustice corrected when the facts showing that such injustice exists are unanswerable.

Senators, try to go back and justify OPA abuses to your constituents. I shall go back to mine. I will tell them that I not only tried at this time but that after the summer recess I will come back and continue to try to correct injustices of the type about which I have been speaking. It is only an example. There will be and are others. Until the Senate of the United States expresses a willingness to appoint the necessary investigating committees which will protect the interests of the American people against such abuses as I have pointed out in connection with the Oregon lamb problem it will fail in what I consider to be its clear duty.

I have told Senators before that if any Senator believes that I personally relish the performance of doing my duty as I have seen it in connection with the Oregon lamb problem, he is badly mistaken. I know enough about government to be perfectly aware of the cost I may pay within the Senate of the United States because of my defense of the people of my State and the consumers of this country. I am willing to pay the cost. Oh, yes; out in the cloakroom I have been told that I am injuring myself because some of the Members of the Senate do not like the way in which I have spoken up frankly and without mincing any words in regard to what I think and know to be a great abuse, and a great maladministration on the part of a Government agency which is, after all, the child of the Congress of the United States. It is responsible to us, and it is our obligation to see to it that it administers itself in the interest of the country.

Well, I guess freshmen Senators have been disciplined before, and I happen to have a skin so tough that none of the discipline applied by any combination on the floor of the Senate of the United States is going to make a dent so long as I am convinced that I am fighting a cause that is just, and so long as I am convinced that the Senate of the United States is not doing its duty. I will continue to raise my voice in protest as long as I am here, and I expect to be here quite a while. I intend to continue to raise my voice in protest against maladministration in government, be that maladministration committed by Democrats or by Republicans, because on these issues of good government we are dealing with a purely nonpartisan matter. I shall continue to raise my voice in protest against any attempt to throttle full and free debate on the floor of the Senate.

Personally I am very much saddened by the procedure that was followed on the floor yesterday afternoon. I am satisfied that the Senator from Delaware meant no discourtesy to me, and I think he knows it, because he knows of my respect for him. I am satisfied that at the end of a hard day sufficient reflection was not given to the principle that was involved in the action that followed, and I trust that never again by that technique will an attempt be made to limit the right of any Member of the Senate, prior to an actual recess or adjournment, to stand on this floor and plead whatever cause he feels needs to be pleaded in the interest of his country.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, on Monday last, at the suggestion of the distinguished Senator from Texas [Senator CONNALLY], I took the floor and briefly spoke a few ideas in relation to the issue before the Senate. I refrained from discussing the provisions of the United Nations Charter. The Charter, in the intervening days, has been fully covered, and yet, for the purpose of the RECORD, I desire to make a few brief comments supplementing my former brief statement.

First. This Charter, when it is approved by the nations, will be the supreme law of the land. It will be an international compact whereby the nations have set up international machinery which they hope will prove adequate to meet the problems and the challenges which will arise in the postwar period between the nations. This machinery consists of:

(a) The General Assembly.

(b) The Security Council.

(c) The Economic and Social Council.

(d) An International Trusteeship Council.

(e) An International Court of Justice.

(f) A Secretariat.

(g) A transitional security arrangement.

The Charter also provides for amendments to the Charter. It sets up fully the purposes and principles of the Organization. It makes provision for membership and the status of regional areas.

Second. When we shall have ratified this Charter, and 25 others of the signatory nations shall have done the same, this country will have pledged its support—with all that that means—to the fulfillment of our obligation under the Charter.

Third. Doing so will not in the slightest jeopardize the validity of the Monroe Doctrine and the Chapultepec compact.

Fourth. It is my understanding, according to the testimony given before the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate, that the terms "agreement or agreements" as used in article 43 are synonymous with the word "treaty." On the other hand, I recognize that Congress might well interpret them as agreements brought about by the action of the Executive and ratified by a joint resolution of both Houses. These agreements would provide for a police force and the specific responsibility of each nation. But outside of these agreements, there is the power in our Executive to preserve the peace, to see that the "supreme laws" are faithfully executed. When we

become a party to this Charter, and define our responsibilities by the agreement or agreements, there can be no question of the power of the Executive to carry out our commitments in relation to international policing. His constitutional power, however, is in no manner impaired.

Fifth. In no way is the right of the United States in the strategic island bases occupied by us prejudiced by the provision relating to trusteeship.

Sixth. The General Assembly will provide a great international mart and forum for ideas, with the world as audience.

Seventh. The Security Council is the executive of the Charter, each representative thereon being the representative of his nation and each such representative of the Big Five possessing a veto power.

CONCLUSION

First. If the contracting nations prove themselves adequate, the peaceful means provided by the Charter will prove very effective.

Second. If the contracting nations prove themselves adequate, the policing provisions of the Charter will be effective to put out the incipient fires of war, if the peaceful means fail.

Third. The importance of this document can be overemphasized, if in so doing we lose sight of the actors. This earth is the stage, and this great drama will only succeed if the actors—the nations—nobly act their parts. Otherwise tragedy will again befall the race.

The play is begun, the curtain rises. May this generation and the succeeding ones prove adequate.

There recently came to my desk the following lines:

They have called many men isolationists,
Those who would not have war,
They who prior to December 7, 1941,
Sought to keep this country out of war.

There were others who saw the road differently.
They wanted to go in.
Now we are all joined to isolate war.
We have faith that the nations have suffered enough,
Have gone through their Gethsemane
And will work for peace.

There was One 20 centuries ago,
Who spoke as man has never
Spoken before or since.
He too would isolate war.
And He gave a charter to the world.
It has been called The Sermon on the Mount.

If man would know the way,
If nations would know the way,
No mechanism will be adequate
Unless they follow His way.

So today we talk
Of the United Nations Charter.
We make available a police force.
We speak of aid and comfort,
Economic and political.
We sign on the dotted line.
But if we would make the thing work,
We must return to this charter—
The Sermon on the Mount.

Then will the nations go into action,
And beat their weapons of war,
Into peace mechanisms.
Then will their hearts be cleansed,
And their vision will see far off.
And the discoveries of the human mind
Will be utilized for the betterment of the race.

And, as we have hope and faith
And pray unceasingly
There still returns the nightmare of the past,
When men failed because of their evil lusts.
And material gain, power, and dominion over their fellows,
Held sway in the council of the human heart.

We see that this world is made up of many worlds.
Geographically it is one,
But there are many minds.
The peoples of earth
Are on different levels.

And so, my beloved America,
I would assert,
That constantly alert this Nation must be,
Giving leadership of mind and soul
And Samaritan-wise,
Giving aid to lift the levels of other peoples.

Yes, ever alert,
Like the mariner
Who knows that storms will come,
And prepares his ship
For the expected blow.

In all ages past,
The prophets, sages, and seers of the world,
Like the Man of Galilee,
Have taught the way.
But it has become obscured,
By man's lack of vision.

Yet, in every generation
There have been those
Who have dreamed dreams
And seen visions,
And carried the torch of hope and faith
For a better day.

We believe, we, of this generation,
Have been chosen as a people set apart
To light that flame into a blaze
That will consume the opposing forces.
Not alone by the mechanism of the charter,
But by this reborn faith,
This regained power of the spirit,
Leadership has come
For direction and guidance
To this people of the new world.

Ever alert to meet the menace,
Ever on guard to protect the advance step,
Ever willing to aid and succor and comfort,
Ever attuned to the higher purpose of life,
We march on—unafraid,
Pledged to transmit
To the generations to follow,
The greater freedoms of the race.

Mr. TUNNELL. Mr. President, I wish to say just a few words with reference to the situation yesterday, since my name has been brought into the discussion several times.

I can say at the start that I certainly had no feeling of animosity toward the Senator from Oregon, and do not have now. While I was in the Chair yesterday afternoon he came to me and told me that he wanted five or six minutes. Later I obtained the privilege of the floor, and after I got the floor I, of course, could have been forced to proceed and talk, or yield. I was not compelled to yield to the Senator from Oregon, and was not willing to yield if I had to stay and listen to a long speech on another subject. Therefore I refused to yield unless he would limit his time to 5 minutes, and if the Senate had refused to recess and he had refused to take his 5 minutes, I would have been compelled to proceed. I was the one who was on a spot, and could have been compelled to go ahead last night. I did not wish to do so unless I were compelled to. The Senator did not choose to compel me to do so. He accepted the suggestion as to 5 minutes, and I think talked 15, perhaps, certainly more that 10, and by unanimous consent I was permitted to retain the floor after he had ceased to occupy the floor.

Mr. President, that was all there was to the matter so far as I was concerned. I yielded the floor when I did not have to yield the floor, but I would have had to go ahead and speak last night if the Senator had not taken the time which I offered him.

Mr. KILGORE obtained the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator will state it.

Mr. MORSE. Do I have the right to make a very brief statement to clarify the matter explained by the Senator from Delaware, or will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me while I make a very brief statement?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from West Virginia has the floor. Does he yield?

Mr. KILGORE. I will yield if I can hold the floor.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I assure the Senator from Delaware that his feelings of friendliness toward me are reciprocated. I desire to point out to him, however, that I talked 5 minutes. I was very careful to watch the clerk, and the moment I saw the signal to the Chair, I think the RECORD will show I said, "My 5 minutes are up." If I took more than 5 minutes it was certainly not as much as 10 or 15 minutes. Secondly, I may say that when I talked with the Senator from Delaware previously, I do not recall verbatim what was said, but I do recall that I told him I would not take long; that I could finish in 5 or 6 minutes or so. But the RECORD shows that when I sought the floor I said it would take me from 10 to 15 minutes. It was that time which was refused me.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Will the Senator suspend a moment while the Chair makes a statement? When the Senator from Oregon had been yielded to for 5 minutes, the Chair made the statement that he recognized the Senator for 5 minutes, but the Chair gave the Senator at least 8 minutes, so the clerk now informs the Chair. The Chair wanted to be exceedingly fair and just to the Senator from Oregon, and the Chair has received his reward this afternoon in some very violent criticism by the Senator from Oregon which the Chair does not appreciate at all, but takes it in the regular course.

Mr. MORSE. I may say to the President pro tempore that if he will read the RECORD he will feel that no criticism was made of him. The Senator from Oregon had no intention of making any criticism of the Chair. The Senator from Oregon simply set forth the circumstances as they took place. The Senator was watching the President pro tempore, and when the clerk signaled the President pro tempore that his time was up, the Senator from Oregon said, as the RECORD will show, "Mr. President, my 5 minutes are up." I watched the clerk, and if I went beyond the 5 minutes I did not know it.

I want to say that when I asked the Senator from Delaware to yield so that

I might have time on the floor I asked for from 10 to 15 minutes. I know exactly the position the Senator from Delaware was in. I was desirous of helping him, and my remarks in the RECORD show it. But I do think in all fairness that I should not have had imposed upon me a 5-minute restriction, even though the clerk now says that perhaps I took as much as 8 minutes. The fact was that being under the limitation of 5 minutes I was not in the position to make the speech that I wanted to make on the subject, because of the limitation imposed upon me, and I believe the limitation was an exceedingly unfair one.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield.

Mr. BARKLEY. Under the rule, when the Senate is considering a treaty in executive session the resolution of ratification cannot be offered until the debate has been concluded. It is desirable that the resolution of ratification be offered today so that it will not have to lie over a day from tomorrow, if we should reach a vote tomorrow. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent that the Chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], be permitted to present the resolution of ratification today.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. WHITE. I know of no objection to that, Mr. President.

Mr. BARKLEY. I thank the Senator.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from West Virginia yield to me for a moment?

Mr. KILGORE. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask that the treaty be reported to the Senate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the treaty being reported to the Senate from the Committee of the Whole?

There being no objection, the treaty was reported to the Senate without amendment.

Mr. CONNALLY. I now submit the resolution of ratification.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The legislative clerk read as follows:

Resolved (two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein), That the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive F (79th Cong., 1st sess.) the Charter of the United Nations, with the Statute of the International Court of Justice annexed thereto, formulated at the United Nations Conference on International Organization and signed at San Francisco on June 26, 1945.

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, it has been said of the Constitution of the United States that "to enable the people to be its guardians, the people must know its history and its purpose." The converse of that statement applies with full force to the San Francisco Charter. To enable the San Francisco Charter to be the guardian of the peace of the world the people of the world must know the nature and the purpose of that Charter.

The first tremendous fact is the fact of the Charter itself—the fact that representatives of 50 sovereign nations sat down at the council table and agreed; the fact that this Charter is the logical sequence of the course of events set in motion by that great statesman and recent Secretary of State of the United States, the Honorable Cordell Hull, of Tennessee, when he began to reduce tariffs in the interest of promoting international commerce on a plane of justice and fair dealing.

Mr. President, it will be helpful to look to the language of the document itself in order to keep clearly before us what we have done and what we have not done:

We the people of the United Nations * * * have agreed to the present Charter of the United Nations and do hereby establish an international organization to be known as the United Nations.

The name, it is well to remember, was chosen for the organization by the late President Roosevelt.

It is noteworthy that this Charter was drafted in 8 weeks, although it was necessary to work in five languages. And one of those languages expresses itself in characters instead of by an alphabet. Although it is the language of the oldest known culture of our day, it was necessary for its delegation to devise 2,000 combinations of characters in order that that language should express precisely the international vocabulary of the agreement. If the Chinese may be so resourceful in producing the mechanics or conveying so great purposes, how can the other 49 signatories confess ineptitude in finding formulas for solving international disputes? Leaving out of view the other 48 nations, shall it be said that American law and history, American traditions and statesmanship stand in the presence of this giants' task impoverished of ideas and of words to express those ideas. We have just agreed to organize an organization and the action of this body will mean, I have no doubt, that we will aid in setting up that organization. The situation that confronts us is not unlike that which confronted the proponents of our Constitution in 1787 and 1788. Shall we take counsel of fear or of courage, of propaganda or of the logistics of history, of the three-fourths of the people of the world who helped write the pending agreement to unite for peace or of the hopeless minority?

In chapter XIX entitled "Ratification and Signature" paragraphs 1, 3, and 4 read as follows:

1. The present Charter shall be ratified by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

3. The present Charter shall come into force upon the deposit of ratifications by the Republics of China and France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the United States of America, and by a majority of the other signatory states. A protocol of the ratifications deposited shall thereupon be drawn up by the Government of the United States of America which shall communicate copies thereof to all the signatory states.

4. The states signatory to the present charter which ratify it after it has come into force will become members of the United Nations on the date of the deposit of their respective ratifications.

With this plain language before us, let us not fall into the error of thinking that the Herculean task will be completed by the action of this body on the pending resolution. That is one more step, and a necessary one, but there are other steps; and each step is as necessary as the one that preceded it. As we take these historic steps may we hear less about compromise and more about the testing of proposals and the accommodation of ideas into an acceptable formula.

There must be 28 ratifications by as many governments, and five of those governments must be the five Great Powers. I am advised by the Department of State that up to this date, two nations, Nicaragua and Salvador have ratified. At that rate at least another year will pass before the United Nations comes into existence. Then come the many things which the interim Commission cannot do.

For 26 years the education of the American people in the need to increase the boundaries of the area of national security has been carried on. America's would-be leaders and teachers here began her education by flouting public opinion and themselves flirting with pacifism and isolationism, the twin daughters of defeatism. But neither pacifism and isolationism could keep the peace, nor will defeatism win peace out of the conflict into which they led America.

Out of this ill-advised flirtation was brought forth the rejection of the League of Nations and the enactment of the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, which set the nations of the world to protesting to our Government against the economic warfare which that statute would let loose upon them. Our Government continued on its course. Many nations retaliated. Currencies became worthless. There was no safe foreign investment market, and we turned our domestic financial resources to a gambling spree and wound up in the Wall Street ditch. And then American sat up and began to look about her. Franklin D. Roosevelt was elected President. Cordell Hull took over at the State Department. They saw that America could not carry on a solvent domestic commerce without a solvent international commerce, and that there could be no solvent international commerce with beggar nations.

Meanwhile, demogoguery and bigotry were thriving in Germany, based on the sophistry that an untruth repeated with persistence would in time come to be regarded as truth. Almost before we realized what was about to happen we were attacked and drawn into another World War, the second in our own generation. And when the casualty lists began to lengthen the folks at home realized that domestic policy is foreign policy, and that foreign policy begins at home.

Out of a common danger there was born the Organization known as the United Nations. Out of the United Nations was born the San Francisco agreement and the promise of other and equally great labors in the Organization and

in the administration of United Nations cooperative plans and purposes.

The San Francisco Charter is not a constitution. That thought bears repetition in our minds. It is an agreement to set up a cooperative organization of sovereign nations. Do Senators appreciate that no such agreement has ever before been made between 50 nations, which among themselves, speak five different languages? Fifty nations have set up the sanction of international public opinion as a sanction that will aid in the prevention of war—better than that, an international public opinion that will work aggressively and affirmatively for international peace.

The sanctions of no treaty can rise any higher than the informed public opinion of the country whose treaty-making authority signs the treaty. Informed public opinion is the highest and at the same time the surest sanction for any law. The reason for that is that an informed public opinion has the will to make the law work and that will reduces the percentage of the population that resists the law and requires coercion and increases the percentage of the population that is law-abiding and makes public opinion. The percentage that lives by the law of its own volition and without a policeman at the elbow with mace in hand and a brace of revolvers in his belt has become the guiding power in 50 nations of this one world of ours.

I remind the Senate of the late unpleasant experience known as the prohibition era, through which this country went. That public opinion will have much to do with the future course of world history which will be hereafter a synonym for the history of the United Nations.

Hitler had never been possible, with the chapter of horrors that he has written in pyres and lethal chambers all over central Europe, had there been an agreement among 50 nations to sit down at the council table and hold a clinic on how to prevent the governmental paralysis known as war. Yes; had there been an agreement among 25 or 30 nations, that condition could not have arisen.

The great gains in modern medicine have been gains in preventive medicine—how to prevent illness from laying hold upon people who are in good health, not how to snatch them from the grave after they have become desperatley ill. And modern statesmen must not be more inept with the mechanisms and the ideals of government than the healers have been with the antiseptics and germicides in which they deal.

It is a principle of ancient Hebrew jurisprudence that he who saves a human life shall be honored among men. Will any man in America gainsay that principle today? And how awful the condemnations that civilization must keep upon the memory of men who have destroyed human lives by the thousands and hundreds of thousands for no other purpose than to pander to their own vainglorious strutting across the footlights of current events. And the people of 50 nations ask us to desist from mobilizing science for war and to join them in mobilizing science for peace.

We do, then, but begin the task that the American people have chosen for their destiny. There are many formulas to be written, many accommodations of ideas to be wrought by the processes of discussion, just as there were when we agreed upon our Constitution. There could have been no greater differences of opinion existing in the San Francisco Conference than the differences between, shall we say, the State of Massachusetts and the State of Gerogia when our Constitution was formed.

As carefully and as thoroughly as this body has heretofore discharged the mandate of the American electorate, it will continue in the discharge of the greatest mandate that has been delivered to it since our Constitution, which we have faithfully observed, was adopted.

It is peculiarly fitting that to us should come the opportunity of being the first major Nation to ratify this Charter—fitting because, as we were laggard in joining an organization for world peace after the last war, we should be the first to set up such an organization after this war. Fitting, because by our very refusal to join in such action after the last war we probably made it possible to set the stage for this war. Fitting, finally, because our great industrial and military power makes us the most critical Nation on the face of the earth in creating a peaceful world.

We must not, however—and when I say "we" I refer to Members of this body—vote for this Charter with tongue in cheek and with mental reservations as to carrying it to its fullest fruition as soon as a sufficient number of other nations have ratified it. To do that is not carrying out our destiny, and not fulfilling the promise made to our people when we drafted their sons to fight in this war to end wars. To vote for ratification of the San Francisco Charter without at the same time committing ourselves to the passage of the necessary implementing legislation to make it effective would be deceiving not only the people of the United States who sent us here to represent them, but all the peace-loving nations of the world who would be tempted to join us in ratification by reason of our preeminent leadership in such matters.

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, the issues which have grown out of the San Francisco Charter are now clearly drawn, and already the debate has proceeded at such length as to make extended discussion largely a matter of repetition. Nevertheless, the action which we are called upon to take in this body is of such a momentous character that I feel impelled to make clear the position I propose to take. I shall be brief in my remarks.

I join with those Senators in this Chamber who have expressed in positive terms their faith in this Charter.

I am in full accord with the sentiment that not only must the Charter be ratified by a practically unanimous vote of the Senate, but our action must be followed by a clear intention to faithfully carry out its commitments and make it work.

I have confidence that it constitutes the greatest forward step which can be taken by our country in the interest of peaceful cooperation among the nations of the world. If this Charter can have the genuine support of our country, it will constitute the greatest contribution which we can make in the establishment of good will among nations and the abolishment of war as an instrumentality for settling international disputes.

My position here at this time is consistent with the stand I have uniformly taken during my membership in this great body on all questions relating to our foreign policies. I have supported every step which the Senate has taken throughout this war to uphold our Government in its efforts to avoid the war in the first instance and to prosecute it to final victory in Europe and in the Pacific following our involvement.

Our adherence to such an international organization of nations as is here designed is an imperative necessity if we are to undertake to play our full part in the affairs of the world. We have learned a costly lesson as a result of our failure following the last war to join in an effort to provide a means for the settlement of disputes leading to armed conflict. The position of isolationism which we took following the last World War no doubt contributed in a large measure to the commencement of the present war.

When the war clouds were growing in Europe, our policy of isolation constituted a signal to aggressor nations of that continent that we did not intend to take our proper stand with the peaceful law-abiding nations of the world in case of armed aggression. That position of neutrality played into the hands of the dictators who were then planning for war.

We must not fail again. We must act now, we must ratify this Charter by an overwhelming vote, and thus give a guarantee to the world that the United States intends to join wholeheartedly in this last chance to banish wars from the earth. Such a course will serve not only the intelligent self-interest of our country, but will also carry out our moral obligations to the nations of the world who stand in constant fear of aggression.

It is true that in some of its articles the Charter of the United Nations is not perfect. It contains some weaknesses, but so also did our own Constitution when it was originally written. Like all documents which are the result of compromise, it contains some weak provisions. But in the course of study and experience and with a true spirit of cooperation among the nations these will be strengthened. Many amendments had to be written into our Constitution and changes in interpretation had to be made in order to make it carry out the true intentions which underlay its adoption. So, too, in the present instance, while the Charter of the United Nations may today contains some imperfections, if it has the whole-hearted backing and support of the United Nations in the spirit in which it is intended to operate, it will eventually become the greatest blessing ever conferred upon humanity.

I shall support this Charter and every provision it contains. I do not share the

views of some who assert that we should hesitate to make the Charter effective by carrying out the provisions requiring us to furnish armed forces for its enforcement. If we adopt this Charter we must have faith in it. We must not ratify it and then proceed to make it ineffective by failing to live up to the obligations we have assumed. If we adopt the Charter and make promises to furnish troops in case of a breach of the peace, this body must respond to its obligation and must carry out that pledge whenever under the provisions of the Charter it is required to act.

The people of this country have utterly repudiated that doctrine of isolationism. They demand that our country assume its proper obligations in the family of nations. They expect us to ratify this Charter and to follow that ratification with a sincere and honest effort to carry out every one of its provisions in the spirit in which they were written.

We must face here and now the issue whether we will approve this Charter by a huge majority with the mental reservation that we can later on render it ineffective through refusal of a minority to approve the agreements needed to provide the miltiary and other forces by which alone the Security Council can preserve the peace. To make my position clearly a matter of record, I wish to state that it is my opinion that the agreements mentioned in article 43, subsection 3 of the Charter will be valid and binding with respect to the United States if they are negotiated by the President and approved by Congress either by joint resolution or by legislative enactments and appropriations of money.

I have full faith that when the time comes for the Senate of the United States to act in fulfilling its pledges under this Charter, it will not disappoint the other nations of the world with which we are associating in the interest of world peace.

Mr. President, the debate on this Charter has already covered a wide range, and every feature of it has been discussed at considerable length. Therefore, I shall attempt to dwell on only a few of the provisions of the Charter which I feel should be emphasized.

One of the most constructive features of the San Francisco Charter is the provision it makes for the establishment of a Social and Economic Council. This is a plain recognition of the fact that the peace of the world depends on more than bayonets. Unless the peoples of other nations of the world can enjoy the benefits of a prosperous and stable economy, their insecurity and misery will be the seedbed for another war which could not be prevented even by a greater pooling of military strength than the Charter provides for.

The close relationship is obvious between the collapse of the world's economy in 1929, the tremendous unemployment crisis which followed not only in the United States but in all other countries, and the rapid rise of Hitler to power.

Hitler made his first striking gains in the Reichstag elections of September 1930, and he seized power through what almost amounted to a coup d'etat in January 1933. It is true that a Hitler could come to power only in a country where democracy as a form of government was relatively weak and undermined by nefarious army schemes. In writing the peace treaties which put an end to this war, let us do all we can to see to it that the German Junkers and the German General Staff and the big economic cartels do not again have a chance to sabotage democratic government in Germany and all over the world.

This is all very good, but it is not enough to insure peace. What we must realize is that peace in a postwar world will depend upon the continued friendship and cooperation of the Three Great Powers—the United States, the British Commonwealth, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

The great international organization which emerged at San Francisco and which is now before the Senate for ratification cannot possibly survive very long if misunderstanding, jealousy, and doubt exist among these dominant centers of power in the world.

I do not believe that at present there is the slightest ground for any such suspicion or jealousy. The San Francisco Charter represents something entirely new in the world. The victorious United Nations are not world conquerors in the old sense of the term. They would not impose their will on all the rest of the world. They are not jealous landgrabbers. In this connection I take pleasure in supporting the noble words of President Truman to this effect when he asserted that we do not seek 1 inch of territorial aggrandizement or one dollar of monetary reward for our participation in the rescue of civilization. Of course, I do not construe this as meaning we cannot hold the bases we have won and hold them until such time as our security may be guaranteed by an effective world organization to enforce peace.

I believe that the security of the United States will be far more amply insured by the ratification of this Charter and by its loyal fulfillment and effective implementation than it could possibly be furthered by seizing a few naval bases scattered over the earth as our exclusive possessions for military purposes. Let us, rather, see to it that all such problems of maintaining world peace are solved by the United Nations sitting down together and holding all such strategic possessions as trustees in a common pool for the common defense of the peace of the world.

Making peace is harder than making war. War is the subordination of man's rational and organizing powers in the service of his emotions of fear and hate. Peace is the subordination of man's emotions of courage and loyalty in the service of his rational search for the greatest good of the greatest number. Peace breaks down principally for one of two reasons: Locally, when individual criminals violate the law; and internationally, when criminally inclined heads of governments and gangsters who have risen to power through deception or domestic violence, violate the written and unwritten covenants between nations. What we need is a world-wide and essentially democratic system of international civil and criminal law which can be enforced by sanctions. The Charter furnishes a long step in our progress in this direction.

Criminals can capture the levers of political power because economic and social injustices cause political upsets which in turn produce the gangster-dictator. Therefore, the chief task before us is to do more than make peace or repress war. We must strike at the economic and social roots of war. This is the magnificent concept back of the Economic and Social Council which is included in the San Francisco Charter.

Throughout my career in the Senate, I have, at all times, been the champion of programs which sought the betterment of our economic life, and kept in view the interests of the common man, the small businessman, the laboring man, and the social security of all the people. I am sure that the Economic and Social Council will provide the means for making long-range plans on a world-wide scale to deal with problems of this nature. I think that it is essential and wise that this be done as one of the major functions of the United Nations Organization.

We do not need to debate at this time the exact nature of the Economic and Social Council. We do not need to know which of the nations of the world will be included among the first 18 nations who will have the privilege and the responsibility of designating the original members of this Council. We do not know that the Council will, from its very start, be faced with the weightiest problems involving the future peace and welfare of all of us.

It is quite clear that the Council will not be in any sense a legislative body. That is well, for we have not yet reached the stage which the poet Tennyson foresaw a hundred years ago when he wrote:

> Till the war drum throbbed no longer, and the battle flags were furled,
> In the parliament of man, the federation of the world.

All that will be expected of the Economic and Social Council, as I understand it, is that it is to be a central body for drawing together all of the many threads which compose the complex web of the world's economic and social life.

The Senate has already approved of the Bretton Woods Monetary Agreement and of the Food and Agriculture Organization. Those organizations should work together, each in its own sphere, very harmoniously with the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. The plain fact which we must recognize at this time is that neither our country nor any other of the United Nations can continue a policy of political isolationism. The two decisions go together. They cannot be divorced, and I believe it is very wise to have faced them at the same time, and to have defeated isolationism both in the economic as well as in the political sphere.

The Economic and Social Council will provide larger opportunity for advancing the welfare and prosperity of the whole world than ever existed in the past. We have had plenty of international planning in the past, but it has been planning

which has hardly been better than the scheming and conniving of conspirators seeking their personal and selfish gain. Let us now put planning on a world basis; let us take it out of the hands of the monopolies and trusts, which have tried to rule the world through their cartels, patent combines, and price-rigging devices. Let us put the economic planning of the welfare of the world in the hands of a public body, the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, and let us instruct that Council that it must work out the best possible solutions for the many problems which face it, and then refer those solutions promptly to the governments and the legislatures of the nations for action.

I am a firm believer in the power of economic planning. There is not an intelligent person in the world who does not believe in planning. I make no prediction whatever as to the kind of planning which will result from the formation of this Council, but I am certain that it will be good planning, and that it will bring together the best economic thinking and social thinking of the leading men of the great nations of the world. I have no fear whatever of the results of such communion of counsel together. Nothing but good can result from it. In fact, I am sure that without it the world will rapidly head toward disaster. We are right now faced with problems which are almost insoluble if we restrict ourselves to the national point of view in trying to solve them.

During the past century we have frequently witnessed some nations struggling along under the burden of surpluses which threaten to destroy the prices of their staple output while other nations are faced with starvation, and are unable to trade their surpluses in order to keep themselves from hunger. Other nations have struggled to meet terrific deficits in their national economy which were caused by shortage of labor, raw materials, or lack of industrial development, industries destroyed by war, or population weakened by disease and famine. There were other nations which would try to seize from these temporary conditions an unjust advantage and would try to coin money out of the tears of misery. It will be the duty of the Economic and Social Council, as I see it, to take the long view of these problems, to find how the surpluses of one country can make up for the deficits of another, and to plan for the long pull, for the greatest good of the greatest number.

Mr. President, if the United Nations cooperate effectively to these ends they will accomplish much toward the ending of conflicts leading to war. If they fail, the world will be threatened with dangerous economic controversies, and perhaps another world conflict which may be disastrous to civilization.

Mr. President, the last World War was brought to a crushing victory. The Allied Nations stood solidly together throughout the years of that historic struggle. Unfortunately, they failed to follow their victory in war with a victory in peace. America suffered through that failure beyond my power to describe. We must not fail again in this crucial moment of our history to meet the hopes and prayers of our people and of all mankind.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS ON THE EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations on the calendar be considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters under both categories set forth in the calendar be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations are confirmed en bloc.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Harold William Judson to be Assistant Solicitor General of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Theron Lamar Caudle to be an Assistant Attorney General.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Alphonse Roy to be United States marshal for the district of New Hampshire.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

FOREIGN SERVICE

The legislative clery read the nomination of George Gregg Fuller to be consul general.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Edwin F. Stanton to be consul general.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Farrell D. Coyle to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Rhode Island.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

That completes the nominations on the calendar.

Without objection, the President will be immediately notified of all nominations confirmed today.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following favorable reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

Vice Admiral David W. Bagley, United States Navy, to be a vice admiral in the Navy, for temporary service, to continue until his detachment from duty as a member of the Joint United States-Mexican Defense Committee, to rank from the 1st day of February 1944;

Capt. Adolf V. S. Pickhardt, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy for temporary service, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, United States Naval Forces, Northwest African Waters, and until reporting for other permanent duty;

Capt. Roger E. Nelson, United States Navy, to be a commodore in the Navy for temporary service, to continue while serving as commandant, United States Naval Operating Base, Guam, and until reporting for other permanent duty; and

Pay Director James W. Boundy to be a pay director in the Navy, with the rank of commodore, for temporary service, to continue while serving as a fleet or force supply officer, United States Pacific Fleet, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

By Mr. GEORGE, from the Committee on Finance:

James E. Manahan, of St. Albans, Vt., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 2, with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt., to fill an existing vacancy.

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

Enrique Campos del Toro, of Puerto Rico, to be attorney general of Puerto Rico, vice George A. Malcolm.

By Mr. McKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads:

Sundry postmasters.

THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the treaty, Executive F (79th Cong., 1st sess.), the Charter of the United Nations, with the Statute of the International Court of Justice annexed thereto, formulated at the United Nations Conference on International Organization and signed at San Francisco on June 26, 1945.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, it will take me about 35 minutes to conclude my remarks. Does the Senator from Texas want me to proceed now?

Mr. CONNALLY. No; I am about to move a recess, if the Senator will yield.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me for just a moment?

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. I merely wish to say, because several Senators from the other side of the aisle have come over and spoken to me, that it is not my intention to block a vote on the Charter tomorrow. I do not know why anyone would even form such an impression from anything I have said in this debate and I do not know who started such a rumor. Whoever did is guilty of doing me an injustice.

What I have made clear today, and wish to emphasize now so that no one can have any question about it, is that I will not join in unanimous consent for any limitation on debate, or unanimous consent to fix an hour to vote, because such an order would in effect amount to a limitation on debate. I am willing that the Senate meet as early tomorrow as anyone desires, and to remain as late tomorrow as anyone wants to stay here, but I think it very important for any

Senator who has anything he wishes to say in this great historic debate to have full opportunity to say it. So far as my own speech on the Charter is concerned, I do not think it will take more than 30 minutes, unless there are many interruptions.

I want my position in this matter definitely understood, because I think anyone who is trying to give the impression that I am seeking to block a vote on the Charter is most unfair in giving that impression.

Let me repeat, I shall object to unanimous consent to limit debate or to fix an hour for a vote. I think if we all come to the Senate and work hard tomorrow, we certainly should be able to get a vote before we adjourn tomorrow night.

Mr. TAFT. I shall ask to be recognized the first thing in the morning to proceed with my remarks.

Mr. BARKLEY. I am sure there will be no trouble about that.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the practice, the Senator will be recognized in the morning if a recess is taken instead of an adjournment.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Oregon for his assurance that he will not attempt to prevent a vote tomorrow. I never for a moment had any suspicion about that. I suggested earlier in the day that I hoped we might enter into an agreement to vote at a certain hour tomorrow. When the Senator from Oregon announced he would not agree to that, I did not pursue it. I made no such request, and I have no intention of making it now. I never suggested a limitation of debate.

I do hope, Mr. President, that we may vote tomorrow. I think it is the well-nigh unanimous desire of the Senate that we vote tomorrow. I think the country would approve unanimously our winding up the debate and voting tomorrow, at the end of the week, during which we have pursued this subject on a high plane. The debate has been one worthy of the Senate, and I hope we may vote tomorrow, even if we have to remain into the night. In order to enable us to vote tomorrow before we recess, I hope Senators will come prepared to remain until we have disposed of the treaty.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Kentucky yield?

Mr. BARKLEY. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. Let me supplement what the Senator from Kentucky has said with an admonition that Senators who expect to speak be here tomorrow. We would continue the session today probably for another hour, but Senators who are listed to speak are not here. So that I hope they will be present tomorrow in order that we will not have to have roll calls in order to get quorums.

Mr. BARKLEY. I approve what the Senator has said. I may be responsible for the fact that Senators who intended to speak have gone, because earlier in the day I announced that I would attempt to hold the Senate in session until 7 o'clock. I did not say we would not go beyond that, but I am sure Senators got the impression we would not. I think that explains why Senators who intend to speak have gone to their homes.

I think there is no reason why we cannot, without limiting debate tomorrow, without cramping or crowding any Senator who desires to discuss the pending matter, conclude the debate and vote tomorrow before we recess, and I sincerely hope we may do that.

CURRENCY AND BONDS SIGNED BY SECRETARY MORGENTHAU

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WHERRY. Mr. President, entirely aside from the subject matter of the Charter, I should like to read into the RECORD at this point an Associated Press dispatch, as follows:

MORGENTHAU SIGNED MORE THAN TRILLION IN CURRENCY, BONDS

The signature of Henry Morgenthau, Jr., appeared on more than a trillion dollars' worth of paper money and bonds during the 12 years he was Secretary of the Treasury.

Treasury records show the signature has been on about 13,619,000,000 pieces of currency with face value of about $64,986,000,000 and about 1,291,000,000 United States securities with face value of about $1,163,000,000,000.

Total: 14,910,000,000 pieces of paper with face value of about $1,228,000,000,000.

Mr. President, a week ago when we discussed Bretton Woods, the present distinguished occupant of the chair, the President pro tempore of the Senate, gave us the figures of the Budget, and if I recall correctly, they ran to about $68,000,000,000 this year on account of the war and the expenses of Government.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. $66,000,000,000 plus.

Mr. WHERRY. It appeared to some of us to be a staggering amount, which was very forcefully shown by the distinguished acting chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, and at that time someone mentioned the fact that we had gotten out of the billion class into the trillion class. I could not feel that we had gotten into that bracket, but when I saw this Associated Press article I thought it would be informative and of interest to Members of the Senate, that in the 12 years he was Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Morgenthau had had his name inscribed on some 14,000,000,000 pieces of money and bonds, and that the total value is $1,228,000,000,000.

RECESS

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, in order that we may gain an additional hour tomorrow, I now move that the Senate take a recess until 10 o'clock a. m. tomorrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 7 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until tomorrow, July 28, 1945, at 10 o'clock a. m.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 27 (legislative day of July 9), 1945:

FOREIGN SERVICE

TO BE CONSULS GENERAL OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

George Gregg Fuller
Edwin F. Stanton

THE JUDICIARY

ASSISTANT SOLICITOR GENERAL

Harold William Judson to be Assistant Solicitor General of the United States.

AN ASSISTANT ATTORNEY GENERAL

Theron Lamar Caudle to be an Assistant Attorney General.

UNITED STATES MARSHAL

Alphonse Roy to be United States marshal for the district of New Hampshire.

COLLECTOR OF INTERNAL REVENUE

Farrell D. Coyle to be collector of internal revenue for the district of Rhode Island.

POSTMASTERS

ARKANSAS

Buford B. Hammond, Beech Grove.
Ruth Shock, Enola.
Clara L. Broyles, Farmington.
Lewis L. Walker, Higginson.
Otto Bee Stamps, Kingston.
John A. Harris, Lafe.
Drucellia Garrett, Manning.
Myrtle M. Saylors, Oil Trough.
Sibyl M. Standefer, Pearcy.
Elsie Elisabeth Reynolds, Reyno.
Arthur Wright, Russell.
Lena M. Dancer, Springfield.
James F. Felts, Viola.

GEORGIA

I. V. Baldwin, Naylor.
J. Robert McGarrah, Plains.

ILLINOIS

Joseph C. Mueller, Bartelso.
Ellis Drury, Bone Gap.
Charles A. Rexroad, Bulpitt.
Fred P. Hull, Burnside.
Anna E. Shanholtzer, Coatsburg.
James T. Conour, Creston.
Clara Lawler, Fieldon.
Thelma Hedges, Gladstone.
Alfrieda D. Kingery, Jewett.
Zelia E. Davis, Kings.
Blanche M. Bergfield, Longview.
Edith A. Defenbaugh, Magnolia.
Mildred F. Pritchard, Matherville.
Ross H. Keys, Milton.
Clarence A. Croegaert, Mineral.
Van B. Michael, Munice.
Inez V. Dunlap, Plainville.
Nelle S. Junk, Rio.
Roy J. Hofmeister, Rock City.
Frances Anne Prelic, Sawyerville.
Zella V. Blaser, Taylor Ridge.
Barbara D. Stahl, Wadsworth.
Ruble O. Alexander, Wedron.
Mary E. Stewart, Wellington.
Grettle F. Spencer, Whittington.

KANSAS

Carl W. Romer, Admire.
Irene Mills, Alexander.
Glen N. Karstadt, Assaria.
Albert J. Panter, Athol.
Anna M. Schulte, Baileyville.
Howard K. Lundy, Cambridge.
Flossie M. Hickle, Cullison.
Edward R. Markovitz, Franklin.
Aquina Stepanek, Garden Plain.
Ethel H. Swanson, Gueda Springs.
Charles E. Yeakley, Hoyt.
Ethel H. Carpenter, Mapleton.
Emma M. O'Dea, Moscow.
Francis D. Christ, Muscotah.
George D. Brooks, Oil Hill.
Neva S. Applegate, Ramona.
John Oliver Ash, Roxbury.
Blanche D. Warner, Viola.
William Meis, Weskan.
Clarence A. Johnson, West Mineral.
Lawson A. Smith, Wheaton.
Frances S. Smith, Zenith.

KENTUCKY

Roy Hays, Rochester.
Norman V. Dossett, Sacramento.

LOUISIANA

Irene T. Prejean, Belle Alliance.
Louise Boudreaux, Centerville.

Ella V. Delhaye, Charenton.
Harold G. Chauvin, Chauvin.
Edras Nunez, Jr., Creole.
Willie F. Scott, Kilbourne.
Louise G. Andrieu, Lacombe.
Howard T. Massie, Slagle.
Henry F. Winters, Transylvania.

MAINE

Gerald D. Morris, Kingman.

MARYLAND

Henry A. Sonberg, Abingdon.
John C. Harrison, Avalon.
Sterling B. Caple, Cedarhurst.
M. Patricia Efort, Cheltenham.
Ernest F. Colaw, Crellin.
Reta B. Abbott, Deal Island.
Roy W. Swank, Dickerson.
Gorman Robinson, Fishing Creek.
Lina W. Penn, Garrett Park.
M. Elizabeth Gorsuch, Glencoe.
Clarence E. Burton, Jarrettsville.
Wilbur Ross Horine, Jefferson.
Harry C. Betson, Monrovia.
Evelyn R. Wilhide, Myersville.
Mildred R. Bramble, Rhodesdale.
Myrtle L. Williams, St. Leonard.
Isabel Rowlenson, Sherwood.
Cora M. Lohr, Swanton.
Blanche V. Sinclair, Tilghman.

MISSISSIPPI

Maud J. Evans, Bond.
Mary P. Gorman, Bovina.
Cora Lee Lyon, Cedarbluff.
Charlie C. Roberts, Dixon.
Charles E. Feigler, Jr., Dublin.
William H. Swales, Edinburg.
Ione Wilkerson, Gautier.
Lettie E. Bourne, Grace.
Lela R. Bracken, Harrisville.
Mollie L. Phillips, Little Rock.
Louis R. Lott, Lyman.
Benjamin H. Chatham, Montrose.
Mamie McAlister, Paden.
Algie A. Edwards, Polkville.
George W. Miles, Pulaski.
Thomas F. Durrett, Jr., Quincy.
Haden D. Gaunt, Redwood.
Rodney E. Chatham, Rose Hill.
Clifton C. Clark, Ruth.
Ruby Hinton, Sandersville.
Ernest A. Douglas, Sontag.
Lauren N. Tilson, Sylvarena.
Lamar Coker, Toomsuba.
Lester R. Meeks, Tiplersville.
Mary R. Rice, Tougaloo.
Preston B. Robinson, Waterford.

MONTANA

Julia L. Rose, Brady.
Carl Anderson, Fallon.
Edward F. Turck, Moore.

NEW YORK

E. Freeman DeZutter, Alton.
Irving S. Whipple, Basom.
Ethel F. Conte, Bridgewater.
Anna M. Jackson, Burnt Hills.
Anna M. Hackal, Calverton.
George W. Miller, Colden.
Louis C. Heim, Collins Center.
Charles A. Fisher, Davenport.
Ralph M. Fierle, Lake View.
F. Marion Moseley, Manorville.
Daniel J. O'Rourke, Massapequa Park.
Clayburn J. Culver, Panama.
Mary A. Cunningham, Pattersonville.
Margaret N. Lynch, Pomona.
Lester C. Trowbridge, Rhinecliff.
M. Michelina Ostermayr, St. Josephs.
Rosalie E. Molin, Smithtown.
Josephine R. Reilly, South Salem.
Dorothy E. Tash, Stafford.
Freda F. Way, Stormville.
Norbert F. Marzolf, Strykersville.
Ward W. Mount, Three Mile Bay.
William Holdorf, Tribes Hill.
Anna F. Barrett, Victory Mills.
Carl G. Kemp, Wading River.

NORTH CAROLINA

Annie B. Thompson, Alexis.
Stella Emerson, Bear Creek.
Mattie F. Greer, Boomer.
Rena J. Weisiger, Bridgeton.
Cleo V. Hood, Bunnlevel.
Annie M. York, Central Falls.
Maud H. Pittman, Clarendon.
Ralph T. Beck, Germanton.
Annabelle Bailey, Greenmountain.
Doris L. Whitfield, Hurdle Mills.
May E. Franklin, Icard.
Hiram M. Orr, Indian Trail.
William W. Watson, Lake Landing.
Alice B. Price, Lake Lure.
Lillie M. Wilson, Lattimore.
Pauline E. Doss, Lawsonville.
Mattie L. Pulliam, Leasburg.
Ruth B. Hughes, Micaville.
Leamon Carbert Ward, Nakina.
Esther A. Davenport, Pantego.
Madge M. Lutz, Polkville.
Mattie O. Frye, Reynolda.
John A. Dodson, Sandy Ridge.
Caroline E. McAden, Semora.
Vardry B. Mast, Sugar Grove.
Eleanor M. Moretz, Todd.
Willie G. Hollowell, Winfall.

OHIO

Clifford A. Belknap, Sherrodsville.
Forrest Shaffer, Trotwood.

OREGON

Veston H. Casey, Beatty.
Daniel E. O'Connor, Paisley.

PENNSYLVANIA

Georgia T. Jordan, Driftwood.
Nellie E. Breslin, Drifton.
Paul G. Shultz, Dublin.
S. Robert Wilson, Millsboro.
Ernest G. Aucker, Selinsgrove.
James R. Dolan, South Fork.
Frances E. Ainey, South Montrose.
Helen C. Keitzer, Venetia.
Warren H. Jones, Youngsville.

SOUTH CAROLINA

Lillian N. Werts, Chappels.
Irene K. Youngblood, Elko.
Mary K. Utsey, Harleyville.
Lucile C. Claytor, Hopkins.
Eddie R. Bishop, Lodge.
Sarah R. Trotter, Lykesland.
Alexander H. Stevens, Monetta.
Johnnie M. Baker, Oswego.
Ollie B. Nichols, Silverstreet.
Hallie C. Jaudon, Tillman.
Margaret Lyon, Troy.
Rosalie H. Ray, West Union.
Blanche Sloman, Whitehall.

VERMONT

Harold D. Somers, East Ryegate.
Calla F. Mace, Ferrisburg.
Nettie Healey Pike, Irasburg.
Harlan P. Boynton, Jamaica.
Laurence K. Tibbetts, Newfane.
Blanche A. Thompson, North Pownal.
George I. Varney, South Strafford.

VIRGINIA

Aubrey G. Graham, Norfolk.

WASHINGTON

Claude E. Googe, Algona.
Antoinette T. Harris, Clayton.
Erwin O. Knobel, Latah.
Dorothy B. Hreha, Wilkeson.

SENATE

SATURDAY, JULY 28, 1945

(Legislative day of Monday, July 9, 1945)

The Senate met in executive session at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

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

Almighty God, Father of all mercies, Judge of all men, with a strange sense of awe in our hearts, we bow this day at our altar of prayer with the solemn realization that once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide where shall be thrown the stubborn ounces of our strength in the eternal conflict between wild beasts and angels. O God, before whom the long travail of the changing centuries is wrought, and who hast ushered us into this strange world where no good thing comes save as we fulfill the conditions of its coming, gird us with Thy enabling might that, forgetting the things that are behind and laying aside every weight of doubt and despair, we may give the best that is in us to the high enterprise of laying the foundations of a noble peace and of a more decent world as the dwelling place of all Thy children. Under the old order of strife we have learned how to destroy ourselves. Under a new charter of mutual aid and tolerance of diversity may we learn at last how to save ourselves. Before Thee and for the generations to come, for the widening of every area of good will our influence can reach, we pledge our lives, our fortunes, and our sacred honor as we set our faces toward the golden goal of a peaceful world for which brave men have agonized and died. We can do no other. So help us God. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Friday, July 27, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

LEGISLATIVE BUSINESS

By unanimous consent, as in legislative session, the following business was transacted:

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER—PROPOSED APPROVAL OF SPECIAL AGREEMENTS WITH SECURITY COUNCIL—STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of State, transmitting a statement by the President of the United States, which, with the accompanying message, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 27, 1945.

The Honorable KENNETH MCKELLAR,
United States Senate.

MY DEAR SENATOR MCKELLAR: I have received through the Secretary of State the attached message to you from the President. In accordance with the President's instructions, I am sending a copy of this message to Senator CONNALLY.

Sincerely yours,

JOSEPH C. GREW,
Acting Secretary.

[Enclosure: Message from the President.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT FROM POTSDAM FOR SENATOR M'KELLAR, JULY 27, 1945

During the debate in the Senate upon the matter of the Senate's giving its advice and consent to the Charter of the United Nations, the question arose as to the method to be followed in obtaining approval of the spe-