

Ella V. Delhays, 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 Eiert, 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, Rhoadesdale.
Myrtle L. Williams, St. Leonard.
Isabel Rowlenon, 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 McAllister, 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. Mollin, 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, Germantown.
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, Selingsgrove.
James R. Dolan, South Fork.
Frances E. Ainey, South Montrose.
Helen C. Keltzer, 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. CREW,

Acting Secretary.

[Enclosure: Message from the President.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT FROM POTSDAM FOR SENATOR MCKELLAR, 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-

cial agreements with the Security Council referred to in article 43 of the charter. It was stated by many Senators that this might be done in the United States either by treaty or by the approval of a majority of both Houses of the Congress. It was also stated that the initiative in this matter rested with the President, and that it was most important to know before action was taken on the charter which course was to be pursued.

When any such agreement or agreements are negotiated, it will be my purpose to ask the Congress by appropriate legislation to approve them.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO STUDY AND SURVEY PROBLEMS OF SMALL BUSINESS ENTERPRISES

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair appoints the Senator from Idaho [Mr. TAYLOR] as a member of the Special Committee to Study and Survey Problems of Small Business Enterprises, continued by Senate Resolution 28 (79th Cong.), to fill the vacancy caused by the death of Hon. James G. Scrugham, late a Senator from Nevada.

COMMITTEE SERVICE

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senator from Nevada [Mr. CARVILLE] be assigned to the following committees: Banking and Currency, Indian Affairs, Mines and Mining, and Post Offices and Post Roads.

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

SPECIAL COMMITTEE TO INVESTIGATE THE NATIONAL DEFENSE PROGRAM—PERMISSION TO FILE REPORT

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that during the adjournment over the week end I may be permitted to file a report from the Special Committee to Investigate the National Defense Program.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD two letters I have received from Kansas that are typical of many others that have come to me in the last few days expressing wholehearted support for the United Nations Charter. These letters are from Rev. Richard S. Klein, pastor of the Southridge Presbyterian Church, of Kansas City, Kans., and Rev. John Thorns, pastor of the Presbyterian Church of Solomon, Kans.

There being no objection, the letters were received, ordered to lie on the table, and to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

SOUTHRIDGE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Kansas City, Kans., July 23, 1945.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR: Let me register my hope that you will vote for ratification of the United Nations Charter. I recognize that it is not perfect, but neither was the United States Constitution when it was first signed. The important thing now is to set up the political framework for the promotion of world interests. Without that framework,

the nations will go back to jungle methods of dealing with one another.

I hope that the vote is unanimous in favor of ratification.

Sincerely yours,

RICHARD S. KLEIN.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,
Solomon, Kans., July 23, 1945.

The Honorable ARTHUR CAPPER,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: At our church service yesterday morning, July 22, by motion of the church, we were instructed to write you expressing our hope that you will vote for the ratification of the United Nations Charter as formulated in San Francisco.

We think, however imperfect this Charter may be, it is a definite step toward permanent peace.

We wish you well in all your work for Kansas, the United States, and now the world.

Many happy returns of your recent birthday.

Signed on behalf of our membership.

JOHN THORNS,
Moderator.
W. C. BOCKER,
Clerk.

PROPOSED INVESTIGATION OF HOLIDAY FOR MANUFACTURE OF INTOXICATING LIQUORS

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I also ask unanimous consent to present for appropriate reference and to have printed in the RECORD a letter I have received from Rev. R. L. Cortner, pastor of the First United Brethren Church, of Wichita, Kans., informing me of the action of the members of that church requesting an investigation of the recent intoxicating liquor holiday.

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

FIRST UNITED BRETHREN CHURCH,
Wichita, Kans., July 25, 1945.

Hon. ARTHUR CAPPER,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I would like to inform you of the feeling of our people which was expressed last Sunday morning by vote, there being approximately 350 present, protesting the July holiday which has been granted to distillers for the manufacture of whisky and its related beverages for future consumption, and also the feeling that we should support Congressman Clifford R. Hope's resolution, House Resolution 278, for a complete congressional investigation of this liquor-making holiday.

Thanking you for whatever support you may care to give, I remain,
Sincerely yours,

R. L. CORTNER.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. BYRD, from the Committee on Naval Affairs:

S. 825. A bill to establish a Research Board for National Security to insure the continued preparedness of the Nation along farsighted technical lines by providing for the application of scientific research to national security; to provide a means of utilizing in times of peace as well as war the services of the outstanding scientists of the Nation in the planning and executing of military research; and for other purposes. To this end full recognition is given that an essential characteristic of progress toward the solution of

problems in scientific and industrial fields is the provision of opportunity for parallel attack under independent direction and recognition that this procedure is not costly duplication with amendments (Rept. No. 551).

By Mr. WHEELER, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce:

H. R. 694. A bill to amend section 321, title III, part II, Transportation Act of 1940, with respect to the movement of Government traffic; with an amendment (Rept. No. 552).

By Mr. ELLENDER, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 982. A bill to provide assistance to the States in the establishment, maintenance, operation, and expansion of school-lunch programs, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 553).

INVESTIGATION OF MEANS OF INTERSTATE AND FOREIGN COMMERCE—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON INTERSTATE COMMERCE

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on Interstate Commerce, I ask unanimous consent to report an original resolution, in lieu of the bill (S. 556) to establish a commission to study and report legislative recommendations on a coordinated transportation policy affecting aircraft, railroads, busses, and trucks, including their communications needs, and I submit a report (No. 554) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the resolution and report will be received, and, under the rule, the resolution will be referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate.

The resolution (S. Res. 161) was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate, as follows:

Resolved, That the Committee on Interstate Commerce, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized and directed to make a full and complete study and investigation of all means of interstate and foreign transportation including transportation by means of aircraft, railroads, inland waterways, busses and trucks, and pipe lines with a view to determining (1) the interrelation of these agencies of transport; (2) the postwar character and adequacy of the services furnished in interstate and foreign commerce by these agencies of transport; (3) the developments and improvements that may be expected in foreign and interstate commerce; (4) such legislation to be recommended as will result in a consistent public policy fair to all competing agencies of transportation, to the using and investing public, and to labor; and generally to consider and to make recommendations to the Congress to the end that the Nation's commerce will be transported with the greatest possible degree of economy, safety, and dispatch.

Sec. 2. The committee, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized to sit and act at such places and times, to require by subpoena or otherwise the attendance of such witnesses and the production of such books, papers, and documents, to administer oaths, to take such testimony, to procure such printing and binding, and to make such expenditures within the limits of Senate Resolution 9, Seventy-ninth Congress, agreed to January 6, 1945, as it deems advisable.

Sec. 3. The committee is authorized to utilize the services, information, facilities, and personnel of the departments and agencies of the Federal Government.

Sec. 4. The committee shall, from time to time, in its discretion, make such report or reports to the Senate as it deems desirable.

DEVELOPMENT OF IRRIGATION AND HYDROELECTRIC POWER PROJECTS—REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON IRRIGATION AND RECLAMATION (REPT. NO. 555)

Mr. McFARLAND. Mr. President, from the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation, I ask unanimous consent to submit a report relating to Arizona water resources, and request that it be printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks. The report is pursuant to Senate Resolution 31, Seventy-ninth Congress, extending Senate Resolution 304, Seventy-eighth Congress.

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

This report is made under the authority and direction of Senate Resolution 304, Seventy-eighth Congress, which provided for "a full and complete study and investigation with respect to (1) the present and future need for development of projects for irrigation and hydroelectric power and the adequacy of the supply of hydroelectric power generated in Government plants; (2) whether such supply is properly allocated and distributed for war purposes and civilian uses; (3) whether the distribution of such supply is made under proper conditions and safeguards; (4) the relation between the generation of hydroelectric power at Government plants and irrigation; and (5) whether plans for future development of Government projects provide for full utilization of such facilities for both development of electric power and providing water for irrigation," and which directed the Senate Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation to report to the Senate "the results of its study and investigation, together with its recommendations, if any, for legislation."

The committee herewith reports as follows:

In June 1944 a subcommittee of the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation was appointed, consisting of ERNEST W. McFARLAND (Arizona), chairman; CARL A. HATCH (New Mexico); and CHAN GURNEY (South Dakota). This subcommittee has held extensive hearings bearing on the five major directives of the resolution. Because of the nature and complexity of the subject matters and the wide geographical areas over which the problems of the investigation lie, the subcommittee found it desirable and expedient to pursue its studies along State-wide lines.

Among the first of the studies made was that in Arizona, a State in which reclamation and irrigation is a major problem. In July and August of 1944 hearings were held in the cities of Phoenix, Florence, Safford, Yuma, and Kingman, Ariz., during which 83 persons appeared before the subcommittee and presented testimony relating to irrigation, reclamation, and hydroelectric problems in that State.

Part I of this report deals exclusively with the findings in Arizona and the subcommittee's conclusions and recommendations for that area.

SUMMARY OF EVIDENCE

Months of intensive study, extensive factual information and data obtained by the subcommittee, and 5 days of public hearings, covering some 250 pages of printed testimony, all may be summarized in a single, four-word phrase, "Arizona needs more water." The State requires additional supplies of water for three major purposes:

1. To "firm up" or supplement the present supply for irrigation projects now in operation.
2. To replenish and build up the groundwater table in certain areas in the State.
3. To develop large new areas of fertile lands.

Areas, described by their project names, which require additional water to "firm up" the present supply and to replenish groundwater tables (many of which are being lowered dangerously) are:

1. Salt River Valley Water Users Association: Area comprises 250,000 acres, 242,000 of which are in cultivation and the remainder in town sites; elevation, 1,300 feet; supplemental water required, 250,000 acre-feet.

This project has the best water supply of all projects in the area. Approximately 250,000 acre-feet of additional water can be put to beneficial use. A reduction of nearly 50,000 acre-feet in underground pumping is advisable.

2. Roosevelt water conservation district: Area, 40,000 acres; elevation, 1,300 feet, plus 52-foot district lift; supplemental water required, 75,000 acre-feet.

This district has a gravity water supply from the Salt River, an average of 50,000 acre-feet. From 75,000 to 100,000 acre-feet are pumped from underground. This underground pumping is in excess of the recharge. The district must have supplemental water or reduce the irrigated area. Approximately 25,000 acre-feet of additional water are required, and pumping should be reduced approximately 50,000 acre-feet.

3. Roosevelt irrigation district: Area, 40,000 acres; elevation, 1,015 feet; supplemental water required, 90,000 acre-feet.

This district pumps more than 150,000 acre-feet from underground. Pumping in this area should be reduced at least 70,000 acre-feet. The district can use approximately 20,000 acre-feet of new water.

4. Maricopa County municipal water conservation district: Area, 35,000 acres; elevation, 1,300 feet; supplemental water required, 70,000 acre-feet.

This district obtains water from the Agua Fria River and from underground. Underground pumping should be reduced 15,000 acre-feet. The project is in dire need of 55,000 acre-feet of new water.

5. Buckeye irrigation district: Area, 20,000 acres; elevation, 940 feet; supplemental water required, 30,000 acre-feet.

Buckeye receives return water from the Salt and Gila Rivers and does some pumping from underground. All water used on this project contains too much salt; 30,000 acre-feet of new water should be used to reduce the salt concentration. This would also reduce underground pumping 15,000 acre-feet.

6. Arlington district: Area, 4,800 acres; elevation, 940 feet; supplemental water required, none.

Arlington receives return water from the Salt and Gila Rivers. All water used on this project contains too much salt; 10,000 acre-feet of Colorado River water should be used to replace an equal amount of return flow. The return flow released would continue on down the Gila River and be used on the Gillespie Water Co. lands.

7. Gillespie Water Co.: Area, 14,000 acres irrigated; 20,000 acres have been irrigated; 85,000 acres, project total; elevation, 800 feet; supplemental water required for land that has been under irrigation, 50,000 acre-feet.

Gillespie now irrigates less than 15,000 acres; 6,000 acres formerly irrigated are now not in cultivation due to lack of water. Water is obtained from the Gila River, mostly return flow, and from underground pumping; 35,000 acre-feet of additional water are required on land that has been irrigated. Pumping from underground sources should be reduced 15,000 acre-feet; 65,000 acres of fertile undeveloped lands could be included in Colorado River new lands project.

8. Marinette and Bumstead lands: Area, 20,000 acres; elevation, 1,300 feet; supplemental water required, 40,000 acre-feet.

These lands are irrigated, by pumps, from underground. Pumping should be reduced approximately 20,000 acre-feet; 20,000 acre-feet of additional water can be used.

9. Southwest Cotton Co.: Area, 12,000 acres; elevation, 1,015 feet; supplemental water required, 25,000 acre-feet.

This company should reduce its pumping from underground 10,000 acre-feet and can use 15,000 acre-feet of additional water.

10. Queen Creek district: Area, 15,000 acres; elevation, 1,450 feet; supplemental water required, 30,000 acre-feet.

Lands in this area should reduce their pumping approximately 15,000 acre-feet and can put to beneficial use 15,000 acre-feet of new water.

11. San Carlos irrigation project.—

(a) Indian lands: Area, 50,000 acres; elevation, 1,300 feet; supplemental water required, 75,000 acre-feet.

Gila River Indians can use 75,000 acre-feet more water than they are getting from the Gila River. These lands are half of the San Carlos project.

(b) White lands: Area, 50,000 acres; elevation, 1,560 feet; supplemental water required, 75,000 acre-feet.

This area, near Florence, Coolidge, and Casa Grande, is 75,000 acre-feet per year short of water. All Gila River water available to Gila Indians could be held back for use on higher lands, being replaced by Colorado River water in event it is found not desirable to raise the water to an elevation of 1,560 feet.

12. Upper Gila lands: Area, 50,000 acres; elevation, replacement delivery, 1,300 feet; supplemental water required, 75,000 acre-feet.

These lands can use 75,000 acre-feet of additional water. This water could be held back from the San Carlos project—Gila River Indians—and replaced with Colorado water delivered at elevation 1,300 feet.

13. Electrical district No. 2: Area, 40,000 acres in cultivation; elevation, 1,575 feet; supplemental water required, 80,000 acre-feet.

All of district No. 2 water comes from underground pumping. The area is badly overpumped. Unless new water is brought in, much of this land must go out of cultivation within a few years. Pumping should be reduced at least 40,000 acre-feet, and 40,000 acre-feet additional water can be put to beneficial use.

14. Electrical district No. 4: Area, 40,000 acres; elevation, 1,675 feet; supplemental water required, 80,000 acre-feet.

All of district No. 4 is supplied from underground pumping. The area is badly overpumped. Unless new water is made available, much of the land must go out of cultivation within a few years. Pumping should be reduced at least 40,000 acre-feet, and 40,000 acre-feet of additional water should be used.

15. White electrical district: Area, 35,000 acres; elevation, 1,700 feet; supplemental water required, 50,000 acre-feet.

All water for this area is pumped from underground. The area is badly overpumped. Unless new water is made available, much of the land must go out of cultivation. Pumping should be reduced at least 20,000 acre-feet, and 30,000 acre-feet of additional water can be used.

16. Magma area lands: Area, 7,000 acres; elevation, 1,500 feet; supplemental water required, 15,000 acre-feet.

These lands are irrigated by pumps from underground. Pumping should be reduced approximately 5,000 acre-feet, and 10,000 acre-feet of additional water can be used.

17. Deer Valley lands: Area, 5,000 acres; elevation, 1,300 feet; supplemental water required, 15,000 acre-feet.

These lands are irrigated by pumps from underground. Pumping should be reduced approximately 10,000 acre-feet, and 5,000 acre-feet of additional water can be used.

18. City of Tucson: 20,000 acre-feet additional water for urban and suburban domestic use.

18a. Upper Santa Cruz agricultural area, Rillito-Pantano agricultural area, Flowing Wells agricultural area, Jaynes agricultural area, Cortaro agricultural area, Marana agricultural area, Avra-Brawley Wash agricultural area, Canada Del Oro agricultural area: 50,000 acre-feet additional water for irrigation.

This portion of Pima County, which includes Tucson and eight smaller agricultural pumping projects in that area, appears to be in urgent need of some 70,000 additional acre-feet of water. Present supply comes from pumpage which is presently exhausting the recharge supply. Tucson City officials suggest that both the city and the pumping areas must obtain additional water through a trade of Colorado River water for San Pedro River water with the San Carlos irrigation and drainage district.

19. Water users on the Little Colorado River in Apache County: 50,000 additional acre-feet.

This water would have to be obtained by trading Colorado River water to the Salt River Valley Water Users Association for Black River and White River water and taking the latter water over to the Little Colorado River watershed.

20. Other Arizona cities and towns: Additional water supply is expected to be required by other Arizona cities and towns with expansion of the agricultural industry in the State. Additional subsequent surveys should be made to determine these needs.

In all, some 700,000 acres of land now under cultivation by irrigation farming are in urgent need of additional water. The evidence submitted to the subcommittee showed, in general, that this need is pressing and immediate. Only one area now under cultivation by irrigation farming in Arizona was shown not to require an additional water supply. The additional water supply needed in these developed areas, computed conservatively on the basis of extensive testimony presented to the subcommittee, is 1,245,000 acre-feet. The need for this additional water in these already developed areas is manifested in various ways. In a number of areas, for instance, the evidence showed quite clearly that the existing water supply, while not very deficient as to quantity, has become salty to a point where continued use of such water over an extended period will have an adverse effect on the soil. In other areas, the groundwater table has been so reduced by pumping as to reach the point where irrigation may become uneconomic due to the high cost of pumping water. In certain areas, lands at one time in highly productive cultivation have had to be abandoned, so far as irrigation farming is concerned, by reason of the shortage of water.

Sizable areas, not heretofore cultivated under irrigation in Arizona, must be cultivated if the continued prosperity of the State and its natural growth as one of the great food-producing States of the Nation is to be assured. This can be accomplished by completing investigations, already far advanced, looking to the use for irrigation of water of the Colorado River in Arizona. These investigations were begun several years ago. They are now being prosecuted by the Bureau of Reclamation, an agency of the Department of the Interior, in cooperation with State of Arizona. They should be pushed vigorously and be completed as soon as practicable, and the recommendations and plans resulting therefrom should be made available to the Congress, so that the basic project itself—putting Colorado River water to the highest use in Arizona—can be adopted, approved, and authorized by the Congress for undertaking in the immediate postwar period.

It is essential that basic plans should be completed at once so that actual construction can get under way immediately upon cessation of the present war. The reasons

for urgency are obvious and compelling. Succinctly put, they are:

(1) There is a great water shortage in Arizona, and Colorado River water is the only source of additional supply. As was emphasized time and again during the hearings, it is necessary to supplement the present supply at an early date, because already part of the land under cultivation is now idle and some is not fully farmed because of water shortage. A recurrence of the drought of 1940 would spell disaster for the State.

(2) Completion of these projects will mean additional homes for returning veterans. Many have already manifested a desire for farming. Thousands of newly irrigated permanent farm homes will be carved from the desert if the projects which were described by Harry Bashore, Commissioner of Reclamation, are completed.

(3) These projects will furnish employment for an average of more than 12,000 to 20,000 men, depending on the projects constructed over a period of 5 years. This development in Arizona will not only benefit irrigated farms but will stabilize business and mean expansion for Arizona cities and towns. Moreover, their completion will insure prosperity not only for Arizona but also will make a substantial contribution to the development of the West and to a more secure future for the Nation.

NEW LANDS

In addition to the lands already in cultivation, there are approximately 5,000,000 acres of fertile land which could be irrigated if water was available. It is evident that there will not be sufficient water to irrigate all of this additional land. Selection will have to be made of the lands to be irrigated with the Colorado River water belonging to Arizona.

The Reclamation Service has stated that this selection would be made jointly with the State officials. It is the opinion of the committee that this is the proper method to determine this problem. It will be a most difficult one and will require consideration of all engineering data as well as consideration of the quality of the various soils. A great responsibility will rest on the State officials as well as the reclamation officials.

WATER SUPPLY

Arizona's principal water supply comes from three sources:

1. Gila River and its tributaries and small tributaries of the Colorado River.
2. Underground water, which is already overpumped.
3. Colorado River, through a contract with the Federal Government for 2,800,000 acre-feet of water and one-half of the surplus, less one twenty-fifth, for which the State of Nevada has a contract.

POWER DEVELOPMENT

The committee is impressed with the potentialities of hydroelectric power developments resulting from the irrigation projects discussed during the hearings. Irrigation projects and power developments go hand in hand. Thus the construction of irrigation projects not only brings large areas of fertile lands into production and makes more secure the farming of lands already under cultivation but makes available large amounts of cheap power which aid in the industrial economy of the State, and even of adjoining States.

Discussing hydroelectric power development plans in Arizona during the hearings before the subcommittee, Mr. H. F. McPhail, Director of the Branch of Power Utilization of the Bureau of Reclamation, said:

"Prior to placing the Parker Dam power system into operation, the transmission systems in Arizona consisted chiefly of isolated systems covering relatively small areas, with only occasionally interconnections. The systems and interconnections were limited to 69,000 volts and below, and the intercon-

nections were of light construction, limiting the interchange of power. These systems were reasonably adequate for conditions existing before the war, but were approaching the limit of their capacity even at that time. With the construction of the Parker power plant and the present Parker transmission system to Phoenix, Coolidge, Tucson, and Yuma markets, a strong, modern, high-voltage interconnecting system was initiated. This constitutes the beginning of a real backbone or primary grid system, looking forward to a coordinated operation tying the immense power resources of the Colorado River to all of the present and prospective markets of the State. Such a system, conceived on a broad scale and carefully planned, will bring adequate and low-cost electrical energy within the reach of all and will serve as a powerful stimulus to the economic development of the State in all ways. * * *

"The next step proposed is the construction of Davis Dam and power plant. This project was started, but was stopped by the war. This plant will have a capacity of 225,000 kilowatts. It will be immediately linked with Boulder power plant and Parker power plant by 230-kilovolt lines. * * *

"The development of the Colorado River power system after the war will be dependent upon plans involving the various multiple-purpose projects now being discussed and studied. * * *

"If the diversion plan from Marble Gorge to the Verde River is constructed, the proposed power plants on the Verde River would be connected by transmission lines into the primary system at Phoenix. If one of the other diversion plans is adopted, plants on the Verde River would only be justified on a much smaller scale. * * *

"In view of the fact that possible production of energy will greatly exceed the ultimate estimated load of the State, development of market for electric energy outside of the State, as well as inside, should be encouraged and matured. In this way the best interests of the State will be served without in any way endangering or limiting the value to Arizona of its potential power possibilities."

Arizona is a State rich in potential hydroelectric power development. Consideration was given by the committee to the opportunities for such development in Arizona. Particular attention was given to the possibilities for producing and transmitting energy to the market at a cost which encourages the fullest utilization of electric power and energy and to the scheduling of irrigation developments which, with power, form the multiple-purpose projects considered.

CONCLUSIONS

The plans are not as of this date sufficiently completed to permit any final conclusion by the committee as to the best method for bringing Colorado River water into central Arizona. However, the three plans outlined by the Reclamation Service give ample alternative choices, assuming, of course, that the completed engineering data will substantiate the opinions given. Mr. E. B. Debler, who was at the time of the hearings Director of Project Planning for the Bureau of Reclamation, outlined these plans as follows:

"Diversion plans: Preliminary studies have narrowed the plans to three as follows: (1) Marble Gorge plan, comprising (a) a high dam in Marble Gorge 36½ miles below Lees Ferry; (b) a tunnel 139 miles in length, capacity 3,000 second-feet, from the Marble Gorge Dam to Verde River near Camp Verde; (c) a series of dams along Verde River for stream regulation and power development, down to Granite Reef Dam.

"(2) Bridge Canyon plan, comprising (a) a high dam at Bridge Canyon; (b) a tunnel 72 miles in length, capacity 3,000 second-feet, from Bridge Canyon Dam to Sacramento, Wash.; (c) a canal of 3,000 second-foot capacity, 82 miles long to Cunningham Reservoir; (d) Cunningham Reservoir with

a capacity of 400,000 acre-feet for regulating purposes; (e) a canal of 4,000 second-foot capacity, 180 miles long, from Cunningham Reservoir to Granite Reef Dam.

"(3) Parker pump plan, comprising (a) a pumping plant of 3,000 second-foot capacity, lifting water 1,040 feet out of Lake Havasu; (b) a canal of 3,000 second-foot capacity, 32 miles long, to Cunningham Reservoir; Cunningham Reservoir and the canal to Granite Reef Dam as in the Bridge Canyon plan.

"With each plan distribution systems would be needed to serve the new lands selected for development.

"With the Bridge Canyon and Parker pumping plans, the use of more water above the level of the Granite Reef Dam makes it desirable to exchange Colorado River for Salt and Gila River waters, to reduce avoidable pumping costs. Such an exchange can also be operated to release Gila River waters for increased uses in New Mexico and Arizona above the Coolidge Dam.

"Project costs: Aside from the Colorado River dams that would be built in any event for power production, the additional investment for the various plans would be: Marble Gorge plan, \$487,000,000; Bridge Canyon plan, \$325,000,000; Parker pumping plan, \$134,000,000.

"The indicated sums include Verde River dams and power plants for all plans; and for the Parker pumping plan, the transmission lines from Bridge Canyon to Parker for the operation of the pumps."

Testimony before the subcommittee by Mr. Debler with respect to the over-all construction costs of the three plans indicated that the Parker pumping plan would be the least costly, approximating same \$700,000,000, with the Bridge Canyon plan scheduled at \$881,-

000,000 and the Marble Gorge plan at \$978,-000,000. However, Mr. Debler pointed out that a financial comparison of the plans by over-all construction costs alone would be misleading. The witness called attention to the fact that varying power outputs, varying operation costs, and intricate allocations of costs between interest-bearing and non-interest-bearing costs materially altered the final over-all cost of each of the projects. In a table presented during the hearings,¹ in which construction costs, annual costs, annual returns, and ratio income to cost on a percentage basis were tabulated, it would appear that the Marble Gorge plan may be the cheapest and most desirable plan on a long-time basis.

Of equal importance in making a final decision as to which plan will be finally adopted is the problem of loss of water. Mr. Debler discussed this situation during the hearings and made a comparison of evaporation losses by each of the three plans, identifying the Marble Gorge plan as route A, the Bridge Canyon plan as route B, and the Parker pumping plan as route C. The table of water losses and pertinent comments on this subject presented at the hearings follows:

"Evaporation losses in reservoirs on the river have been taken at 5 feet per year. The same evaporation losses have been taken from the water surface of canals, which is used here as 150 feet wide at water line. All canals have been taken as concrete line, and experiments by the Salt River Valley Water Users' Association show this loss to be 0.035 feet in depth over the wetted area. The wetted area of canals has been taken as 160 feet.

"The results of the comparisons are summarized in the following table:

Route	Colorado River Reservoir evaporation (acre-feet)				Evaporation and transportation loss in open canals (acre-feet)	Total loss (acre-feet)
	Bridge Canyon (12,000 acres)	Lake Meade (147,000 acres)	Davis (28,000 acres)	Lake Havasu (25,000 acres)		
A.....						
B.....	16,000				68,000	84,000
C.....	16,000	196,600	37,000	33,000	72,100	354,000

"Using a value per acre-foot of \$3, route B shows a yearly loss of income of \$252,000; route C shows a yearly loss of income of \$1,062,000.

"The water lost under route C would irrigate about 80,000 acres of land. Using the average crop value of \$76 per acre, the loss in crop income per year under route C would be \$6,000,000. Also, under route C, tax-levying organizations would lose the tax on 80,000 acres. In route C there will be about 33,000 acre-feet of water in a full canal extending from Cunningham Wash Reservoir to Granite Reef (about 181 miles). On an average, not less than twice a year, summer rains in the Salt River Valley shut off water demand, so an average of 66,000 acre-feet per year might have to be delivered as 'free water' or wasted, with an attendant loss of income (at \$3 per acre-foot) of \$198,000 annually.

"Therefore, losses at \$3 per acre-foot by route C might total \$7,392,000, or at \$1.50 per acre-foot, \$3,696,000 (not including tax losses), as compared with route A.

"It appears that if route A is used, there will be water for an additional 80,000 acres in new projects over route C. Also, route C will thus prove of little or no benefit to increase the surface supply for considerable land lying above the proposed canal and now in cultivation and badly in need of additional water.

"An operational phase to be considered under route C is that at 3 feet per second, it will take about 3½ days for water to travel

from Cunningham Wash Reservoir to Granite Reef, with a full canal. If the canal were empty it would probably be nearly a week before first releases from Cunningham Wash Reservoir would reach Granite Reef. This would seem to demand very adequate storage at Granite Reef, and the proposed grade elevations of route C do not reach Granite Reef much above river-bed elevation."

Two facts appear to stand out from this testimony comparing costs and water evaporation between the three plans: (1) The Parker pumping plan will require perpetual pumping and elevation of 1,040 feet; (2) the Parker pumping plan will show the greatest amount of evaporation loss. It appears to the committee, therefore, that the Parker pumping plan should be eliminated entirely from further consideration unless subsequent final engineering data should prove the Marble Gorge or Bridge Canyon plans to be unfeasible.

Taking into consideration that the Marble Gorge route is reasonably free from earthquakes, which modifies the danger of loss of tunnels, its lower annual cost over a period of half a century or more, and relatively lower loss of water, the committee is impressed with the fact that on the basis of factual evidence so far adduced this route appears to offer the greatest permanent advantages to the State. The committee believes, if the final engineering data proves the Marble Gorge route to be feasible, that the most careful investigation and serious consideration should be given to this plan.

Based on the testimony offered to the subcommittee and such data as has been made available, the Bridge Canyon plan appears to the committee as second in desirability and should be given important consideration only if the Marble Gorge route is not found to be feasible and engineering data substantiates the Bridge Canyon plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

The committee recommends the following actions be taken:

1. That all possible speed be exercised in the completion of engineering data and plans leading to a final decision on the method of bringing Colorado River water into central Arizona, such data and plans taking into consideration such factors as irrigation costs per acre-foot, amounts of new lands which may be irrigated (giving consideration to soil quality and other pertinent factors), long-time costs of plan selected, amount of water loss, and hydroelectric power produced.

2. That surveys be completed as rapidly as possible to determine the feasibility and costs of irrigating and placing into cultivation new lands in Arizona. (The completion of such surveys is essential in order that the State and Federal authorities may have the necessary data to make the proper selection of lands for irrigation with Colorado River water available to Arizona under the contract with the Secretary of the Interior.)

3. That the Federal Government undertake to develop Arizona sources for such additional water as are found feasible; and for the various irrigation projects to contract directly with the Federal Government for such water on an acre-foot basis. (This recommendation is deemed advisable because of the divergent needs and interests.)

4. That the survey be completed as rapidly as possible of all of the remaining smaller Arizona irrigation projects.

5. That the enactment of legislation be secured to provide for preferential rights to veterans of World War II for (a) purchase by means of Federal Government low-cost loans of lands suitable for farming; (b) right of entry to Government lands on the same basis extended to World War I veterans; and (c) Federal Government aid in the development of such lands granted to or purchased by such veterans.

BILLS INTRODUCED

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

By Mr. FULBRIGHT (for himself and Mr. THOMAS of Utah):

S. 1325. A bill to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. STEWART:

S. 1326. A bill to transfer to the Secretary of Agriculture control over and responsibility for price control and rationing for food and feed; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. RADCLIFFE:

S. 1327. A bill for the relief of Petrol Corp.; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 1328. A bill to amend the act of October 14, 1940, as amended, entitled "An act to expedite the provision of housing in connection with national defense, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. WHEELER:

S. 1329. A bill for the relief of the trustees of school district No. 2, Dodson, Mont.; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. WALSH:

S. 1330. A bill to amend section 14 of the Veterans' Preference Act of 1944; to the Committee on Civil Service.

¹ P. 14, hearings, S. Res. 304, Arizona Water Resources.

² Ibid., p. 15.

³ Ibid., pp. 23, 24.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to introduce a bill to provide for approval of the United States-Canadian Agreement dated March 19, 1941, for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin, and ask that it not be referred but that it lie on the table.

Also, a bill to provide maternity leave for Government employees, for reference to the Committee on Civil Service.

Also, a bill to provide for binding of Government officials, to establish a Federal fidelity trust fund, and for other purposes, for reference to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Also, a bill to provide for the establishment of a Bank of the United States, and for other purposes, for reference to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the bills introduced by the Senator from North Dakota will be received and referred as requested.

By Mr. LANGER:

S. 1331. A bill to provide for approval of the United States-Canadian Agreement dated March 19, 1941, for the improvement of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence Basin, and for other purposes; ordered to lie on the table.

S. 1332. A bill to provide maternity leave for Government employees (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Civil Service.

S. 1333. A bill to provide for binding of Government officials, to establish a Federal fidelity trust fund, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 1334. A bill to provide for the establishment of a Bank of the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSING FOR VETERANS ATTENDING EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTIONS—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE submitted amendments intended to be proposed by him to the bill (S. 977) to aid in providing housing for veterans attending educational institutions, and for other purposes, which were referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

PROPOSED FULL EMPLOYMENT LAW—AMENDMENTS

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I wish, in behalf of the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and myself to read a joint statement in regard to the so-called Murray full-employment bill as a preface to offering certain amendments to the bill.

Several of the Democratic sponsors of the so-called Murray full-employment bill, S. 380, as well as many groups and organizations interested in the principles and objectives of the bill, have urged bipartisan sponsoring and support of the bill. We, as Republican Senators, agree that the problem of unemployment and the objective of full employment truly is a nonpartisan problem. In fact, it is a national problem, which should be approached and solved without reference to partisanship. Hence, we are pleased to join in bipartisan sponsoring of the Murray full-employment bill, subject to the understanding that we think that the bill should be amended in several respects. In making this announcement of our joining in the sponsorship of the bill we

also make certain suggestions as to amendments.

One of our criticisms of the bill in its present form is that it is in essence little more than the expressing of a very high and laudable social and economic ideal for America. We are very pleased to join those who seek to accomplish that ideal, and we desire to help them implement it so that it may become a reality. We are in complete sympathy with the stated purpose of the bill, namely, to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government. We feel that in implementing the bill procedural and substantive amendments should be attached to it which will give maximum encouragement to private enterprise operating in a free competitive economy to accomplish all that it is capable of accomplishing toward attaining full employment in the United States.

We agree with the general proposition that if it should come to pass that during the postwar adjustment period private industry is not able to maintain full employment, then the Government must step in and give support to such wealth-creating and job-producing projects as may be necessary to maintain a decent standard of living for employables who are ready and willing to work. In carrying out such an employment program we think that the Murray full-employment bill should be so modified and redrafted in committee as to assure private industry that it will be the policy of the Government to give it such aid as it may need in keeping with a full protection of the public's interests to the end that private enterprise under a free competitive economy will be able to supply the maximum possible number of good-paying jobs.

As we have sought to point out in one of our amendments, we think that it is of great importance that the Federal Government work in close cooperation with industry, agriculture, labor, and State and local governments in any governmentally sponsored full-employment program and that the basic democratic principle of home-rule administration be recognized at all times.

The amendments which we submit at this time are only suggestive, and we do not submit them with the idea that they are necessarily in final form. We think they are worthy of committee consideration subject to such modifications as the committee may wish to make. We are satisfied that there undoubtedly are several other amendments which should be made to the bill, and after the summer recess we shall probably submit additional amendments. At this time we wish to say that we are pleased to join in bipartisan support of the objectives of the Murray full-employment bill, and we shall be glad to work with the sponsors of that bill in an endeavor to perfect it so that its essential objective of full employment will become a reality in the period of postwar adjustment and thereafter.

As I have said, Mr. President, I submit this joint statement in behalf of the

Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. TOBEY], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. AIKEN], and myself.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I should like to have the permission of the distinguished Senator to be allowed to join him, the Senator from New Hampshire, and the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. MORSE. I am sure we are more than happy to welcome the Senator from North Dakota as a sponsor of the statement and of the amendments which I now ask unanimous consent to submit and ask to have referred to the appropriate committee.

There being no objection, the amendments submitted by Mr. MORSE (for himself, Mr. TOBEY, Mr. AIKEN, and Mr. LANGER) to the bill (S. 380) to establish a national policy and program for assuring continuing full employment in a free competitive economy, through the concerted efforts of industry, agriculture, labor, State and local governments, and the Federal Government, were received, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

THE OREGON LAMB PROBLEM

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, without comment upon them, I ask consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD certain editorials, telegrams, letters, and newspaper articles dealing with the abuses of OPA, which speak much more eloquently on the subject to which they relate than I could. The material supports my persistent plea for the passage of my resolution calling for a Senate investigation of OPA.

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

BAKER, OREG., July 19, 1945.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

Care Senate Office, Washington, D. C.:

Thanks for your telegrams and splendid work on lamb situation by you and CORDON. Have been away hence delay answering.

F. A. PHILLIPS.

WYOMING WOOL GROWERS ASSOCIATION,

McKinley, Wyo., July 23, 1945.

HON. WAYNE MORSE,

United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR MORSE: I was delighted to note in the press a day or two ago that you had finally won your point with the OPA and that they were to make lamb ration free in parts of Oregon for a limited time. Of course, this decision should have been made long ago without the necessity of your having to work so hard on it. It does prove, however, that persistence properly used will win, and you are to be congratulated on keeping after this as you did.

I have read with much interest and approval all of the speeches you have made in the Senate on this subject, including the speech you made on July 18.

Again thanking you for your continued efforts in behalf of the wool-growers industry, and I can assure you they are much appreciated, and with all good wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

J. B. WILSON.

TELLING THE EDITOR COMPLAINT ON OPA

To the EDITOR:

KLAMATH FALLS, OREG.—On Monday, June 4, we went to the OPA office to make application for our canning sugar, and after making

out the application to the 20 pounds allotted, to my consternation I discovered that spare stamp No. 13 was missing along with the entire row, and the page of spare stamps was loose.

I took my application back to the desk and stated my difficulty, and presumed I could only make application for No. 10, so would require another form.

The clerk informed me, after asking to see the book, that this would not be necessary, that the book was in a bad condition and suggested I turn it in for replacement, and that the No. 13 sugar stamp would be included. We asked her how long it would require, and if I should call for it. She said the book would be mailed to me within a few days.

We did not receive this book until July 9, and all the valid stamps had been confiscated for the month of June.

After waiting 2 weeks for the return of this book, I called the OPA office, as all our stamps, from my book were used up and then was informed that the book would be held 30 days, and when I asked what we were to do for red points, she giggled and said, "well that's just your hard luck," and added, "You know your ration book is more valuable than your money, yet you wouldn't treat your money as you do your ration book." I sure could see no comparison, and asked her if she realized how many times the bills were replaced, without penalty, in the period we had been carrying and using these flimsy ration books, and also if she had ever read the history of the process the bills were subjected to make them substantial, and suggested it might be interesting knowledge. She again giggled and hung up.

Then I immediately wrote our Congressmen, to which I received immediate replies, and then sent my letters to McDannell Brown at 1108 Bedell Building, Portland.

Senator Morse states "I read your letter with great indignation that any one of our citizens should be subjected to any such treatment by any of our Government agencies." "Repeatedly I have criticized the OPA's autocratic action, and this letter (of yours) is an example of some of the defects that should be corrected." "If prompt action is not taken to see that your husband is supplied with these ration points, wire me Government collect."

Senator CORDON wrote, "I fully understand how you feel, and share your indignation over many of the unnecessary, irrational, and dictatorial policies and procedures emanating from the OPA." "I am immediately investigating, and shall write you again."

In consequence, I received a letter from McDannell Brown, OPA district director at Portland, in which he stated, "Your lost (I had plainly stated it was not lost, but was turned in with the full month's valid stamps intact) ration book would be replaced without any unduly delaying action."

I am stating these facts for the benefit of all ration book holders, and the warning against the suave suggestion of turning in a mutilated book for replacement, which will be mailed to you within a few days.

Every red point is needed for a minimum of dietary needs and then to be deprived of a full month's supply, that were rightfully ours, is the most inhumane, dastardly, unconstitutional policy that a citizen of democracy can be subjected to. We aren't supposed to be under nazism, communism, yet I wonder how much better off we are than under a dictatorship, when any Government agency can take such powers unto themselves.

Mrs. H. L. BROWN.

PORTLAND, OREG., July 28, 1945.
Senator WAYNE L. MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

Appreciate your continuing demand for investigation of OPA. Hope you obtain im-

mediate action. Capable management could improve food and gasoline situation.

ROY A. GAGE.

SPOKANE, WASH., July 27, 1945.
Senator WAYNE MORSE,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.:

We who rent houses and apartments have suffered grievously from the maladministration of OPA, and rejoice that you are sponsoring resolution to investigate that agency. Controls are right and proper. Extermination of landlords is of questionable value. We urge the investigation you sponsor.

SPOKANE HOUSING ASSOCIATION,
MARY FLAHAVERN, President.

EUGENE, OREG., July 19, 1945.

DEAR WAYNE: I'm skipping the proper formalities, etc., just because I want to get to the point of complimenting you on your splendid actions in regards your stand on the CPA—especially on the meat situation. You are really doing great. Stick to it. We are all back of you.

Hope that you are not missing the West as we miss seeing you.

Regards and best wishes.

Sincerely,

HENRY D. FEHLY.

POINT-FREE LAMB

Secretary of Agriculture Anderson has asked OPA to remove points from Oregon "soft" lambs. For this he is to be commended. This action resulted from the consistent and persistent pressure applied by Senators CONDON and MORSE.

The lambs are grown locally and can be consumed locally with a change in point value. Thus a dual service will be performed. There will be an advantage to the farmer. There will be an advantage to the consumer.

Secretary Anderson made this recommendation after ascertaining the facts from the Oregon Senators. For OPA not to follow his recommendation would be unwise, to say the least.

OREGON LAMBS GO POINT-FREE—OPA REMOVES SALES CURES IN EMERGENCY—LONG BATTLE CLOSES WHEN CONTROL BODY BOWS TO ANDERSON

WASHINGTON, July 21.—The Office of Price Administration announced today that in western Oregon only lamb of commercial, utility, and cull grades will be point-free from July 23 through September 1. The removal of ration point values on these grades of lamb was necessary for the quick slaughter and consumption of the "soft" lamb crop in the Willamette valley in Oregon, OPA said.

The decision lifting the point values was taken after Secretary of Agriculture Clinton P. Anderson asked OPA to look into the matter. Previously, Members of Congress from Oregon repeatedly had protested the retention of high point values which they said would have caused a loss to consumers of the soft lamb crop.

The lamb will be point-free in the counties of Hood River, Multnomah, Clackamas, Marion, Linn, Lane, Douglas, Jackson, and counties west of them.

OPA said the situation in the Willamette Valley has several unique aspects. The agency said the "soft" lambs in that area are fed on moist grass and tend to be of inferior quality. They cannot be shipped any considerable distance alive. They also must be slaughtered quickly or they deteriorate.

OPA said that in fairness to other areas of the country, the Department of Agriculture will forbid the shipment of any outside lambs into the Willamette area except those to federally inspected slaughter houses which will be supplying chiefly army demands.

OBSERVERS SAY ACTION ONLY PARTIAL RELIEF

The national OPA's partial answer to Secretary of Agriculture Anderson's lamb point removal request will be but a partial solution to Oregon's soft lamb problem, according to belief expressed in some quarters Saturday.

State Director of Agriculture Ervin L. Peterson, R. L. Clark, president of BoDine & Clark Commission Co., and Milton H. Wolf, president of the Independent Retail Meat Dealers Association, do not believe the new OPA amendment covers enough territory.

Ben Buisman, Oregon Grange Bulletin editor, remarked that "if this new action along with past changes fails to solve the Oregon lamb problem, it never will be solved."

"The OPA must have restrictions. The point removal is restricted to western Oregon and will only solve the distribution trouble to the extent of lambs that can be consumed in this area. The consuming centers of Washington's Puget Sound area should have been allowed to eat point-free lamb in order to increase needed market movement," Clark said.

Peterson said that restriction of the point removal from commercial, utility, and cull grades "places a premium on lower grades of lamb," explaining this step is "contrary to good marketing practice of stimulating the sales of the best grades."

"The new OPA action won't solve the problem of moving the top grades," Wolf declared. "Present values on the two top grades are too high and removal of points on the lower grades is likely to bring about pile-up of high-quality lamb."

Saturday's ration change came after a long fight by Oregon Senators WAYNE B. MORSE and GUY CORDON to show the OPA that the lamb trouble is a Northwest problem since the valley lambs can't be shipped very far without losing weight and causing a financial loss to producers.

FORMULA FOR RECONVERSION—A COMMUNICATION

By this time you will have received announcements of OPA's first reconversion pricing action. I am writing you in some detail because reconversion is one of the most important problems this country has to face.

The OPA is working on the principle that the best way to put out the fire of inflation is to smother it under an avalanche of goods. Our entire reconversion program is designed to keep up our guard against the inflation of living costs and operating costs and at the same time clear the way for the mass production and mass sale of civilian goods as rapidly as material and manpower can be released.

I am sure you will find our reconversion program very flexible. We have devised practical methods of making necessary adjustments rapidly, without exposing either the public or business to the inflation and crash that followed World War I reconversion.

Our reconversion formula provides for necessary price adjustments, based on legal increases in basic wage rate schedules of factory employees and for legal increases in the prices of materials and parts. This program of adjustment covers 90 percent of industrial costs.

Our program provides for industry-wide adjustment based on cost increase information provided by industry themselves. The program also provides individual firm adjustments for manufacturers who are unable to operate profitably on the basis of industry-wide adjustments.

For firms with less than \$200,000 annual volume, we have a short green line adjustment application form, which enables them to calculate their own reconversion ceiling price adjustment. Unless they hear from OPA to the contrary within 15 days after filing this form, they may begin production

at the price derived from their own calculation.

In addition, we are very carefully studying the special problem of small firms. We are prepared to take additional steps to provide them with rapid and simple pricing methods.

You will be interested to know that in developing this program, we have given special consideration to clearing the way for the mass market upon which sustained production and employment depends.

I think that now more than ever before we must realize that price control is also cost control. One man's selling price is another man's cost. For the protection of all, we must prevent that kind of inflation that was so costly during World War I reconversion.

At that time inflation made prices and operating costs soar. The value of financial reserves was seriously cut, and businesses which wished to expand had to take on an excessive debt burden. During the World War I reconversion period businesses also bid against each other for limited supplies of raw materials. Rising prices set loose a wave of speculative buying which forced costs still higher and created artificial scarcity. By mid-1920, prices were so high that neither consumers nor businesses could pay them.

We all remember the results of that inflation. Orders and production stopped and prices crashed. Business inventory losses totaled \$11,000,000,000, 106,000 firms went bankrupt, hundreds of thousands of others lost large parts of their investments. Five and one-half million workers lost their jobs and their incomes. Markets dried up.

At this time, inflation pressures are much stronger than they were in 1918. During the next year income is expected to be about \$155,000,000,000. In addition, people have about \$140,000,000,000 in various types of savings. The demand for both consumer goods and raw materials will be much bigger than supply for many months. This is the stage of the game in which we lost our fight against World War I inflation.

During the critical months ahead, this country will have to take bold steps to lay the foundation for peacetime prosperity. Our reconversion price program must help clear the way for volume production and good profit.

Our program must also provide a sound basis for the advanced planning for production and delivery schedules. Any repetition of an inflation like the one that upset our World War I reconversion period would make costs unpredictable. Unpredictable production costs would seriously delay reconversion.

It is my hope that Americans can understand these facts during the coming months when inflationary pressure will be so strong. We are already making plans to remove price control and get out of the picture as soon as inflationary pressures are over. But at best, the months ahead will bring many difficult problems. If we make the necessary adjustments quickly and wisely we can prevent disaster and clear the way for full production, full employment, and mass markets we have set for our peacetime goal. Then we won't need any OPA.

I hope you will give me your ideas about how our office can finish this last phase of our job quickly and safely.

ROBERT K. THOMPSON,
District Director, OPA.

WASHINGTON, July 21.

THE NAVAL ACADEMY CENTENNIAL CELEBRATION

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, as a result of a joint resolution passed by Congress, plans are now being formulated for the celebration of the hundredth year of the existence of the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis, and I am submitting for the information of the Members of the Congress and the public

the data that is now available as to the progress being made by the Naval Academy Centennial Commission.

The Commission, created by special act of Congress, has for its honorary chairman the President of the United States. Ralph A. Bard, former Under Secretary of the Navy, is Chairman of the Commission which includes Senator David I. Walsh, Senator Hiram W. Johnson, Senator Millard E. Tydings, Representative Donald L. O'Toole, Representative Lansdale G. Sasser, Representative J. Glenn Beall, Gov. Herbert R. O'Connor, of Maryland, Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal, Frank Folsom, Andrew A. Johnson, Paul Patterson, Dr. Robert S. Sproul, and Vice Adm. A. W. Fitch. Admiral Fitch is the prospective Superintendent of the Naval Academy. Commander T. W. Sterling, United States Naval Reserve, has been named secretary of the Commission.

The executive committee named by the Commission includes Senator Walsh, Representative Sasser, Governor O'Connor, Mr. Bard, Mr. Folsom, Mr. Johnson, and Mr. Patterson.

The Commission is planning to provide complete coverage of the ceremonies through every news medium, including the radio, and realizes the necessity of restricting the number of persons who attend the celebration at the Academy because of present travel limitations. The centennial day is October 10, 1945. It is planned that ceremonies marking the observance will be held during the week from October 7 to October 13. In addition to events to be held at the Academy, the Commission is making plans for simultaneous observances of the centennial by Naval Academy Association branches throughout the Nation.

As details are decided upon, information concerning them will be released by the Commission through the Office of Public Information, Navy Department.

ASSISTANCE AFFORDED BY FARM SECURITY ADMINISTRATION—ARTICLE BY H. E. KLINEFELTER

[Mr. BRIGGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "How FSA Has Helped Thousands of Missouri Farmers," written by H. E. Klinefelter and published in the Missouri Farmer of June 1, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

RELIEF FOR OUR ALLIES AND NECESSITY FOR WORLD ORGANIZATION—ARTICLES BY EDGAR ANSEL MOWRER

[Mr. BRIGGS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record two articles, one entitled "Urgency To Relieve Our Allies," and the other "President Truman and the Republic of the World," both written by Edgar Ansel Mowrer and published in the St. Louis Post-Dispatch, which appear in the Appendix.]

WASHINGTON WATER LOBBY—ARTICLES BY PETER EDSON

[Mr. TAYLOR asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a series of articles on the Washington water lobby, written by Peter Edson and published in the Washington Daily News of July 16 to 21, 1945, which appear in the Appendix.]

COLUMBIA VALLEY AGENCY—LETTERS AND NEWSPAPER COMMENT

[Mr. MITCHELL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a number of

newspaper articles, editorials, and letters with regard to the Columbia Valley Agency, which appear in the Appendix.]

EXTRACT FROM ADDRESS BY HON. C. A. BERENDSEN, MINISTER OF NEW ZEALAND TO THE UNITED STATES

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an extract from an address delivered by Hon. C. A. Berendsen, Minister of New Zealand to the United States, at the annual meeting of the City Club of Portland, June 29, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

DEAR SON—EDITORIAL BY GILES L. FRENCH

[Mr. MORSE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Dear Son," written by Giles L. French, editor of the Sherman County Journal, Moro, Oreg., and published in the issue of the Journal of July 1, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

AN IMPENDING CRISIS AT HOME—LETTER FROM A SOLDIER ON THE RACE PROBLEM

[Mr. BILBO asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record a letter from a Missouri soldier in the Army of Occupation in Europe, dealing with the race problem, which appears in the Appendix.]

THURMAN ARNOLD'S RESIGNATION FROM THE BENCH—EDITORIAL FROM CAPITAL TIMES, MADISON, WIS.

[Mr. LA FOLLETTE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an editorial entitled "Thurman Arnold Goes Back to Fighting Front," published in the Madison (Wis.) Capital Times of July 25, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

TESTIMONY OF MRS. ELISE FRENCH JOHNSTON ON THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record the corrected testimony on the United Nations Charter, given by Mrs. Elise French Johnston, of New York City, before the Foreign Relations Committee, which appears in the Appendix.]

CORRECTED TESTIMONY OF MRS. CATHERINE P. BALDWIN ON THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record the corrected testimony relative to the United Nations Charter, given before the Foreign Relations Committee by Mrs. Catherine P. Baldwin, of New York City, which appears in the Appendix.]

TESTIMONY OF JOHN T. FLYNN, CARL H. MOTE, AND MRS. FLORENCE CAFFERATTA ON THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER

[Mr. LANGER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record the testimony on the United Nations Charter, given by John T. Flynn, Carl H. Mote, and Mrs. Florence Cafferatta before the Committee on Foreign Relations, which appears in the Appendix.]

POLICIES AND OBJECTIVES OF THE DISABLED AMERICAN VETERANS—STATEMENT BY SENATOR PEPPER.

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an outline prepared by him of the policies and objectives of the Disabled American Veterans, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE PEPPER BILL FOR EQUAL PAY FOR EQUAL WORK FOR WOMEN—ARTICLE BY MRS. ELEANOR ROOSEVELT

[Mr. PEPPER asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article written by Mrs. Eleanor Roosevelt relating to

Senate bill 1178, published in the Washington Daily News of July 10, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

REVIVAL OF SILVER MONEY USE

[Mr. MURDOCK asked and obtained leave to have printed in the Record an article entitled "London Sees Revival of Silver Money Use," published in the Salt Lake Tribune, Salt Lake City, Utah, of July 21, 1945, which appears in the Appendix.]

THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The Senate 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. WAGNER. Mr. President, I favor the ratification of the United Nations Charter and I should like to add a few brief comments to those of the Senators who have spoken so ably in support of this great instrument. Like many other Members of this great body, I have over the years given much thought to the need for the establishment of a world organization to maintain peace and security and to prevent aggression. In December of last year, in an address delivered in New York City, I stated my views on the proposed international organization with particular reference to the question of the power of the American delegate to commit a predetermined contingent of our armed forces for use in restraining aggression. I believe those views bear repetition and what I shall say now is in substance what I said then.

Mr. President, we are asked to embrace an historic opportunity—the opportunity of taking a great step forward toward the establishment of peace and security, law and order among nations.

There is no problem of defining the objectives for which mankind is yearning. Mankind craves peace and tranquillity, the reign of law and justice in international conduct, coupled with freedom from fear of external aggression. This generation has been given the task of realizing this goal. Toward this end, the blood and treasure of all civilized communities have been and are today being poured forth, conscious that if we miss this great chance now, it may never come again.

What are the obstacles to success? It is not the unwillingness of the plain people anywhere. It is not their resistance which might cause us to fail as we failed once before. The obstacles have existed rather in the voluntary subservience of many of our statesmen to the slavery of words. They have been fettered by words like "sovereignty." They have been shackled by phrases like "liberty of action."

They would hesitate to enter the Garden of Eden, until they knew the name of every tree that grew therein. And, as usual, there are those who have uncanny capacity to find in our Constitution the letter that killeth instead of the spirit that giveth light.

I suppose that the quibblers and the doubters have always been with us. Be-

yond question, among the great throng that stood at the base of Mount Sinai to receive the Ten Commandments, there were some who were ready with amendments and reservations.

But we must always remember that the history of our law and the history of our Nation—in fact, the whole history of Anglo-American institutions—have subordinated logic to experience, and have fashioned new ideas to meet new facts. Consider the genius which, unguided by a written constitution, fashioned a modern democracy out of a once feudal kingdom like England. I have no doubt that, in 1789, there must have been legalists who said that the concept of a sovereign nation composed of many sovereign states was logically impossible. But the great lawyers who sketched the outlines of our Federal Union were not legalists.

It is astounding to contemplate how much progress we have made in our system of common law, in our legislation, and in our practice of national government, while by contrast in international relations we have clung to a horse-and-buggy age. The ethical concepts, the moral concepts, the practical concepts, which have heretofore prevailed in our international thinking are extraordinarily primitive. When we speak of personal honor, we think of obligations and not of rights. But when we have spoken of national honor, we have thought solely of some right that might be affronted. When we speak of a great citizen, we mean one who has labored for the common weal. But when we have spoken of a great power, we have thought only of its strength and armaments. When we think of individual liberty, we realize that it is attainable only under a uniform and democratic system of law. But when it was suggested that a sovereign nation subscribe to similarly established international law, we shied away.

The twentieth century cries out for a newer and richer concept of the place of a nation in the family of nations. We must reach for practical devices that balance obligations with power, that place justice above self-will, and that replace isolationism with responsibility. The people are more than ready for such a concept. And when the Senate votes on the Charter, I believe it will be demonstrated that this body is ready for such a concept and is prepared to adopt the practical machinery for its effective application.

Mr. President, the fact that we are ready for this concept and that we have before us an instrument providing the practical machinery for its effective application is in great measure attributable to the wisdom and the tireless efforts of the distinguished chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], and to the magnificent assistance rendered him by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and other members of the American delegation to the San Francisco Conference. The American people owe them an eternal debt of gratitude for their historic accomplishment.

At this point, I also wish to pay tribute to the group of members of the Foreign Relations Committee headed by the

chairman, and including the distinguished majority and minority leaders [Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. WHITE]; the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], our former colleague the distinguished Senator from Iowa, Mr. Gillette, the distinguished Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the distinguished Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN], and the distinguished Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], who in a splendid spirit of nonpartisan cooperation labored many long hours in consultation with the executive branch of the Government during the elaboration of the proposals which finally culminated in the Charter of the United Nations.

Nor will we ever forget the inspired leadership and foresight of President Roosevelt, whose unparalleled statesmanship paved the way for our full participation in international cooperation, and the great service rendered by Secretary Hull, under whose wise guidance many pitfalls were safely avoided.

Mr. President, I now wish to comment briefly on the question whether the American representative on the Security Council should have power to commit a predetermined contingent of our armed forces for use in restraining aggression. I believe that it is crucial to the success of the enterprise that he have this power.

It is crucial because of the very fact that the democratic nations are also peace-loving nations. They are not ready to declare war on slight provocation. They move only when it is manifest that there is no course other than war. They act only when the danger is clear, imminent, and overwhelming. But by that time, the little aggression has become a major aggression; the little conflict has become a great war. What might have been prevented by prompt show of force must be undone at the price of wholesale slaughter.

Thus no action was taken when Manchuria was attacked. Thus no effective action was taken when Ethiopia was trampled under foot. Thus we find the world in the midst of its present agony and tragedy.

No one seriously disputes the proposition that the Security Council of the United Nations must, beyond all else, have the military means at its disposal for prompt application. But we are told that this is unattainable because our Constitution vests the war-making power exclusively in Congress. We are told—and how many times have we not been told before—that we cannot attain a supremely important objective because the Constitution forbids it.

Let me not be misunderstood. I am familiar with the long struggle of the people to curb the war-making propensities of their self-appointed kings and rulers, by forbidding them to make war without the consent of the people's representatives. That long struggle is one of the noble chapters in the march of human freedom. I would not underestimate one step of that progress. The authority to declare war and the power to make war must remain in the hands of the Congress. On that issue, our Con-

stitution is eternally right and eternally clear.

But the charter does not propose that the President or the American delegate should possess authority to declare war. It does not propose that any individual shall have power to appropriate funds or mobilize American manpower or resources for war making. It proposes merely that the President and the delegate shall have available the use of a police force—a police force constituted initially, so far as this Nation is concerned, by Congress—and operating ab initio, so far as this Nation is concerned, for purposes defined in general by act of law.

This proposition is not shocking, or even novel. In Tripoli in 1801, in Algiers in 1815, in China in 1900, in Mexico, Nicaragua, and Haiti, Presidents of the United States have used force without congressional declarations of war. They have used only such force as Congress, and only Congress, had made and could make available for the purpose.

The question of whether, in the particular instances I have cited, the decision to use force was wise or unwise is beside the point—for that same question of wisdom in the light of history might be raised with respect to some of the wars which Congress declared. The only significance of the illustrations is that throughout our history the use of a police force to enforce the laws and treaties of the United States has not been regarded as war. This distinction has been recognized and lived by. Its success in practical application is the best evidence that our Chief Executives, as well as our judges, have given that living construction to our Constitution which is the essential spirit of that great Charter of our liberties.

Let us not be disturbed by the difficulties of formulating some petty definition which would distinguish between war making and international policing, in a manner to satisfy the most critical of textbook legalists. Nobody has ever written a final definition of interstate commerce, or of the respective powers of our Nation and our States. Through more than 150 years of our constitutional history, we have been weaving the definition into the pattern of our national existence by deciding cases as they arise. Year by year, necessity has supplied refinements in the definition to meet new cases and new controversies.

It is incomprehensible to me that we, who have accepted this pragmatic philosophy in dealing with the relatively smaller matters of the daily business of our courts and the relationship between the Nation and our States should reject this pragmatic philosophy in dealing with the supreme problems of world peace.

Mr. President, I shall vote for the ratification of the Charter of the United Nations so that America may discharge fully its obligation for the maintenance of an honorable peace throughout this one world in which we live.

Mr. TAFT obtained the floor.

XCI—513

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BRIGGS in the chair). The clerk will call the roll.

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

Alken	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.
Eyrd	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 absent because of illness in his family.

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 PRESIDING OFFICER. Ninety-one Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

SENATOR WILEY'S RECORD ON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, will the Senator from Ohio yield to me for a moment?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, the ratification of the United Nations Charter marks a great turning point in American history. We are embarking now on a great new adventure of international cooperation.

This is an appropriate time to stop and review the past as well as to think of the future, to contemplate "whence we have come and whither we are tending."

The people of the State of Wisconsin have vested a great trust in me in the turbulent years through which we have just come and in the trying years that are still ahead. I feel, therefore, that I owe it to them to submit my record on American foreign policy during the 6½ years, from January 3, 1939, to July 28, 1945, in which I have been proud to have been a Member of this great body.

I ask unanimous consent that there be inserted in the RECORD at this point in chronological order a series of excerpts from statements and speeches which I have made through these years, together with editorial comment thereon.

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

SENATOR WILEY'S RECORD ON AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY 1939

1. THE FIRST OF ALL FIRST THINGS FOR ALL OF US—AMERICAN PATRIOTISM

From a Lincoln Day address delivered in Fairmont, W. Va., on February 10, 1939, as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 16, 1939, volume 84, part 11, page A553:

"In this last election in my own State I traveled 17,000 miles. I learned to know and love Wisconsin as never before. It would not hurt if we had a 'good shot in the arm' of old-fashioned patriotism—the patriotism that makes a man love his home, city, State, and Nation. Aye, makes him love the soil he stands on, and where lie the mortal remains of his parents, the cultivated broad acres and the pleasant valleys, the wooded hills, the brooks, rivers, and lakes.

"Love of country, love that is deep and abiding, that makes a man want to grow and leave behind his outworn shell of yesterday. Love that follows him through the busy day; that attends him when on bended knee he bows to his Maker and asks for guidance and direction. This love is not narrow and unkind. Do you know, folks, there are many people who have never had the experience of feeling this thing called patriotic love of country? This is due largely to a lot of false education and propaganda, due to a cheapening process of the real values of life. If you want to exalt yourself, then go onto the heights and know and sense your obligation to the present and the Nation. Teach yourself to be self-reliant, self-respecting—a son of God dwelling in America.

"America, 'tis of thee I sing
Sweet land, sweet land of liberty."

"Teach yourself to be self-sustaining—a builder and a sustainer of the State.

"Then truly we shall be a 'Government of the people, by the people, for the people,' and we shall have a Nation 'that shall not perish from this earth.'"

2. SIX MONTHS BEFORE THE EUROPEAN WAR BREAKS OUT, A FIRM PLEDGE TO SUPPORT INTERNATIONAL LAW AND ADEQUATE NATIONAL DEFENSE, THEN A WARNING TO PROFITEERS

From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 1, 1939, volume 84, part 2, page 2078:

"I do not believe in turning the hands of the clock back and sacrificing the international law the centuries have built. I do not believe in resurrecting the buccaneers and pirates, national or individual, of yesterday.

"International law and order and good will and common sense are part of the world's heritage of which we are custodians. Let us not, as did Esau of old, sell our heritage for a mess of pottage. There is no need for us to play the traitor to the future.

"Mr. President, I shall vote for adequate defense.

"Are we, in voting this money, making provisions so that every dollar of it will go into preparedness? There are so many places where money is needed to help and encourage and influence constructively the life of our people that we cannot afford to waste the money which is to be appropriated. We must see that no exorbitant profits or graft are permitted."

3. ONE MONTH LATER, THE PLEDGE TO SUPPORT PREPAREDNESS IS KEPT. A PLEA IS MADE FOR CONTINUED PRODUCTION OF A CRITICAL DEFENSE ITEM—ZINC

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 24, 1939, volume 84, part 5, page 4379:

"Today I am presenting a * * * measure to restore the cut in prevailing tariff rates on zinc ores and slab zinc. * * * It is desirable that attention be directed to the prevailing zinc tariff rates because it is more than possible that they constitute a genuine menace to the American zinc industry and its employees. * * * Also * * * this menace, with its resultant shut-downs will seriously curtail production of a product vital to national defense."

(NOTE.—This plea was for a long time disregarded by the Administration. See No. 36 for a newspaper editorial on the failure of the Administration to respond quickly and constructively to the plea. See also No. 6 for the story of the duplication of this Administration failure in the case of another vital item—hemp.)

4. A MESSAGE THAT AMERICA MUST REARM, BUT THAT THERE MUST BE SPIRITUAL REARMAMENT AS WELL AS PHYSICAL REARMAMENT

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 24, 1939, volume 84, part 5, page 4679:

"If war should come in Europe at least 95 percent of the people do not want America to get into the war. To keep ourselves out of the melee if it occurs—and, I repeat, in my opinion it is not necessary, for Europe to go into war—the great need here is for moral and spiritual rearmament. In this Congress we have spent billions of dollars to build up physical armament, ships, and equipment of every kind; but now I am talking of the need for mental poise, spiritual balance, moral rearmament, if you please."

5. LET AMERICA REMAIN THE LIGHTHOUSE OF THE WORLD—AN ADDRESS BEFORE EMBARKING FOR EUROPE

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 24, 1939, volume 84, part 9, pages 9795 and 9796:

"Mr. President, I expect shortly to leave for Europe, to attend the sessions of the Interparliamentary Union, at Oslo, Norway, which will be held there from the 15th to the 19th of August. I hope to come back with a better grasp upon the European situation and a better understanding of the effect of our American foreign policy."

"I believe America should be the lighthouse keeper. The business of a lighthouse keeper is to keep the light burning. It is not the business of a lighthouse keeper to go out and attend to the wrecks. He must keep the light burning so that when the navigators of ships look for the light, it will be there. If Europe 'goes to pot,' it is not our business to go to pot with her. It is our business to keep the light of democracy burning, so that in the years that are ahead, stricken people everywhere will be able to see the glory and the worthwhileness of democratic principles."

6. HOW THE ADMINISTRATION "MISSED THE BOAT" BY IGNORING A WARNING TO STOCK-PILE ANOTHER CRITICAL ITEM—HEMP

From a letter received on August 17, 1939, from the Assistant Secretary of War, Col. Louis Johnson, in response to Senator WILEY's previous urgent advice that America should stock-pile hemp:

"In connection with the supply of hemp, jute, sisal, and other similar fibers, in an emergency, it is anticipated that no serious fiber procurement problem will be encountered, as a sufficient domestic supply of substitutes satisfactory for military purposes, is available to meet all essential requirements."

(NOTE.—Three years later after the Japanese took over the Philippines and the Dutch East Indies, America faced a desperate hemp shortage!)

7. A TALK TO EUROPE'S STATESMEN JUST 2 WEEKS BEFORE THE OUTBREAK OF THE EUROPEAN WAR

From an address delivered before the Interparliamentary Union Conference at Oslo, Norway, on August 17, 1939, as reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 2, 1939, volume 85, part 2, page 86:

"America owes much to Europe. From every land in Europe America has received its bloodstream. Your great culture has enriched our lives. Your music, your literature, your drama, some of your great ideas in economics, philosophy, and religion we have made our own. But, Mr. President, you have something we do not want. I refer to those barriers analyzed by the psychologists as fear, hatred, and distrust. Yes, we owe you much. We know that the world is small. We are neighbors. We want to help. Your problems are intricate. There are many equations that we do not understand. I say we want to help, but we want to help you to help yourselves to the end that your problems may find solution through you."

"We want to be helpful, but America does not want to meddle in Europe. The role of a meddler I do not crave for my country."

8. ON SEPTEMBER 1, 1939, THE WAR COMES—GALLANT POLAND FALLS—1 MONTH AFTER HER DEFEAT, AN URGENT PLEA FOR FACTORY PRODUCTION THROUGH CASH ORDERS FROM THE ALLIES

From a radio speech of October 17, 1939, as reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 18, 1939, volume 85, part 2, page 346:

"Practically everyone in America agrees that certain features are wise, such as—

"The requirement that all goods sold to the belligerents must be sold for cash.

"The War Department has recommended the smallest possible number of planes necessary for our defense. They will be ample only with one provision, and that is that our factories shall be allowed to sell enough planes to foreign countries so that the factories may be placed on a mass-production basis, so that the mistake of 1918 will not be repeated. Obviously we shall need fewer planes actually in the air if we can get more when we need them, and get them in a hurry.

"I submit to you that weakness invites attack and results in war without provocation.

"For example, did Ethiopia bring war on herself by meddling into the affairs of other nations? Certainly not. China's only crime was that she did not have adequate national defense. Poland's only crime was that she and her allies were not prepared to repel the German attack.

"When dictators decide to make war, their decision is based upon only one question, and that is whether or not they are able to destroy the other nation. The arguments which prevailed at Munich were the comparative number of war planes of the contending nations. The only language dictators understand is spoken from the mouths of cannons with tongues of fire. Therefore, I favor enlarging the capacity of our factories and thereby strengthening our guaranty of peace."

1940

9. NINETEEN MONTHS BEFORE PEARL HARBOR, THE SALE OF ARMS AND SCRAP IRON TO JAPAN IS DISCUSSED—A SUGGESTION IS MADE THAT AMERICA CONSERVE NEEDED RAW MATERIALS RATHER THAN SHIP THEM AWAY

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 9, 1940, volume 86, part 6, page 6226:

There are rumors in and out of the Capitol relating to the sufficiency and adequacy of America's equipment for self-defense in this great hour. What have we in the way of raw materials? Are we spending our resources? Certainly if we need our raw materials adequately to prepare ourselves, none of them should be shipped to any other nation."

10. THE WAR WIDENS—NORWAY, DENMARK, FRANCE, AND THE LOWLANDS ARE INVADED—A MESSAGE THAT AMERICA AS A NATION MUST, NEVERTHELESS, REMAIN NEUTRAL AND HOLD HERSELF READY TO BIND THE WOUNDS OF THE NATIONS

From an address on May 17, 1940, on the occasion of Norwegian Independence Day at Stoughton, Wis., as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 20, 1940, volume 86, part 15, page 3056:

"While the great heart of America was shocked by what took place in Scandinavia, and is being duplicated elsewhere, and while this same heart bleeds for downtrodden people everywhere, this question arises, What can we, as individuals, and what can we, as a nation, do in this international crisis? What should we do?"

"The first reaction when injustice occurs in the family of nations is for every red-blooded individual to want to rise and strike back at the aggressor. The individual can do that now if he desires. He can enlist in foreign armies and sacrifice his life for the cause if he wishes to. A public official, however, who has a part of shaping the direction that his Government shall take, must, if he is going to be a trustee of the people's Government, think the problem through."

"For us to help as a nation * * * we can continue to keep the record straight. We can continue to make a dispassionate appraisal of foreign affairs and then judiciously express the weight of American approval or disapproval in our official utterances.

"What else can we do? As individuals we undoubtedly will be called upon to make contributions during the war to aid our relatives in Norway. My fellow citizens, I see another position where we all will be called upon, in the days that are up ahead, when war-torn Europe is bled white, for America to do what we did once before under Hoover—when he fed the millions at our expense. Then will be given the opportunity for us to demonstrate that the principles of the Christ still live in the hearts of humanity. When that day comes, when the Biblical saying has come true. 'They who take the sword shall perish by the sword,' we can demonstrate that they who love their brothers—Germans, Frenchmen, Scandinavians, Poles, Englishmen—will give a rebirth to the Spirit of Him who taught us to love one another.

"Our opportunity will be to bind up the wounds, the broken hearts, to cast out the fears and hates of a lacerated humanity. Perhaps then we will be the great instrument to bring about the fulfillment of the prophecy that nations will 'beat their swords into plowshares and there will be no more war.'"

11. PERFORM AN ACT OF MERCY—USE AMERICA'S SHIPS TO TRANSPORT LITTLE REFUGEE CHILDREN FROM THE WAR ZONE TO THE NEW WORLD

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 6, 1940, volume 86, part 7, page 7642:

"There is another subject I should like to call to the attention of the Senate. It is the matter of making a peaceful contribution to the conditions in Europe. We are informed that because of the tremendous number of refugees, England is planning to send her children to Canada.

"Twenty centuries ago the voice of Someone who did not believe in war said:

"Inasmuch as ye have done it unto one of the least of these (children), my brethren, ye have done it unto me."

"In these turbulent times we have a tendency to forget that there are great underlying spiritual laws and principles. The Master expressed one of these in the simple language I have quoted.

"Now, I ask, is there any reason why America should not offer to aid in the transport of these children? We have idle ships. This would be more than a gesture; this would be

a candle lighted in a dark world. We could arrange to carry the children across to Canada. Hitler agreed not to disturb the boats which recently carried American tourists out of Ireland. We could get his promise also to refrain in every way from interfering in the transport of these innocents to the Western Hemisphere—God's country."

12. A WARNING OF AMERICA'S DANGER IN FAILING TO PROVIDE FOR HER SELF-SUFFICIENCY

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 11, 1940, volume 86, part 7, pages 7918 and 7919:
"Mr. President, at this time I direct attention to the slowness of the United States in becoming economically self-sufficient. It is now apparent that the development of the Government purchasing program last fall, under the provisions of the Strategic and Critical Materials Act of June 7, 1939, has not been as rapid in some directions as it should have been. It is obvious that the present European conflict has many far-reaching economic implications, and it is increasingly important that all sovereign powers become economically independent."

13. LET AMERICA ADEQUATELY PREPARE, BUT LET HER STAY WITHIN INTERNATIONAL LAW

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 10, 1940, volume 86, part 9, pages 9393 and 9394:
"There is no place in a national-preparedness program for ostrich minds. Such folks should be taken from the controls of government. We need men at the controls who can and will build America stronger."

"Everyone . . . who does not want to get America into war stands for the doctrine that this country as a political entity must not sell munitions or contraband goods to any combatant.

"I said that this country must not sell such goods. That does not prohibit the nationals of this country, corporations, or institutions from selling, but this country must not sell. Why? Because if this country sold them it would not only violate the statute law of this Nation but it would violate international law, and it would be equivalent to intervention. It would mean war.

"According to recent polls . . . all America would send aid 'within the law' to her Allies, but all America would not send her ships or her men, to fight on European soil, in Europe's war, unless such a war should become America's war.

"In this stand all America shows her common sense, her horse sense. In the first place, we are unprepared. We cannot fight battles nowadays with pea shooters because the other fellow will not fight with such weapons.

"America does not want war, but America will prepare herself so that if she is attacked, or her rights and her sphere of action invaded, she will then be able to defend herself. We must be ready then to put into action the saying that the 'best defense is an offense.'"

14. FIFTEEN MONTHS BEFORE PEARL HARBOR—AN URGENT CALL TO AMERICA TO BUILD A FLEET OF MODERN TORPEDO BOATS

From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 23, 1940, volume 86, part 10, page 10798:

"It is conceded that it is imperative to get our national forces built up. That does not mean simply more ships of the same kind. No; it means, if we are to have a preparedness program, that America must use its head. We do not want more ships of the old type. We want our present ships made more immune to attack from torpedoes, submarines, and airplane bombs. It may mean the creating of a new type of ship.

"Recently I took the matter up with the Secretary of the Navy, Colonel Knox, of building on the Great Lakes a great program of shipbuilding—whereby America would create an independent arm of the Navy—a mosquito

fleet—if you please. We could build these small torpedo boats—they are only 70 to 100 feet long—we could build a hundred or more of them for the cost of a battleship. In the Battle of Britain, which is to come, we may find new lessons. But when we speak about a two-ocean navy, we talk of prospects 5 and 6 years from now. We could build in 6 months to a year 5,000 of these small torpedo boats by taking over the shipyards on the Great Lakes, and these boats could protect every harbor on the Pacific and Atlantic coasts. Why? Because they are speedy. We could improve the present design. They carry two torpedoes. Some of them go at the rate of 70 to 90 miles an hour. They have anti-aircraft protection. The sinking of one of these small boats would mean the loss simply of a complement of a few men. These boats are built for attack. They could proceed 500 miles out to sea. They could tear out from behind warships. They could supplement our submarines, they could supplement our air force, and they would give us the protection which America wants now.

"For a year and a half now I have pressed this matter upon the Navy Department. I took it up about a year and a half ago with Admiral Land, as I recall, and I persisted in it. I hope to have talks with Mr. Knudsen and others in relation to that subject. We do not always have to look to Germany to have the most advanced step. Germany has the blitzkrieg. We have intuition here. We have invention here. We have brains here. Let America use these qualities. Let America awake and lead the world—not simply be a follower."

(NOTE.—For a long time thereafter, this call for a torpedo-boat fleet continued to fall on the deaf ears of the Administration. The call was heard and accepted years later, but only after German submarines had taken a terrible toll of American ships. See newspaper comment on this matter in No. 36.)

15. AMIDST THE DEBATE ON AMERICA'S FIRST PEACETIME MILITARY CONSCRIPTION LAW, A PERSONAL TELEGRAM IS REPORTED UPON. THIS TELEGRAM POINTS UP THE FUTURE HOPES AND ANXIETIES OF AMERICA AND THE WORLD

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 30, 1940, volume 86, part 10, page 11303:

"Mr. President, on arriving in my office yesterday afternoon, after the Senate had adjourned, I found a significant telegram awaiting me. . . . This brief telegram caused me a flood of mixed emotions, and made me think of the past and the present and the future—the past 22 years, just the span of youth.

"Twenty-two years ago, Mr. President, we were at war. Our boys were in the Argonne, in France, in England, and in Russia.

"Twenty-one years ago the war was over, though some of our boys were in Germany, on the Rhine. Versailles was still to be. The voice of democracy, however, was in the ascendancy everywhere. The great experiment of the League of Nations was under way. Peace, glorious peace, seemed to be an accomplished fact.

"Then followed years when nations undertook to repair the damage of the Great War. We had the Washington Treaty limiting armaments. The Kellogg Pact outlawing war followed. Then came the depression years, and now we have the impact upon the world of communism, fascism, and nazism.

"Mr. President, what does the future hold? This telegram caused me to think about that. Twenty-one years hence, what will the picture be? How will the youth of 21 in 1961, looking back upon 1940, interpret this period?

"Will the youth born today have to be a conscript? Will Europe be aflame again with war, or, Mr. President, will we of this generation have found the way out from the curse of war? I hope we will not have to transmit that problem to the generation to come. I

hope we will transmit to the generations that follow the liberties of America unmarred and unimpaired.

"Mr. President, the telegram which caused me to philosophize in this manner . . . announced the birth of a boy child in my own city of Chippewa Falls, Wis. In his veins flows the blood of England, Wales, Norway, Germany, New England, and perhaps Scotland. But he is an American, and he owes allegiance, thank God, only to his Maker and to America.

"I congratulate this young soul on coming into the theater of action at this time. I shall expect great things from him. He will be named Alexander, or 'Alec,' after me. He is my first grandson."

16. ANOTHER UNHEEDED WARNING—AMERICA'S BOYS IN UNIFORM DO NOT HAVE MODERN WEAPONS OR TACTICS FOR OFFENSE OR DEFENSE

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 14, 1940, volume 86, part 11, page 12169:

"The war in Europe has demonstrated a new technique of land warfare, known as the German blitzkrieg. It is conceded as a conclusive fact that 150,000 Germans, equipped in blitzkrieg methods, not only penetrated, but paralyzed 3,000,000 Frenchmen. What lesson do we draw from that fact? Does that mean now more semi-trained men or better training for the regular Army and National Guard?

" . . . We have found that the Navy must have a supplemental arm in the air. However, we are inadequately prepared in that respect. Why? . . . We just have not any air fleet to supplement the Navy or to act as an independent arm, for defense or offense. . . . It is expected that under voluntary enlistments shortly we will have 375,000 men in the regular Army. I ask this question: Are they trained in the blitzkrieg technique of offense and of defense? Have they modern equipment, tanks, anti-aircraft guns, and so forth? The unanimous answer is "No." Has the Army a supplemental air arm, such as the spearhead Hitler had? It will be remembered that he had 150,000 men equipped with super land dreadnaughts, followed by tanks and mechanized units of men with machine guns, and over and above this land organization he had a synchronized air force of Stukas and bombers. Is our Army prepared in that way? The answer is "No."

1941

17. TEN MONTHS BEFORE PEARL HARBOR—A REQUEST IS MADE TO THE ADMINISTRATION THAT IT INFORM THE SENATE ON THE TRUTH OF THE SITUATION IN THE FAR EAST

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 14, 1941, volume 87, part 1, page 999.

"The suggestion I have to make now is that about the middle of next week the Senate go into closed executive session and that we then get from the Secretary of State, having him present with his Under Secretaries, a report on world conditions especially having reference to the situation in the Far East and the Near East.

"We cannot close our eyes to the realities. We certainly know that there are big stakes in this war game; but if Japan should fall for the seductive influence of Adolf Hitler and commit an overt act along the same line I have suggested, then I tremble for the consequences to Japan and to the world.

"I want to know what our Government knows about the situation. I want to know what kind of a supplemental air arm we have to our fleet in the East."

(NOTE.—This request was one more which was tragically unheeded. See Nos. 27 and 38 for newspaper opinion on the Administration's failure to inform the Senate.)

18. NINE MONTHS BEFORE PEARL HARBOR—STILL ANOTHER WARNING OF AMERICA'S PERIL IN THE PACIFIC

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 4, 1941, volume 87, part 2, pages 1714, 1715:
"Mr. President, on the 14th day of February 1941, I introduced a resolution. . . .

"I wanted to find out something about our situation in the world. What did I want to find out?

"A. What are our commitments in the Far East? Putting it bluntly, are we going to step in if Japan continues to rape the east as Adolf Hitler has raped Europe? She has let it be known now that she wants all of Oceania.

"B. What is the condition of our fleet, especially its coordinating air arm? Is it like the Russian Fleet was in the Japanese war? I wanted to know whether or not our fleet had a coordinating air arm, such as the world has recently demonstrated every fleet must have.

"C. What is our military position and our condition in the Philippines? Have we sufficient airplanes there? Are we ready for any eventuality?

"If we put our fleet into the Atlantic breach for Britain, Hitler may goad Japan into attacking us, or Japan, on her own initiative, may seize the opportunity to attack our unguarded flank.

"We have stationed our fleet in the Far East. Japan is creeping toward Singapore and the East Indies. We are shipping more and more airplanes to the Far East for ourselves and for Britain. We are appropriating money to fortify Guam and Samoa."

19. IN THE SAME SPEECH, A CLARIFICATION OF THE TERMS "INTERNATIONALIST" AND "NON-INTERVENTIONIST"

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 4, 1941, volume 87, part 2, pages 1718-1719:

"We have in this country two types of minds. One type we might characterize as the international mind which constantly looks afield for problems there to solve—the mind that always feels that it has not enough to do in looking after its own business—it must put its fingers, meddler-like, in other people's affairs.

"On the other hand, Mr. President, there is another group. They have been called many names, and in this latter period columnists and superficial thinkers have plastered the name "isolationist" and "noninterventionist" with many connotations which do not belong there. The President of the United States once defined an isolationist as one who does not want to engage in Europe's wars. In that definition he is correct. And if recent polls are correct, over 90 percent of the people of this country will belong to that class.

"Now this group has another viewpoint, another perspective from the internationalist. First, I believe those who belong to it are more realistic. They are not unmindful of the suffering of their European brothers, but they have a deep-rooted sense of trusteeship. They do not want to have repeated on this continent the holocaust of war which every generation has known in Europe. This group, consciously or unconsciously, knows that their forebears came over here to escape not only war such as they knew it in Europe but to escape from the conditions and the environment and the thinking of Europe. They also wanted to escape from the hatreds and the prejudices and the poisoned mental virus which characterizes the physical makeup of Europe. They found here—my parents found here—not only a refuge but a wonderful land where they grew in stature

physically, mentally, and spiritually, and they have a conviction that war does not pay.

"This class, nevertheless, hates cruelty, deception, treaty breaking, international brigandage, and slavery.

"I live in a State 30 percent of whose people are probably of German descent. I know that 99 percent of that group are the finest Americans on American soil. Why? Because they and their fathers decided to leave Europe. They became Americans because they decided they wanted to be. They came here and developed great businesses, created magnificent farms, reared fine families, and established peaceful homes; and they educated their children and sent them out to become constructive citizens of a great land.

"I am convinced that 99 percent of the people want to do whatever will insulate America from the horrors and the consequences of war, but all of us recognize that we are living in a world community. We know that every nation is vulnerable to attack from the airways. We read in our newspapers of modern inventions which have contracted the globe; we know there is no such thing as physical or mental isolation."

20. SIX MONTHS BEFORE PEARL HARBOR—A PROPOSAL FOR A NATIONAL DEFENSE RESEARCH LABORATORY

From an address of June 9, 1941, delivered in Milwaukee, Wis., as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 19, 1941, volume 87, part 12, pages A2945 and A2946:

"I believe we need a great defense laboratory, involving the Navy Department, the War Department, and the State Department, and embodying a first-class observation system.

"It isn't enough for this Administration to write our defense plans in the shifting sands of day-to-day expediency."

(NOTE.—Four years later the Administration introduced a national research bill.)

21. FIVE WEEKS BEFORE PEARL HARBOR—ANOTHER APPEAL TO AMERICA TO PREPARE FOR WAR AND TO AVOID INTERVENTION UNTIL SHE IS PREPARED

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 30, 1941, volume 87, part 8, pages 8341 and 8342.

"I believe we are still unprepared for war. Consequently, I believe we must do everything we can to postpone any military conflict until we are prepared and then, and only then, if it were necessary—and only if it were necessary—we would at least be ready to participate effectively and on a basis which would be fairer to the American boys, and to the mothers who gave the boys, whose lives would be risked. Until the time when we are prepared, however, our negligence has robbed us of any alternative.

"I want to repeat that statement: 'Our negligence has robbed us of any alternative.' We have no choice. Unless war is thrust upon us by force of circumstance, we cannot court an unprepared involvement which would send our inadequately trained boys to a slaughter of the innocents, into a battle which we could win only at a cost much dearer now than it would have to be if we were prepared.

"Partly because I believe we are unprepared I have opposed each and every measure which appeared to be directed toward an unwarranted involvement, and I shall continue to oppose measures looking toward an unwarranted involvement.

"Along with 85 percent of our people—and I have previously stated this in the Senate—I belong to a group which is fully aware of all the dangers which confront us, but which is also aware of the grave dangers of immediate involvement—dangers rendered graver by our unpreparedness."

22. THE HISTORIC CALAMITY WHICH MIGHT HAVE BEEN AVOIDED OCCURS—THE JAPS ATTACK PEARL HARBOR AND FIND US UNPREPARED—A STATEMENT ONE DAY AFTER THE TREACHEROUS ATTACK

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of December 8, 1941, volume 87, part 9, page 9509:

"America has been attacked in a dastardly manner and war declared on her by Japan. This is undoubtedly pursuant to the tripartite agreement between the Axis Powers, Germany, Japan, and Italy.

"We as a people did not want war; it has been brought to us. Now we will take care of the job. There is no division in our ranks now. The criminal attack on Hawaii and Guam and elsewhere has made America one. We have but one purpose, and that is to win the war and preserve our American way of life.

"Let us now have:

"(a) Less loose talk and more action but no underestimation of Japan's strength.

"(b) More defense production and more for our money.

"(c) Extension of the workday for everyone. This is no time for hysteria or complacency; no time for life as usual.

"(d) No grafters or racketeers should be permitted now in Government or in industry.

"Japan asked for it. We will, with God's help, carry through to victory."

1942

23. A SUMMARY RECORD OF SUPPORT OF ADEQUATE FUNDS FOR PREPAREDNESS

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 2, 1942, volume 88, part 8, page A319:

"I supported appropriations for more than \$800,000,000 in 1939; more than eight billion in 1940. (That includes every military and naval appropriation presented to the Senate.) And in 1941 I supported defense appropriations of more than thirty-two billion."

24. THE MEANING OF THE LESSON OF PEARL HARBOR

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 5, 1942, volume 88, part 1, page 1047:

"Mr. President, ever since December 7 last the expression 'Remember Pearl Harbor,' has been constantly heard over the radio, has appeared in the press, and has been repeated by practically everyone who has spoken on current events. So long as we read history our people will remember the dastardly attack by the Japanese, without a declaration of war, when our two peoples were at peace, when our Secretary of State was negotiating with the Japanese Ambassador, and a special envoy of Japan. But, Mr. President, merely to remember the attack on Pearl Harbor as a historic incident is not enough. Of course, it provided the cement that unified all our people; it also gave impetus to our war program and stimulus toward obtaining ultimate victory; but to me, Mr. President, the international crime which is brought to mind when we say 'Remember Pearl Harbor' has other and more significant connotations. Let America pledge herself now that she will not in the next generation, or in the next 50 generations, close her eyes to earthly realities. I say, in the next 50 generations, because we hope and pray at the end of that period enough of God's wisdom will have infiltrated into the minds of mortals so that incidents such as the one at Pearl Harbor will not be possible.

"This beloved land of ours must never again become lulled to sleep by the siren voices of the impractical idealists, the devilish voices of the international propagandists, and the imbecilic voices of those who as leaders have their noses so close to magnified local problems that they cannot see the international situation. If the blind lead the blind, both will fall into the ditch. In the days that lie ahead may God provide American leadership that will keep her safe."

25. THE SPIRIT OF WISCONSIN'S GREAT SON, BILLY MITCHELL, STILL LIVES—TWO AVIATION BILLS ARE INTRODUCED TO MODERNIZE OUR MILITARY SET-UP

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 28, 1942, volume 88, part 3, pages 3745-3747: "Mr. President, I hold in my hand a statement showing that in the years 1941 and 1942 the total amount appropriated for airplane construction amounted to \$22,963,000,000 in round figures.

"I send to the desk two resolutions and ask that they be read."

"Mr. President, it will be noted that one resolution suggests the creation of a separate Cabinet officer known as the Secretary of Aviation. * * * The second resolution would amend the Senate rules and create a Committee on Aviation Affairs.

"Until this war broke out and it was demonstrated that ships of the air are more important than ships of the sea, this Nation had given very little consideration to the importance of an air navy. We had prophets like Billy Mitchell, whose stature has grown with the passage of time, and whose prophetic vision—disregarded at the time—has made him a symbol of America's future domination of the air—domination if we have his vision and do not let lesser minds dominate the picture.

"He along with others fought courageously and unselfishly to prepare America to meet a new kind of warfare, and to make America safe from assault from the air. Billy Mitchell and others fought against bureaucratic and rut-minded military leaders, and sacrificed themselves in that fight. Theirs was a fight to awaken America. They failed. It may be too late if we fail now.

"We now hear much of isolation, and of the attack upon men who did not want to get this country involved in war. If there ever was an isolationist group of men who had their eyes closed to realities, it was those men who would not and could not see the importance of aviation. Blindness is the worst form of isolation.

"We know now, after the fall of France with its Maginot line, the fall of Singapore with its half-billion dollars of defense, the fall of Poland, the occupation of Norway, the subjugation of the Lowlands, the occupation of Crete, that the air arm dominates on land. On sea, the lesson of the occupation of Norway shows that the air arm also dominates the sea.

"Frankly, in my judgment, the ideal method of dealing with our military affairs would be to have one Cabinet officer vested with complete unified military control of the entire conduct of the war. Under him there might be an Under Secretary of Aviation, an Under Secretary of the Army, and an Under Secretary of the Navy. Their efforts would be integrated through the unified command of one Cabinet officer, under the President. That is, however, so momentous a change that its adoption would perhaps be impossible at this time.

"Accordingly, in my proposal suggesting the creation of a department of military aviation, I am merely advancing the necessity for centralizing in one head the authority and control of our vast military aviation program—a head who is air-minded and capable of applying air strategy to world affairs."

26. A BILL IS INTRODUCED TO MAKE THE UNITED STATES SENATE AND THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES TEAMMATES WITH THE CHIEF EXECUTIVE IN AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY

From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 17, 1942, volume 88, part 6, pages 7165, 7166. "It is apparent now that if the present war is not to be lost by a disastrous peace there

must be a better working arrangement between the Senate and the Chief Executive.

"This objective * * * could be achieved by a foreign relations advisory council. What do I mean by such a council? I mean, we should have an advisory council on foreign relations which would include the Secretary of State, the Under Secretary of State, and any other technician whom the Secretary might designate, the chairmen and the ranking minority members of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and of the House Committee on Foreign Affairs.

"This council would, of course, be concerned with the definition and formulation of the foreign policy of the United States and the agreements of the council would have the force of an understanding between the legislative and executive branches, and could well serve as guide posts in the formulation of treaties. Treaties would be negotiated in accordance with definite policies defined by the council, and then submitted to the Senate for ratification.

"All this would mean that there would be less need for defeating or amending treaties on the floor of the Senate, and less possibility of political friction. All the compromises between the Executive and the Senate could be considered long before the treaty itself was presented to the Senate.

"Mr. President, I submit at this time a resolution asking the Executive to join with the Senate in creating a Foreign Relations Advisory Council."

(NOTE.—See Nos. 27, 39, and 40 for the later history of this resolution.)

27. A NOTED NEWSPAPER PRAISES THE PROPOSAL FOR FOREIGN POLICY TEAMWORK

From an article in the Christian Science Monitor of September 24, 1942, as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 6, 1942, volume 88, part 10, pages A3585 and A3586:

"The short speech which Senator ALEXANDER WILEY, Republican of Wisconsin, delivered on the floor of the Senate a few days ago is certain to grow in significance.

"In it Senator WILEY advanced the most important, constructive and forward-looking suggestion in behalf of the future peace which has come from Congress since the United States formally entered the war. He proposed that President Roosevelt be invited to join with the Senate in forming a foreign relations advisory committee.

"The value of the proposal is enhanced by its source. It is an offer of genuine intelligent cooperation from the ranks of the minority party.

"If this be isolationism, then the internationalists would well embrace it. But this is not isolationism, it is the voice of constructive, midwestern leadership which is awake, alert, and concerned that the United States shall neglect no step which will produce a peace-secured world as the only guaranty of a peace-secured America.

"The Constitution provides that the President may negotiate treaties by and with the consent of the Senate. Too often in the past there has been very little call for the Senate's advice and in consequence the Senate has hoarded its consent.

"Now, it is already evident that the administration is not going to embrace Senator WILEY's proposal very eagerly—at least not at first."

1943

28. A STATEMENT OF AMERICA'S HIGH OBLIGATIONS TO HERSELF AND TO THE WORLD

From a speech on June 27, 1943, before the Republican Convention at Appleton, Wis., as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 30, 1943, volume 89, part 11, page A3322:

"The Republican Party proposes that never again shall the United States undertake any international commitment without the necessary Army and Navy and Air Force to make the commitment good.

"The American people have never and do not now love armament for its own sake. But we do love this land of ours. We do love our freedom. We do love our children. That is why we must never again invite such deadly risk as we invited a year ago last December. That is why we must never again send out our sons as gallant 'expendables' to buy time for us on some future Bataan, Corregidor, Wake Island, or Guadalcanal. Yes, eternal vigilance is the price of freedom and the maintenance thereof.

"The Republican Party recognizes that as one of the major nations of the earth, the United States must accept a major share in helping to restore and preserve international law and order in the postwar period. This is the way to world peace.

"The Republican Party proposes that the people of this country stand ready to join all like-minded peoples in seeing to it that never again shall any gang of national savages and international outlaws be permitted to destroy the peace of the world in a lethal challenge to every standard of human decency which the nations of the earth have raised up through 3,000 years of slow and painful and persistent effort.

"The Republican Party proposes that a strong America shall be a strong champion of international justice; that a purposeful America shall help weave the pattern of durable international peace and order; that an America, aware and confident of her own great future, shall help relight the lamps of freedom for all the groping nations of men.

"The Republican Party insists that all this can be done without the sacrifice of any vital American interest or the undue expenditure of any American wealth or the yielding of any sovereign American right."

29. WHAT ONE OF THE WASHINGTON NEWSPAPERS THOUGHT OF THE PRE-PEARL HARBOR SUGGESTION FOR A REPORT BY THE SECRETARY OF STATE ON THE JAPANESE SITUATION

From an editorial of July 1943, in the Washington Post, as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 31, 1944 (vol. 90, pt. 10, p. A3813):

"Ten months before Pearl Harbor, Senator WILEY introduced another resolution asking the Secretary of State to report in executive session to the Senate on the threat of war in the Far East and our preparations to meet it. At that time the State Department knew that war in the Pacific was rapidly approaching. But the resolution was pigeonholed. The Senate did not get the information sought. No adequate preparations to meet an attack were made. The United States was humiliated at Pearl Harbor, and a great sacrifice of human life will be necessary to regain what we have lost in the Far East. No one can say with assurance how the situation would have been changed if the information in the hands of the State Department had been conveyed to key Members of Congress. This much, however, is certain: The withholding of such information makes it impossible for the representatives of the people to act intelligently in the face of a global crisis."

30. HOW WORLD PEACE MAY BE SECURED

A telegram of September 6, 1943, sent to Senator ARTHUR VANDENBERG at the Mackinac Island Conference, as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 14, 1943 (vol. 89, pt. 6, p. 7535):

"United States must cooperate actively with all other like-minded nations in an effort to preserve world peace. World peace can be best assured only when sovereign states, while preserving their own full sovereignty and their own essential interests, find common

ground on which to work together. This common ground can be found only by clearing away existing differences particularly among the major Allied nations, and building on the basis of definite common purposes a new international order. Until such time as international relationships become beyond all question, orderly and secure, the people of this country want us to keep our eyes open. They know that in this matter we are dealing with international poker players who have been playing the game for 1,000 years and they believe the United States should maintain such armaments as will not only enable us to discharge our international obligations but will assure our national security. (The people believe that the United States should secure adequate air and naval bases to assure our national security.)"

31. ALMOST 2 YEARS BEFORE THE BRETTON WOODS FINANCIAL AGREEMENTS WERE RATIFIED BY THE SENATE—A PROPOSAL IS MADE FOR CONGRESSIONAL PREPARATION FOR WORLD MONETARY AGREEMENTS.

From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 21, 1943, volume 89, part 6, pages 7693 and 7694:

"I do not want to see any attempts made to bypass Congress when monetary agreements are made. The question of international machinery to effect an exchange stabilization is one which must be considered, but it cannot be considered by the executive branch alone, nor can it be the subject for executive agreement without any congressional participation.

"If any kind of international monetary machinery is ever to be approved Congress must be consulted long before the stage of final agreements is reached.

"It may be argued that Congress cannot be consulted in this matter because it has no machinery, because it has not made any independent investigation, and has no information with which to talk along except such information as may be doled out to it by the Administration back-room financial experts.

"I propose the creation of such machinery, and in the immediate future I propose to introduce a bill which would create a joint congressional international monetary stabilization committee. This committee should include both majority and minority memberships from the Senate Finance Committee, the House Ways and Means Committee, and the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and the House Foreign Affairs Committee."

(NOTE.—This proposal, too, was turned down by the Administration with the result that in July 1945 when the Bretton Woods agreements were considered there was widespread complaint that the Senate was insufficiently informed on matters of international finance.)

32. ONE AND ONE-HALF YEARS BEFORE THE SAN FRANCISCO CONFERENCE, A REQUEST IS MADE THAT SERVICEMEN BE REPRESENTED AT THE PEACE TABLE

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of October 14, 1943, volume 89, part 6, page 8299:

"I know of no group of men better qualified to have substantial representation at the peace conference than our 10,000,000 men in the armed forces."

"It will be said that there have been representatives of the armed forces at every peace conference. That is true, if by this is meant the technical military and naval staffs who sit in as advisers. But these are not the men I have in mind. I have in mind the civilian who left his job in the factory, the bank, the merchant establishment, and the schools to take up arms in defense of his country. I have in mind the buck private, the corporal, the sergeant, and the officers who do the bleeding, sweating, and dying.

Great, public-spirited, understanding men have come from their ranks.

"Some of our greatest industrial, spiritual, and civic leaders came out of the last war and the wars preceding it. A sizable percentage of our Senators, Representatives and governors proudly wear the badge of the American Legion or the Veterans of Foreign Wars. Who, may I ask, are better fitted or more entitled to sit, with equal voice and authority, at the peace table."

(NOTE.—This request for servicemen's representation was partly fulfilled by the attendance of a Navy commander, former Governor Stassen, at the San Francisco Conference. On February 26, 1945, the request was repeated that the millions of GI's in the ranks as well as their officers be represented.)

33. A WHOLEHEARTED ENDORSEMENT OF THE SENATE'S RESOLUTION FOR INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION

From an Armistice Day radio address of November 11, 1943, as reprinted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of November 15, 1943, volume 89, part 12, page A4853:

"On the 5th of November last the Senate of the United States took a significant step toward international accord when it passed Senate Resolution 192."

"The resolution resolved that the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved; that the United States cooperate with its comrades in arms in securing a just and an honorable peace; and that the United States, acting through its constitutional processes, 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.

"This resolution is based on sound thinking. It is a harbinger of better things to come. It manifests that spirit of cooperation which omens well for the future of the world. However, it is not a fulfillment, it is simply a beginning. It is well to remember that the mere adoption of a resolution will not accomplish the objective, the imperative need for working out complete accord between the United Nations for the postwar period. To attain that end this resolution must be implemented by the will to keep, and enforce the peace, and that will must exist, not only in America, but in each of the United Nations and in many others. Without this will for peace wars will continue to rise and sweep the world."

1944

34. AN ANSWER TO THE DIFFICULTIES BETWEEN THE LARGE AND SMALL STATES IN THIS CONTRACTED WORLD

From a radio address of January 11, 1944, as reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 21, 1944, volume 90, page A330:

"Just as no single state is powerful enough to achieve its own total security, so no single state or group of states can undertake to set up a system of world security without recognizing the reasonable security of the small as well as the great, the weak as well as the strong. Again, this is much more than a matter of mere abstract justice. The smaller states of the world can work harmoniously and confidently with their powerful neighbors or they can sulk in sullen fear. If we are able to convince them that they may all work in harmonious confidence with us, our task will be substantially easier.

"Any durable system of world security can be achieved only if the major powers of the postwar world first of all achieve their own reasonable security. And since reasonable security is by definition a security which is not achieved at the expense of a similar secu-

rity of others, the postwar world we hope to build will not be a static world.

"Even with the airplane at its present state of development, no spot on earth is more than 60 hours of actual flying time from your nearest airport. Chungking, China, is only 39 hours from Chicago; that's about the time it takes to travel from Chicago to Reno, by train. Brisbane is only 40 hours away, Berlin only 23 hours, London 22 hours, and Moscow only 28 hours."

35. AN EARLY PLEA FOR AMERICA TO RETAIN RIGHTS ON THE HARD-WON ISLANDS OF THE PACIFIC

From a radio address of January 14, 1944, as reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 15, 1944, volume 90, pages A195 and A196:

"We are going to strip Japan of all her loot of the past 50 years.

"We should all be frankly concerned about the disposition of those Pacific islands which Japan seized or occupied since 1914.

"The United States not only has a historic interest in these islands, we have a much more direct and immediate interest as a matter of national security.

"I am speaking now in particular about the island groups we know as the Carolines, the Marianas, and the Marshalls.

"These particular islands are mostly mere specks in the ocean, extending some 1,200 miles north of the Equator and dotting the ocean for some 2,500 miles east and west.

"But in this modern aerial age, each of these 623 islands is a potential airfield base, and we have learned to our cost that Japan has made many of them real and deadly airfield bases. We have learned to our bitter cost, indeed, at Tarawa, in the British Gilberts, which Japan seized only after Pearl Harbor, how much blood must be spent to recover even one of the smaller of these islets, once they have fallen into enemy hands. We have learned that each of them may well be worth an entire task force full of airplane carriers.

"These scattered coral islets can in no sense be considered territorial gains or repossessions in the same sense as such densely populated major islands Java or such heavily populated lands as Burma, Malaya, and Indochina.

"But as outer defenses of our own west coast, as stepping stones and lines of communication with the densely populated lands of southwestern Asia and its islands, the three ocean groups are of major importance to this country. * * * They should be incorporated definitely in the American system."

36. A NEWSPAPER EDITORIAL IN PRAISE OF TWO PREVIOUS SUGGESTIONS FOR NATIONAL DEFENSE

From the Kenosha (Wis.) Evening News of February 29, 1944, as reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 31, 1944, volume 90, page A3814:

"Long before the Federal Government opened up low-grade zinc mines by paying a differential, Senator WILEY made the suggestion to do so. Over 2 years before the Government began to utilize shipyards on the Lakes, he asked the Navy and the Maritime Commission to do this very thing, suggested the need for the building of corvette-type boats. If his suggestion had been followed earlier it would have saved 700 oil tankers, eased the oil rationing, and put the solution of that problem months ahead."

37. A TRIBUTE TO VALIANT POLAND ON POLISH CONSTITUTION DAY

From the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of April 28, 1944, volume 90, page A2029:

"May 3 is Poland's national holiday, commemorating the signing of the Polish Constitution on May 3, 1791.

"The Polish Constitution emphatically affirmed the principle that all power in civil society is derived from the will of the people. The power of the executive, in the instance of Poland of 1791, the power of the King, was limited. The Polish Parliament, the Sejm, attained the rightful stature which it deserved; it became the sole lawmaking body of the nation. It is no wonder, in the light of these significant advances, that the constitution of 1791 is for Poland what the Declaration of the Rights of Man was for France and the Declaration of Independence was for America.

"The underlying passion of the Polish people for representative government has not changed in a century and a half of peril and persecution, of ruthless slaughter, of fire and sword. The sacred ideal of Polish liberty stands undimmed today, revered by all who love freedom, its place in history proud and unchallenged.

"In 1791, Poland was in the vanguard of the free and enlightened nations of the world. Today, a century and a half later, Poland occupies the same exalted position in a world that needs Polish courage and Polish independence of thought more than these qualities have ever been needed before in all history."

38. A MICHIGAN NEWSPAPER PRAISES PREVIOUS NATIONAL DEFENSE RECOMMENDATIONS

An editorial from the Tribune and Legal News of Saginaw, Mich., of August 11, 1944, as reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 31, 1944, volume 90, page A3814:

"People in Washington can't get over the fact that American Ambassador Grew reported on the dangers of an attack from Japan to the Department of State long before Pearl Harbor.

"And Washington remembers that Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin had an inkling that things were in a bad way in the Pacific, and that he introduced a resolution nearly a year before Pearl Harbor asking the Secretary of State to appear before the Senate in executive session and make a report on the situation in the Pacific. It has been suggested that had this Wiley resolution been adopted that the Japs might not have been able to get away with the attack on Pearl Harbor.

"It also appears that Senator WILEY has been first in looking ahead most of the time during the 6 years in which he has been in the Senate. At least he was the first person to recommend to the Secretary of the Navy and the Maritime Commission that shipyards be constructed in the Great Lakes area and utilized to help produce American ships. Today our Great Lakes area stands out at the peak among the regions where big things are done to win the war."

39. DR. BEARD, THE DEAN OF AMERICA'S HISTORIANS, COMMENTS ON THE PROPOSAL FOR FOREIGN POLICY TEAMWORK

From "American Government and Politics," a book by Charles A. Beard, ninth edition, 1944, pages 217-218, 295:

"Addressing himself to the problem of foreign relations, Senator ALEXANDER WILEY of Wisconsin resubmitted to the Senate on January 7, 1943, a resolution calling for the creation of a joint council on foreign relations to coordinate the operations of the President and Congress in respect of foreign affairs. Mr. WILEY drew attention to the fact that both branches of the Government had constitutional responsibilities in this connection and insisted that machinery should be established to facilitate cooperation between them and avoid conflicts or antago-

nisms, such as had often marked their transactions in time past.

"Prodded by other Senators, the Senate Committee on Foreign Relations later entered into personal communications with the Secretary of State and arrived at a modus vivendi with him by which he was committed to the closer observance of the rights and duties of Congress in making further agreements with foreign governments."

40. A DESCRIPTION OF HOW THE ADMINISTRATION, IN ADOPTING THE PROPOSAL FOR FOREIGN POLICY TEAMWORK, WEAKENED IT AND MUDDED IT

From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 5, 1944, volume 90, page 7521:

"On numerous occasions I stated on the floor of the Senate that the suggested Foreign Relations Advisory Council would provide a clearing house for ideas, not merely the ideas of the Secretary of State, but of the best thinkers in America and the rest of the world—ideas relating to the very things which are now upon us.

"The representatives whom the Secretary of State has chosen from the Foreign Relations Committee sit and listen to what he thinks the idea should be. That is not what I had in mind.

"We are facing a thousand problems. Certainly Members of the Senate should not be disregarded. The mere fact they have been called in to have a little tea is not the important thing to consider.

"The informal gatherings during the past 6 months of the Secretary of State and a few chosen buddies does not come within a thousand miles of the suggestion I had in mind, and now we have Dumbarton Oaks and Europe ready to be thrown in our laps.

"Mr. President, there was a time when people everywhere looked to us as the hope of the world. That was when I submitted my resolution. Then was the hour to start planning. Then was the hour when we could have put America's ideas into the mechanism for peace. Then was the time to have obtained agreements ceding to America the outer ramparts."

41. A SUGGESTION IS MADE FOR FREE ELECTIONS FOR THE BALTIC PEOPLES AND POLAND

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 19, 1944, volume 90, page 7894:

"The overwhelming majority of the people of the western democracies are not convinced that the elections held in Poland in the fall of 1939 or the elections held in the Baltic States in the summer of 1940, were free elections. They are not convinced that even granting the elections represented an actual choice by the peoples then involved, the choice would be the same in a reasonably secure postwar Europe. The choice of 1939 and 1940 was quite obviously a narrow one. It was the choice between Soviet occupation and savage Nazi domination.

"There is an obvious solution of the difficulty, a solution which seems to rest entirely with the Soviet Union.

"The solution, of course, would be to offer these peoples full opportunity as soon as this war ends, again to express their choice. Should they vote in such new elections to remain within the Soviet Union, the Soviets would then have not only a sound political right, but a sound moral right to retain them.

"Should the Soviet Union refuse to offer this obvious solution to the Baltic and Polish problem, what then?

"In that event, I can only say that we should continue to make every reasonable effort to work out our pledged system of postwar world security despite all difficulties. We must do so because we cannot afford to accept the dreadful alternative, the prospect of

still another world war before we shall have repaired the ravages of this one."

42. A CONSTITUTIONAL INTERPRETATION IS GIVEN OF THE RIGHT OF THE PRESIDENT TO USE OUR ARMED FORCES FOR THE PRESERVATION OF THE PEACE

From an address of October 16, 1944, before the League of Women Voters at Madison, Wis., as reprinted in the Appendix of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on December 8 1944, volume 90, page A4675:

"In reference to this matter of utilization of force, we are a constitutional government. Under the Constitution, the power to declare war rests in the Congress of the United States. The President, however, throughout our history has possessed the power to preserve peace in the sense that wherever the peace of this country was at stake, such as where there might have been an insurrection or where the integrity of the Monroe Doctrine in the Western Hemisphere was threatened, the President had the inherent power to preserve the peace.

"Now there is possibly no clear line of demarcation between actual war and the Presidential use of the power to preserve the peace. In my opinion, if the Congress of the United States enters into a general treaty which has in it the joint obligations of the contracting nations to preserve peace, I believe our Supreme Court would hold that such a treaty might validly contain a provision for the utilization of our armed forces to effectuate that purpose, but, of course, such congressional treaty power would not be in derogation of the constitutional power of the Congress to declare war or in derogation of the Presidential power to preserve the peace."

1945

43. A STATEMENT AFTER BEING DESIGNATED NEW MEMBER OF THE SENATE FOREIGN RELATIONS COMMITTEE

From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of January 10, 1945, volume 91, page 173:

"Last week I was honored by my Republican colleagues by being selected as a member of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and that appointment was approved a few moments ago by the Senate. At this time I wish publicly to express my gratitude for this honor. Coming as it does at a time of great international crisis, this assignment presents me with a high challenge and a high opportunity. The challenge is to lend my humble efforts to help guide our ship of state, this beloved America, through the treacherous shoals of disunity with ourselves and with our allies during and after this war. This opportunity is to lend my humble efforts to help bring our Ship of State safely into a harbor of peace and security.

"I enter upon this task with an open mind, not an isolated mind. My vision is not clouded, I have been a student of history, I know something about the human mind, and I am aware of the obstacles; but I have faith that if we make a supreme effort to insure lasting peace we will accomplish it.

"I enter upon this task with no grudge, no hatred, no prejudice. I enter upon it with a calm and rational conviction that in the contracted world of today and tomorrow, America must not fail to find the way to world peace. Since peace is not a unilateral matter but a multilateral undertaking for the Big Five at the beginning and for all nations later on, you and I know, Mr. President, that all nations, especially the Big Five, must play ball together. Every boy knows what that means. The phrase means there must be collaboration in purpose, in mind, in will, in desire, and in the effort to put back of the objective the economic and physical strength necessary to accomplish it. Another Kellogg-Briand pact, or the like, will not do the job. We attempted once to outlaw war. There must be back of the pact, or treaty, or authority, as I have stated, the desire, the

purpose, the will of the nations to live up to their obligations. Are the nations ready for this?

"Mr. President, I enter upon this task with no desire other than to safeguard the interests of my country first, last, and always, and, through so doing to advance the interests of all other like-minded nations."

44. VE-DAY COMES AT LAST—A VICTORY MESSAGE HAILS THE SUCCESSFUL END OF THE WAR IN EUROPE

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 7, 1945, volume 91, page 4218:

"Victory has come in Europe. The news sends a thrill to every American heart. It stirs the deepest pride in every American breast. The hour for which we and our allies have longed, for which we have sweated and sacrificed these long years, is now at hand.

"We have completed the long hard road to victory in the Old World. This road was paved on the western and eastern fronts with our blood and treasure and that of our allies. In the west, it began by the American invasion of north Africa. It continued through Sicily, Italy, Normandy, the Siegfried Line, the Rhine, the Ruhr, and now to the last fallen fortress of the foe.

"I congratulate the American people. I salute the citizens of the 48 States, particularly those of our State of Wisconsin, whose contribution to victory I know best. I pay tribute to our fighting Badger sons and daughters. To our farmers for their magnificent food production. To our industrial management and labor for their mountains of weapons, vehicles, and supplies. To the thousands in the trades and professions who carried on in every community. And to our parents, wives, and sweethearts who have so patiently borne the anxiety, the strains of separation from their loved ones in the armed services. I pay this sincere tribute to them all, in this, their hour, our hour, of triumph.

"Yet, now we pause in devoted memory to those of our own who gave their lives, their health, that this day might come to pass. We contemplate with sadness the untold millions of civilians and combatants among the other United Nations who have perished in the European and African struggle. We pray for divine aid that may lessen the sacrifices still to be made in the Pacific. We pray, too, for divine guidance that will assure that all of these sacrifices have not been in vain.

"VE-day has come. Now if we resume our posts and carry on with renewed energy and rededicated purpose, VJ- (victory in Japan) day will not be far distant. And, too, if our hearts are pure, our minds clear, and vision far-seeing, there shall come one day soon VP-day, a day of the victory of peace, a just and enduring peace.

"We have paved a highway to victory across Europe with blood and treasure. We are still paving the highway to victory in the Pacific with blood and treasure. We must, lastly, pave a highway to a righteous and workable peace with faith and realism. We must fulfill the word of old in the Book of Books: 'And a highway shall be there, and a way, and it shall be called the way of holiness.'"

45. RENEWAL OF A SUGGESTION TO CREATE AN AMERICAN DEPARTMENT OF PEACE

(NOTE.—On July 6, 1945, these thoughts were incorporated into a Senate bill to create this Department.)

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of June 27, 1945, volume 91, page 6786:

"Mr. President, on July 7, 1943, I spoke on the floor of the Senate in relation to a Department of Peace. I stated at that time that I craved for my Government the distinction of being the first Government on earth to establish a Secretary of Peace.

"The establishment of such a secretary would be heralded throughout the world, as was Woodrow Wilson's idea for a League of Nations. His great idea brought hope, but we know that the hope died and the Second World War ensued.

"The reason I speak particularly today about this thought is that last evening I happened to note a column in the Washington Star by David Lawrence, that great thinker and American philosopher.

"David Lawrence said:

"DEPARTMENT OF PEACE DECLARED UNITED STATES NEED

"Billions are spent for war and war preparations, but virtually nothing is spent to prevent war except when the crisis arises. Thus the State Department is in charge of our relations with foreign governments and has a multitude of business chores to do for American business and individuals with interests abroad, but there is no department of the Government which gives its undivided attention to the subject of peace.

"SENATOR WILEY'S IDEA

"Senator WILEY, of Wisconsin, Republican, had a good idea about this and made a speech about it in the Senate a year ago. He suggested that a Department of Peace be established to concentrate and specialize on the maintenance of peace. Nothing came of it because at the time America was engrossed in war. Now the United Nations have set up an organization and the time has come for America to take the lead in establishing a special department of government to carry on the all-important work of our participation in such a league."

46. INTRODUCTION OF A RESOLUTION TO ADVANCE WORLD FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 9, 1945, volume 91, page 7346:

"Mr. President, I am today submitting a concurrent resolution which would express the desire of Congress for the immediate ending of censorship and of other measures now abridging international freedom of the press in many areas abroad.

"This resolution would strive to eliminate immediately the gravest single menace to the peace of the world today, namely, the misinformation and the lack of information between Allied peoples. It is against this menace that I have humbly fought on many previous occasions.

"The world cannot exist half in news darkness, half in news light, any more than it can exist half-slave, half-free. We must end the black-out of information."

47. INTRODUCTION OF A RESOLUTION TO INVITE THE UNITED NATIONS TO ESTABLISH THEIR WORLD HEADQUARTERS IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 12, 1945, volume 91, page 7433:

"Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit a concurrent resolution which reads as follows:

"Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the United Nations be and hereby are invited to locate the seat of the United Nations Organization within the United States of America."

"President Truman, may, as the Executive head of this Nation, in his consultations with Churchill, Stalin, and others, extend such an invitation.

"But, the San Francisco Charter begins with the words: 'We the peoples of the United Nations,' and it is therefore most appropriate that 'we, the people of the United States,' as represented by the Congress, extend this invitation.

"The resolution is self-explanatory. There is overwhelming justification for the location of the permanent headquarters of the new league within America."

48. AMERICA MUST COOPERATE ON A BUSINESS-LIKE BASIS IN THE BRETTON WOODS FINANCIAL PROGRAM AND SHE MUST ALSO CONSERVE HER VITAL RESOURCES

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 19, 1945, volume 91, page 7757:

"I believe that when we do business we should do business. When we engage in charity, we should forget business. We should decide now, if we are going into this international game of rejuvenating other lands, whether it be business or charity.

"I expect to vote for the Bretton Woods program.

"Some of us have for years continuously urged that Uncle Sam cease playing the role of a prodigal. Whether we realize it or not, the war has served to impoverish America in many ways. We have lost some of the finest of our blessed young men. We have spent over a quarter of a trillion dollars. We have drained the American earth of its minerals, and we have overworked our soil to yield the greatest possible amount of foods and textiles.

"The so-called inexhaustibility of our wealth is so much hokum. Our so-called ability to feed, clothe, arm, and transport the rest of the world is so much buncombe.

"We must husband our natural resources. We must make unmistakably clear to the United Nations Social and Economic Council that the United States does not intend to continue and cannot continue to lavish its unreplaceable wares upon the peoples of the earth. Let us make clear to the Social and Economic Council that we do not intend to use disproportionate amounts of our own financial resources as well as mineral resources in relation to the financial and other mineral resources expended by the other nations.

"We must not give away mineral resources necessary to American safety—resources bought with the blood and lives of our servicemen. Let our best expert mineralogists investigate the islands we have bought with our blood and see what mineral resources we have there. Also let those who deal for America 'talk turkey' to the Dutch and others of our allies, and let us see what we can obtain in lands that we are reconquering for them to reimburse this Nation for the minerals we have spent in this great war.

"We must be watchful lest free-trade 'nuts' open the floodgates and eliminate production in those industries where we must retain our skills for purposes of national defense.

"We must beware lest, as admonished by and become unworthy, and an infidel to our St. Paul, we fail to look out for our own, own cause."

49. SPEECH IN SUPPORT OF THE RATIFICATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER AND ENUMERATING BASIC PRINCIPLES OF FOREIGN POLICY

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 23, 1945, volume 91, page 7965:

"I am going to do my part to launch us successfully on our great adventure. I shall cast my vote for the ratification of the charter without reservations. I shall do so wholeheartedly and proudly. I shall feel some concern, to be sure, knowing that this great project will not have an easy and quick success. But I shall have the faith and shall offer my humble prayer that it will eventually and enduringly succeed. And I shall dedicate my every effort and energy to make it succeed.

"I shall cast my vote with the fervent hope that my vote, the votes of my colleagues, and the support of the American people at home and abroad will find fruition in a world organization which will realize our dearest desire—justice for all, peace for all.

"With the Charter we have a definite course to follow which may lead to a just and lasting peace. With the Charter, we have a highway of peace to travel. It is not an easy highway. There will be stumbling blocks and dead-end paths. But the highway to a just and lasting peace does have finger posts or signposts, as outlined in the Charter and in our past experience. So we can take this highway with confidence, with courage and with faith.

"But without the United Nations Charter, there is no highway to peace, no road which we can take to end the scourge of war.

"That is our choice—the highway of the Charter or no highway of peace.

"But this does not mean that the United States is going to rely exclusively on the Charter for her protection from war.

"It does not mean that America will be putting all her security eggs in the basket of the Charter. On the contrary, we ourselves must keep our powder dry. After the war, we must remain strong militarily, strong politically, strong spiritually. Eternal vigilance will still be the price of liberty.

"But the Charter will be of help in keeping America out of war by keeping war out of the world. If the Charter is used properly, it will put out the incipient fires of war before they get started.

"We must note that big 'if'—'if the Charter is used properly.'

"We must remember that the Charter is merely a collection of 10,000 words. They can become empty words. The Charter itself can become another scrap of paper, just as the Nine Power Pact was or the League of Nations Covenant was.

"Yes; the Charter will not be worth the paper on which it is written unless all the signatory nations have the will, the intent, and the purpose to live up to their obligations as outlined in the Charter.

"For years I have emphasized this point. The nations must have more than documents of peace. They must have the continuing spirit of peace.

"So the United Nations Charter challenges us all to fulfill the spirit of its 10,000 words. It challenges us to realize its great possibilities to make a peaceful world.

"This is our hour of decision. This is a time for greatness. We must be as great in carrying out the blueprints of peace as our gallant boys have been in carrying out the blueprints of war.

"War is man-made. Peace must be man-made, made in action, in living, not merely in promises. We must act to breathe the spirit of life into the San Francisco Charter.

"Mr. President, the people of Wisconsin sent me to the Senate of the United States on January 3, 1939. Every day and month and year since then have been filled with dynamic changes in the world. In those years the principles which I now enumerate have proven a guide to me:

"First. Protect, defend, and conserve America, her human and physical resources, first, last, and always.

"Second. Live up to our high obligations in this ever contracting world, or even new technological advances.

"Third. Abide by the Constitution of the United States.

"Fourth. Have faith in America, in her institutions, and in the meaning of those institutions to the world.

"Fifth. Cultivate the spirit more than the letter of the growing, evolving law of the nations.

"Sixth. Feel sympathetically, think realistically, speak frankly, act forthrightly, in our relations with other nations.

"Seventh. Build the base for a sound foreign policy upon the foundation of a sound domestic policy.

"Eighth. Establish the closest possible foreign policy teamwork between the executive and legislative branches of Government.

"Ninth. Find the truth about foreign as well as domestic affairs, disseminate the truth, follow the truth.

"Tenth. Recognize that world collaboration is the answer to war. How to get the nations to collaborate is the real issue."

50. AN EXPRESSION OF THE FEELINGS OF MILLIONS OF AMERICANS THAT RUSSIA DO HER PART IN THE PACIFIC WAR

From the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 25, 1945, volume 91, page 8007:

"In millions of American homes, mothers, fathers, and sweethearts are awaiting anxiously for news of Russia's intentions. Hundreds of thousands of our brave soldiers, sailors, and marines are poised for the tough and bitter invasion of Japan.

"They know and we know that if Russia declared war, if her bombing fleets roared out from Vladivostok over to Japan, these acts might be the final ones to force a quick surrender of the Japs. Thus, countless American lives are at stake in Russia's decision.

"Our ground troops, seamen, and airmen have carried the overwhelming load of the bloody Pacific fighting for 3½ years. We have every right to speak bluntly and plainly, the only language the Russians understand anyway.

"We know how Russia has bled in the war with Germany. We know of her valor and her courage. But we know, too, that her security demands that the Japs be licked. We know that whether or not Russia enters the war she will make big postwar demands regarding Asia at the peace table.

"Thus America has everything to gain and thousands of her boys' lives to lose unless Russia joins in the Pacific struggle.

"It would be our dearest hope that Russia's mere entrance into the war would be sufficient to make the Japs throw in the sponge without a single additional Russian boy or a single additional American boy's dying.

"But we cannot foresee the future. We can, however, say that it is apparently the overwhelming sentiment of our people that we will not easily forget Russia's contribution in the Far East if she pitches in with us and we will not easily forgive her shirking of her responsibility if she remains on the side lines.

"I would be remiss in my obligations as a United States Senator if I did not voice, in all humility but with all the force at my command, the feelings of millions of Americans that Russia do her part in the Pacific."

51. THE DAY BEFORE RATIFICATION OF THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER, A DESCRIPTION OF THAT DOCUMENT AND OF ITS MEANING TO OUR OWN AND THE OTHER NATIONS

From CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 27, 1945, volume 91, page 8127:

"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 means—to the fulfillment of our obligations under the Charter.

"Third. Doing so will not in the slightest jeopardize the validity of the Monroe Doctrine and the Chapultepec compact.

"Fourth. * * * 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 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. * * *

"CONCLUSIONS

"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 prove adequate."

THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The Senate 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.

I HAVE ALWAYS SUPPORTED INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATION

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, I speak in support of the ratification of the Charter of the United Nations. Since there has been some discussion of recent converts, let me say that my father was one of the original supporters of the League to Enforce Peace, and of the League of Nations. While I was not in politics myself, I always strongly supported his position. I have always maintained that an international organization was the best method of reducing the danger of war. After this country rejected the League of Nations, and after it adopted a policy of neutrality I believed we should adhere to that policy, and I was in favor of doing everything possible to keep out

of the present war. In 1940 and 1941 the question was not whether we should join an international organization to prevent a world war, but whether we should join in a world war already existing, which we had done nothing to bring about, and which it was the whole purpose of a League to prevent.

On October 26, 1943, I spoke before the American Bar Association urging the formation of a world-wide organization of sovereign nations. I ask that an extract from my speech on this subject be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

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

3. WORLD-WIDE ORGANIZATION OF SOVEREIGN NATIONS

The plan for an enforced peace which accords most closely with the ideals of the American Republic, and of the Atlantic Charter, is that for an association of nations to include the United Nations and the neutrals and, after a period of probation, the Axis nations. It would be supported by covenants between sovereign nations agreeing to determine their disputes by the law of nations and judicial decision, or by arbitration. It would further be supported by covenants to join in the use of force against any nation determined to be an aggressor by the decision of some international tribunal. Frankly this is an obligation which the American people may be loath to undertake, but I believe they will undertake it, because they know that if war is not prevented at the start under modern conditions, it is more than likely to spread throughout the world. Certainly this plan is to be preferred to an international state or a British-American-Russian offensive-defensive alliance.

But there are certain conditions to be insisted on.

First, force should not be called for against any nation because of any internal domestic policy, except rearmament in excess of a quota imposed or agreed to. Interference in domestic policies, even such vital matters as tariffs or the treatment of minorities, would be more likely to make war than prevent it. The test is: Is the subject one on which the people of the United States would be willing to have other nations interfere with our internal action? If not, we should not attempt to impose such interference on others.

Second, the covenant must be preceded by an economic arrangement fair to all nations, and by political arrangements providing for proper self-determination. The covenant, of course, must provide for the revision of boundaries and obligations, but essentially we will be asked to guarantee the status quo. We cannot make that guaranty unless the status quo is fair to all peoples and gives them a chance to live, and therefore affords a reasonable hope that peace can be maintained.

Third, I believe that any obligation to use force in Europe should only be secondary, not to be effective until the peace-loving nations of Europe have exhausted their own resources. This is in accord with Mr. Churchill's suggestion of a council of Europe under the association of nations. We cannot help solve the problems of Europe unless the great majority of the European nations first agree on what that solution should be.

Mr. TAFT. Shortly thereafter, I supported the resolution adopted by the Republican Conference at Mackinac Island favoring, "responsible participation by the United States in a postwar cooperative organization among sov-

eign nations to prevent military aggression and to attain permanent peace with organized justice in a free world." This was the language of the able senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. It contains the soundest, most concise and most effective statement made, before or since, of the proper basis of international organization. I wish it had been more closely followed.

On November 5, I supported the Connally resolution adopted by the Senate of the United States on that date, and I ask that my statement in support of that resolution be inserted at this point in the RECORD.

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

STATEMENT OF SENATOR TAFT IN VOTING FOR THE CONNALLY RESOLUTION

The Connally resolution expresses the opinion of the Senate in favor of international cooperation to assure peace in the future world. While it has no legislative effect, the overwhelming vote by which it has been adopted demonstrates clearly to our allies the desire of all the people of this country to make every effort to develop a practicable plan. The resolution makes clear that any specific plan negotiated by the President must be later approved by a two-thirds vote in the Senate, and the resolution is therefore not a commitment to support any specific plan.

The first three paragraphs comprise the original Connally resolution. The fourth paragraph is identical with paragraph 4 of the Moscow Four-Power Declaration. The fifth paragraph is an amendment offered by Senator WILLIS, of Indiana. I think it was wise to add the Moscow Declaration, so that there might be no question of any conflict between the Senate and the executive representatives of the Four Powers.

As I read the Connally resolution, it expresses the willingness of the Senate to abandon the traditional policy of the United States which usually refused to commit our Government to any action in advance, and left it free to deal with each crisis as it arose. On the other hand, the insistence upon the sovereignty of nations in both paragraphs excludes the idea of any federal union, or international superstate, or predominant international police force strong enough to overcome the national forces of every nation in the world. The language taken from the Moscow Declaration excludes the policy of any exclusive military alliance as advocated by Mr. Lippmann.

My only criticism of the resolution is that it omits any reference to the establishment of a rule of law and order, and to a World Court to interpret that law. This principle is set forth far more effectively in the resolution adopted by the Republican postwar council at Mackinac. However, it may be argued that a rule of law is implicit in the setting up of any general international organization.

The resolution as passed, therefore, is like the Mackinac resolution of the Republican Party, the Hull speech of September 12, and the Moscow Declaration. It looks in the direction of a League of Nations not unlike that established after the World War, but with more definite obligations to use national military forces to suppress aggression in its early stages. This is the policy which I have heretofore favored, and I believe there is now substantial unanimity on the broad outlines of such a policy, between the President and Congress, between the Senate and the House, and between the Republican and Democratic Parties.

Mr. TAFT. I said then:

My only criticism of the resolution is that it omits any reference to the establishment of a rule of law and order, and to a world court to interpret that law.

The present Charter establishes a World Court.

On May 21, 1945, in a speech before the American Polish Associations in the East, I said:

But with all the handicaps arising from unsolved problems in the political field, and the unwillingness of key nations to agree to submit their disputes to lawful decision and abide by the results, I believe that the San Francisco Conference has done a great job and is proposing a plan which should be approved by the people and the Senate of the United States.

THE CHARTER PROVIDES A MEANS TO PREVENT WAR

There can be no difference between Senators on the necessity of avoiding a third world war. The present war is the most destructive to human life and property which the world has ever seen. In the normal developments of science a third war might well bring about the complete destructive of modern civilization. The very money cost of such a war would certainly destroy freedom in the United States as we understand it, as well as our whole business and financial structure. Today perhaps, in spite of much propaganda to the contrary, the oceans are still a great barrier which, with an all-powerful Navy and Air Force, can protect this country from foreign attack. But no one can be certain that 10 years from now the most powerful Nation in the world might not be tremendously damaged and almost destroyed from the air by sudden and skillful attack. No one differs about the need of avoiding war.

The question relates to the means by which that can be effectively done. At the end of every past war treaties have been written, nearly all purporting to assure perpetual peace between the parties. Time after time international arrangements have been made to assure peace and have failed in their purpose. There is and can be no panacea to secure peace. Its continuation must depend principally upon the wisdom of the leaders of the nations of the world. We cannot set up any organization which will protect the next generation from its own faults.

But I believe that an international organization, devoted to the maintenance of peace, to the study of possible threats to peace, and to a constant effort to solve the differences which lead to war, is an essential feature of any peace hope or peace policy. The United Nations' Charter has many faults, some of which I shall discuss, but it provides without question a continuing Council table at which are represented all the nations of the world, meeting constantly to solve those problems which in their opinion may endanger international peace. If the men who participate in this continuing conference are men of ability and good faith, I believe that this organization can go far toward preventing war.

WE MUST SUPPORT THE SPIRIT OF THE CHARTER

The underlying spirit of the Charter, as I read it, is the determination to prevent war. When we ratify this Charter we must have no reservations with regard to our enthusiastic cooperation in that spirit. In particular there are certain policies which I think are required to carry out the spirit of the Charter.

First. We should do our best in good faith to settle every dispute in which we are concerned by peaceful negotiations. We have not always done so in the past.

Second. If we cannot reach an agreement, we should ourselves be willing to accept arbitration or adjudication, even on the most vital issues, provided it can be set up in such a manner that the decision is to be based on justice and not on any principle of expediency. It seems to me impossible to hope for peace in the world unless all the nations ultimately come to be willing to submit all their disputes to arbitration or adjudication by an impartial tribunal. America must set the example. If we take this attitude it will never be necessary for us to use our veto power for the purpose of protecting this Nation against the use of force unless our opponent and the Council are wholly unreasonable in the form of arbitration suggested. I assert again that we cannot hope for peace in this world unless we come to universal arbitration and adjudication, and yet there are many who shout loudly for international peace and armed forces to enforce it, who will not be willing that we arbitrate every matter relating to our international relations. The record of the Senate is none too good in the frequent rejection of treaties of general arbitration.

Third. We should be prepared to implement the use of force without exercising our veto whenever we are satisfied that such use will tend to bring about peace and not cause injustice. With relation to the discussion in the Senate regarding article 43, I myself believe that the supplemental agreement should be considered as a treaty like the Charter of which it becomes a part. However, I am greatly concerned about the matter because I believe that this Senate will ratify any reasonable agreement and authorize armed forces of any size reasonably required for the use to which such forces may be put. I believe we commit ourselves to such a position by ratifying this original treaty.

WE MUST INTRODUCE MORE LAW AND JUSTICE INTO THE ADMINISTRATION OF THE CHARTER

Mr. President, since I intend to support the Charter and its spirit fully, I hesitate to proceed with criticism of a very good job, and I certainly do not do so to express any doubt of the wisdom of ratifying it. I believe, however, that if the faults of the Charter are clearly understood it can lead to its improvement in the future, and can also determine certain policies which our Government should pursue in administering the Charter to make it work and to bring about those improvements. I believe, furthermore, that it is a mistake to claim that the document is so perfect that it will insure absolutely against war. If too

much is now claimed for the Charter and then it begins to develop faults or fails in some of its purposes, there may be such a reaction by an oversold populace as to reverse the whole direction of our policy.

My principal concern about the Charter is the fact that it is not based primarily on a system of law and the administration of justice. I believe that in the long run the only way to establish peace is to build up a law which shall govern the relations of nations with each other, and secure the consent of nations that they will abide by law and by decisions made under that law. I criticized the Connally resolution because it omitted any reference to the establishment of a rule of law and order. The original Dumbarton Oaks Proposals omitted all reference to justice.

The Charter, largely through the efficient work of the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] does recognize the importance and desirability of justice and is, therefore, a great improvement over the original proposals. But chapters V, VI, and VII, dealing with the Security Council, which form the heart of the Charter, require the Security Council to make such decisions as will maintain peace and security without any express reference to justice. The two standards may be completely in conflict.

It is true that article 24 contains a general provision that in discharging its duties the Security Council shall act in accordance with the purposes and principles set forth in chapter I; and it is also true that this chapter includes justice as one consideration. But the reference to justice and international law in paragraph 1 of article 1 and the reference to justice in paragraph 3 of article 2 seem to be related only to the settlement of disputes by peaceful means. If the Security Council has to make a definite decision looking to the employment of force, it is done primarily on the basis of maintaining peace and security.

Peace and security are not synonymous with justice. It might well be that the Security Council, acting in full compliance with the Charter, could take property from one nation to which it justly belonged and give it to another because they felt that would promote peace. So Mr. Chamberlain agreed to the transfer of Sudetenland to Germany. By substituting the maintenance of peace and security for law and justice, we authorize the basing of decisions on expediency, and for expediency there are no rules which cannot be changed to fit the facts of the particular case.

However, Mr. President, besides the references to justice to which I have referred, there is also the suggestion in article 36, paragraph 3, that legal disputes as a general rule be referred to the International Court, and there are other references to justice in the Charter. I believe it is proper for our representative on the Council to insist that force not be authorized unless it is in accord with justice as well as with the maintenance of peace and security. If our representa-

tive takes that position, the veto power which he has may establish by precedent a course of action which will, in effect, write the requirement of justice into the Charter. I believe that in dealing with the powers and duties of our representative, Congress may well impose such a policy by law. I believe further that the Assembly must undertake the codification of international law, as authorized in article 13, clearly defining the rights and obligations of nations between themselves.

THE VETO POWER KILLS THE IDEA OF ENFORCING PEACE, BUT IT CAN BE OVERCOME BY A WORLD PUBLIC OPINION FOR PEACE

Mr. President, in connection with the failure to base the Charter on law and justice, it should also be pointed out that the veto power given to prevent the Security Council from making recommendations, under article 39, or using sanctions and force, under articles 41 and 42, completely dispels the idea that any system of universal law is being established, for surely nothing can be law if five of the largest nations can automatically exempt themselves from its application. There is only one way that I can see gradually to overcome this objection. We, ourselves, can always voluntarily submit our disputes to adjudication or arbitration. That can be an example to the world. We can further attempt to build up a world public opinion that disputes between nations must be settled, not by war, but according to the principles of law and justice. I do not believe we can hope for peace in the world until all the more powerful nations are willing to take that course. The principal objection to it today comes from Russia. We must admit that Russia has some reason to be suspicious that tribunals made up of foreign nations cannot be impartial as between Russia and its neighbors. We can only hope that the continuous conference provided by the Charter and a good example set by ourselves and others may convince Russia that the people of this world propose to be guided by principles of justice. The veto power becomes of no importance if all the nations come gradually to avail themselves of the methods of peaceful settlement provided in the Charter.

I do not think most people in this country realize how much the veto changes the whole nature of the Organization, as long as it exists. Whatever hopes we may have, the fact is that the veto power reduces the whole United Nations Organization for the present to a consulting body. All the discussion about force is of minor importance because it can never be used to solve any major crisis. It is said that the provisions for pacific settlement of disputes are of tremendous importance because they require all nations to consult with each other before going to war. They are important because they show the way to the final solution. This requirement, however, is easy to comply with, and has not removed many real threats of war in the past. There has usually been consultation before actual war has begun. Mr. Chamberlain conferred with

Mr. Hitler at some length, and thought he had made progress. The Japanese delegates to this country met repeatedly with Secretary Hull, and submitted one proposal after another. The requiring of such consultation is helpful, but it is not materially different from what happens today. The Security Council itself and its constant consultation is the real contribution to peace made by this Charter.

Assume that after the last war the five great powers would have been the United States, England, France, Italy, and Japan. If the Charter had been in effect, Japan would have vetoed any action against itself on the invasion of Manchuria and of China. Italy would have vetoed any action against itself on the invasion of Ethiopia. In some ways the Organization would have been less effective even than the League of Nations. The Charter could not use force if Russia were to invade Poland or seize the Dardanelles from Turkey. It could not use force if France invaded Syria and Lebanon. Even attacks by satellite nations of one of the great powers might be engaged in safely if a great power had agreed in advance to exercise the veto power. I favor the Charter because it does set up a continuous consulting body.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I should like to propound a question to the distinguished Senator from Ohio. Assuming that one of the great powers should be obstreperous, does he not believe that we could better exert our influence and have a better opportunity of controlling it if we had it sitting around the Council table with the other four permanent members? Does he not believe that by such a method we might either dissuade the particular nation involved from doing what it was attempting to do, or bring pressure to bear upon it through argument, and so forth, and show it that such a course as it proposed to follow would be opposed by the concentrated opinion of the world?

Mr. TAFT. I fully agree with the Senator from Texas. In what the Senator has stated lies the great value of the Organization, and it cannot be underestimated. My only point is that I believe the people of America should not feel that force is the main feature of the Charter. If they do, they may be badly disillusioned, and they may turn against the Charter, as well as the Organization, because certain things are not being done which they thought would be done. So much emphasis has been placed on force in public discussions that most of our citizens do not realize how impotent this force is in any major crisis. Force has been grossly overplayed.

VETO POWER CAN BE A WEAPON TO PROTECT JUSTICE

So long as action under the Charter is based on expediency and not on justice, I believe that the veto power is necessary. Otherwise it might be possible for the great nations, while fully complying with the definite obligations of the Charter, to act unjustly and contrary to the in-

terest of many smaller nations. Apparently, under paragraph 4 of article 2, boundaries fixed in the treaty of peace are to be frozen in the absence of some voluntary readjustment, for all members pledge themselves to refrain from the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any state. If unjust boundaries are set up in the treaty of peace, any attempt to rectify those boundaries by force would be a violation of the Charter no matter how just that rectification might be. The veto power enables us to judge such a matter and refuse to permit the machinery of the Charter to be used against a nation fighting, in effect, for the freedom of its own people.

I have also been interested in the problem of whether the obligations of the Charter prevent one nation going to the assistance of another which is attacked by one of the powers holding a veto. Thus, conceivably, Russia might attack Turkey, or France might attack Syria. It is at least doubtful to my mind whether Great Britain or ourselves, for instance, could go to the defense of Turkey or Syria, assuming that the veto power were exercised. I suppose the answer to this is that if one of the five great powers violates the Charter and vetoes action against its own violation, the charter is for all practical purposes dissolved in failure. Of course, we look forward with hope for unanimous action by the great powers, and a willingness on their part to submit their disputes to peaceful settlement. On this continent we could clearly go to the defense of any American state under the doctrine of collective self-defense in article 51.

THE POWER OF THE AMERICAN REPRESENTATIVE

In connection with the veto power, I think it is much more important to fix the powers and duties of the American representative on the Security Council under chapter VII. I believe that we should fix these duties at the same time we adopt the treaty, but I do not greatly object to considering the question at a later time. I do wish to emphasize the importance of this representative's powers and duties. There are three cases in which they affect the vital interests of the American people:

First. There are those cases in which action is sought against the United States itself. I have stated that in my opinion we should always be willing to submit any international dispute to arbitration or adjudication, providing that the boards or courts established are bound to decide the question on principles of justice. This, however, involves authority to arbitrate disputes. That has always been a matter determined by Congress. I should be inclined to pass a statute defining the conditions under which the American representative could agree to a proper submission. I should make the authority as wide as possible.

I agree with the Senator from Minnesota that we should adhere to the World Court with regard to matters which are justiciable. I also believe that we should go further and agree to submit other matters, as well, to arbitration, and di-

rect our American representative to do so. Moreover, we should state the conditions upon which he should do so.

Mr. President, if our representative, in some extraordinary circumstances, should find it necessary to refuse to agree to arbitration, I believe he should be instructed to veto any measures thereupon threatened against us under articles 41 and 42.

The second class of cases involves those in which we are called upon to apply sanctions or supply forces against nations which the Security Council considers to be aggressors. There may be a number of different situations. I do not think we would care to approve the use of force in an oppressive way against a nation struggling for its freedom and with whose cause our people sympathize. It is important to determine whether such a case shall be determined by the President or by Congress.

It may be that we will not care to approve the use of force if it involves an obligation which would inevitably lead to a major war. We should determine whether this is to be decided by the President or by Congress.

There may also be cases in which the threat to the peace is so distant from us that other nations should undertake the police function. Probably this situation would be covered by the supplemental treaty under article 43.

There is this consideration, however, in dealing with the power of our representative to authorize sanctions or force. If we assume certain definite obligations, I am prepared to leave to the President the performance of those obligations. But the veto power given under article 27 makes every individual case a question of national policy and not of justice. There is no obligation of any kind on us to vote for sanctions or force if we consider that it is unwise to do so from a question of our own national policy. Ordinarily, national policy in the field of sanctions and war has been decided by Congress. Under the Constitution, only Congress can declare war. It would seem desirable, therefore, that some power be reserved to Congress to direct voting by our representative which may involve a war as distinguished from policing operations or may involve sanctions or vital economic dangers to the United States. I do not intend here to state any final opinion on these questions. I only feel that they are questions which must be decided by Congress when the office of representative is created, and that they are far broader and more important than the problems arising under article 43, which have been debated at some length on the floor of the Senate this week.

THIS TREATY WOULD NOT BE AIDED BY ECONOMIC FOOLISHNESS

I have been somewhat amused by the apparent disappointment of some Senators that there is so little opposition to the entrance of the United States into the international organization. They seem to feel that because some of us opposed the Reciprocal Trade Act and the Bretton Woods Proposals we should also oppose this treaty. I absolutely

deny the argument that the Bretton Woods agreements, or the particular form of tariff reduction sought in the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, are in any way necessary to the operation of the United Nations Organization or in any way an integral part of this plan. Certainly it is desirable for purposes of peace that we assist other nations to get their economic machinery in running order and assist in giving them some market for essential exports. But that does not mean that we should pour out \$20,000,000,000 in a single year, or establish free trade, or adopt the expensive and peculiarly ineffective measures proposed at Bretton Woods. In fact, if these measures interfere with the prosperity of the United States—as I believe they do—either by destroying industries here or by bringing about a serious inflation with a resulting depression, they will do the world far more harm than good.

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

Mr. TAFT. I will yield when I finish the paragraph. The foundation of prosperity in the world is likely to be the prosperity within the United States. Nothing in the economic field can be so helpful to peace as the adoption of sound fiscal policies and sound policies for the development of industry and employment in the United States.

I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. PEPPER. Does the Senator suggest by what he says that the policy of the United States ought to be a policy of isolation and independence in the economic sphere, or does he agree that the only way the United States can achieve the position he looks forward to is to work in collaboration with other nations in the economic sphere as well as in the political sphere?

Mr. TAFT. I fully approve of the Economic and Social Council; I think they can perform a great job if they will try to solve the basic economic questions between nations, but I deny that free trade in the United States is going to accomplish any such purpose, and I deny that the Bretton Woods agreements are suited for the particular purpose for which they are set up. I am in favor of international cooperation, but I am not in favor of international cooperation by a one-way street, in which we contribute everything and nobody else contributes anything, and I say that kind of cooperation will do the world more harm than it will do good.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. PEPPER. I do not think I can agree that the statement the Senator makes is a desirable statement. The Senator does not mean to infer, does he, that the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act and the Bretton Woods Act have the effect of committing us to any such foolish policy as he describes?

Mr. TAFT. The Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act authorized a reduction of tariff rates to 25 percent of the statutory rates, which in effect is free trade. If my fears are correct—I do not know

whether they are or not—that is going to destroy many industries in the United States and interfere with the prosperity of our people. Lack of prosperity in the United States will be reflected abroad in depression, and their peoples will gain but little from the imports which they send into this country.

Mr. PEPPER. Mr. President, if the Senator will yield further, of course, we do not give anybody free trade unless they give us free trade in return; in other words, there is no one-way street about it.

Mr. TAFT. If the Senator from Florida wants to argue the reciprocal trade agreements, he must remember that when we make an agreement with one nation every other nation gets the same concession that is granted to the nation with which the agreement is made; and gets the concession for nothing.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield to the Senator from Arkansas.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. There is no difference between us as to the purpose for which Bretton Woods is designed; the only difference is as to whether or not we think it is effective to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. TAFT. That is correct.

My opinion is that so far as economic cooperation is concerned we are better off to confine it to organizations where we can sit down and study the problems and solve them according to the needs of each nation. We ought to be free to do that and not try to commit ourselves in advance.

Take UNRRA. I think we would have been further along in relief work in Europe and would have done much more if we had done it by a consultative organization and attempted to do our job in certain countries and let England do the job in other countries. I believe that if we had an American relief organization, as we had after the last war, instead of an international organization with a dozen masters, we would have been able to furnish relief much more effectively than UNRRA has done the job.

When we come to economic matters, it seems to me that so far as action is concerned it can be more effectively handled by direct national action. So I favored the Export-Import Bank. If we are to lend money abroad, I think that is the way to do it, and not through an international bank or an international fund.

However, I do not wish to go back and reargue the whole Bretton Woods debate. I merely desire to deny the argument that because one is not for Bretton Woods and not for the new Reciprocal Trade Act therefore he cannot in good faith support a political organization to prevent war.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President, we are trying to found international organizations based upon the cooperative action of peoples. To do as the Senator from Ohio suggests would be to follow exactly the methods we followed after the last war. Those methods failed. I think we should try a new method. Bret-

ton Woods and the Charter are new methods. I think they have a good chance to work. The Senator from Ohio thinks they will fail. That is the principal difference between us.

The Senator admits that the purpose of Bretton Woods is perfectly consistent with the purpose of the proposal we are considering. I do not see that there is any inconsistency. The apparent inconsistency arises from the fact that the Senator assumes the failure of Bretton Woods. If one admits that it can succeed then it certainly could be said to be an integral part of the system embodied in this Charter. Of course, I deny that it cannot succeed just as strongly as the Senator denies that it can. As to an international organization such as UNRRA, and others, in each of these organizations the getting together of the representatives of the nations is required, and it seems to me there would be as much value in the discussion of some of the economic matters as of matters in the political field.

But the Senator's theory is that we must stand alone and act boldly by ourselves. This is like the old argument, that a dictator is more efficient in the administration of a country domestically, and some of us know he is, but there is great value in the democratic process, in spite of the fact that it may not be as efficient in some activities. We still think there are superior values in the fact that we all participate, and the same can be said of each of the international organizations.

Mr. TAFT. I think I agree with the Senator. I am in favor of international organizations, and will support all of them, to make studies and determine what should be done, and lay down the rules. What I was attempting to answer was what the distinguished Senator from Arkansas said himself a few days ago. This was his language:

I find myself somewhat suspicious of the unanimity with which the charter is apparently received by this body. Practically no measure of real importance has been accepted with such docility by the opposition. Only a few days ago the Reciprocal Trade Act and the Bretton Woods Proposals were vigorously opposed and yet they are integral parts of the general plan and purpose embodied in this Charter. It is somewhat difficult for me to understand how Senators who opposed those two acts can now accept the San Francisco Charter, unless they misconstrue the significance of the Charter.

I wish to put myself on record as saying I do not regard them as integral parts of the general plan, and that I do not misconstrue the significance of the charter. That is the purpose of my remarks.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not know that I would say that I had the Senator from Ohio specifically in mind. However, he did participate in part of the debate, and I might say that the way in which I thought he might misconstrue the Charter was that he did not feel the Organization has the possibilities or the power I think it does have, or that it is the beginning of the development of a power and international law which I doubt the

Senator would approve of. I do not know about that; it is mere speculation.

Mr. TAFT. What I wish to point out is that the difference between the Senator and myself is not as to the purpose of Bretton Woods, it is as to the machinery of the two organizations, as to whether or not they will carry out the purpose.

As a matter of fact, modern wars have not resulted to any great degree from economic difficulties. China and India have the lowest standard of living in the world, but in modern times they never attacked their neighbors. The Germans never had a legitimate ground for economic complaint and could have created one of the most prosperous nations in the world without a foot of conquest. Undoubtedly, it is wise to help eliminate economic sore spots throughout the world. But they will never be as active a cause of war as will be political sore spots. Yet, the same gentlemen who insist upon giving away our substance to remove foreign economic troubles accept without a whisper political settlements which are a real threat to future peace. War is far more likely to develop from the Polish situation, the Lithuanian situation, the situation in the Balkans than it ever will from our failure to lend money.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I cannot quite see why the Senator is justified in stating that Bretton Woods is simply a method of giving away money. That certainly is not the theory of it, and that is the point on which we differ. It is not a charitable institution, such as UNRRA, and in setting up UNRRA we frankly said we were giving money away. Does the Senator think it is fair to say those economic organizations are simply methods of giving away money?

Mr. TAFT. Of lending money.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. The Senator said giving it away.

Mr. TAFT. If we lend money to Europe today at the rate of \$20,000,000,000 a year, or at the rate even of \$12,000,000,000 a year, it is equivalent to giving it away, because it is in such tremendous volume that it can never be repaid. That was our experience after the First World War, and in my opinion, it will be our experience again. If our loans were in reasonable amount, held to a billion or two billion a year for a few years after the war, I think they could be repaid. Then I would take back the suggestion that we would be giving it away.

My argument is only that in my opinion Bretton Woods was not a stabilization fund; it was just a method of lending more money to countries throughout the world. The Senator did not agree with me, and I do not think we should reargue the merits of Bretton Woods.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the Senator said we insist upon giving it away. I do not think Bretton Woods should be characterized as a method of giving away \$12,000,000,000.

Mr. TAFT. As I said, war is far more likely to develop from the Polish situa-

tion, the Lithuanian situation, the situation in the Balkans, than it ever will from our failure to lend money.

In fact, when we have ratified this Charter, we must surely go on to insist upon a reasonable political settlement in Central Europe, for the organization that we have set up will be seriously handicapped if it is based on a series of unjust political settlements. As long as any people desires to be free and agitates for its freedom, it will find friends throughout the world prepared to encourage war. We must surely insist upon a Poland which is controlled by the people of Poland. We must try to see that every problem is worked out in a way which is likely to provide a permanent solution. The chance of success of the new Organization depends far more on the treaty of peace than it does on the form of the Organization to which we are giving so much attention. I think the Organization has a chance of success no matter what the settlements may be, but certainly that chance is tremendously reduced if the disposition of peoples in the peace treaty is unreasonable or unjust.

It is also important that the people of this country realize and accept the fact that we are not entering into a world state or assuming to direct the affairs of the world. The distinguished junior Senator from Arkansas is dissatisfied with the treaty, because it is based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all its members. He says this is a very unfortunate principle to begin with. To my mind it is the very essence of the nature of this Charter. Of course, it does not mean that all nations are equal. It does mean that each one within its own territory enjoys the same kind of complete sovereignty. I have read long philosophical discussions as to the nature of sovereignty, but for the purposes of our present debate it seems to me to mean only one thing, namely, that each people shall have complete power to decide its own affairs within its own territory. Outside of its territory I do not conceive that any nation has ever enjoyed complete sovereignty. It has always been modified by the sovereignty of others. This Charter deals with the rights of nations outside of their own territory in their relations with other nations. To the extent that those rights are sovereign rights, they are substantially modified by this Charter and I see no objection to such modification. The sovereignty of each nation within its territory remains complete and should remain complete except as it may be modified by later agreements to limit armament.

Paragraph 7 of article 2 states distinctly that "nothing in the Charter shall authorize the United Nations to intervene in matters which are essentially within the domestic jurisdiction of any state, or shall require the members to submit such matters to settlement under the present Charter.

I think it is important that those who seem actually to favor a world state accept in good faith the principle here laid down. I cannot imagine anything more likely to bring about war than the attempt to intervene in the domestic af-

fairs of other nations. Our people would deeply resent it if there were interference with our immigration policies, our tariff policies, or our agricultural policies. There is some tendency in the present Organization for the great powers to consider themselves as policemen of the world. To my mind it is vitally important that we accept the fact that every nation is sovereign within its own territory, and that we do not propose to interfere with its political or economic policies.

This treaty is not a move toward a world state. It is the exact opposite, a law of nations and not a universal law for individuals. To a world state I would be unalterably opposed, for it means the sacrificing of freedom to peace. Peace, after all, is not the only consideration in the world. If it were, there would be no United States of America, for our ancestors certainly preferred war to continuing subjection by an alien people. A world state is fundamentally different from the present proposal because it would vest ultimate sovereignty over our internal affairs in an organization which we do not control.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. Mr. President—

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Ohio yield to the Senator from Arkansas?

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. If I understood the first part of the Senator's remarks correctly, he referred to the establishment of a rule of law, and hoped it would be established, and that we might accept compulsory arbitration thereunder—all of which I approve thoroughly. It seems to me that that is the same expression that I and other Senators have used, which the Senator now interprets to be a world state, which the Senator is against. If the Senator is in favor of the establishment of a rule of law in the sense that we use the word "law," the Senator seems to me to be progressing to that extent toward the establishment, if the Senator wants to call it that, of a world state.

Mr. TAFT. It seems to me the attempt to set up a law which will govern nations between themselves is fundamentally different from a world state.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. In what way?

Mr. TAFT. A world state operates directly on the individuals of the various nations. I am talking about the kind of world state proposed by Mr. Striet, for instance, in Union Now, comparing it to the formation of the United States of America by the Thirteen Colonies. The result of that consolidation has been to make the people of the United States as a whole the sovereign power of this country. There are no real sovereign States any more in this country, and the Government of the United States operates directly on all individuals in the country. It can impose on any State policies it wishes to impose. I say that is a fundamentally different kind of an institution from one which attempts to set up a relationship between independent nations, and which cannot in any way affect the internal operation of those nations or operate directly on its citizens.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I realize we are getting into a subject that is much too difficult to deal with in a debate of limited time, but I think the Senator placed his finger on a difference in conception here concerning the use of the word "sovereignty," which really makes it very difficult to arrive at any decision, because I have not conceived of the States of this country as being sovereign. It has always seemed to me that the people were sovereign. We do not refer to the Government as being sovereign and telling the people what to do, and so on. That is one difference in the way we approach the problem. The argument of sovereignty, I will admit, is a very difficult one, and I do not want to bring it up now and take up the Senator's time with further discussion. But absolute sovereignty is quite inconsistent with the establishment of law in any real sense.

Mr. TAFT. Mr. President, a world state is fundamentally different from the present proposal because it would vest ultimate sovereignty over our internal affairs in an organization which we do not control.

There is a fundamental difference. You may try to reserve this right or that right, but once you set up a world state with an over-all legislature and an over-all executive and an all-powerful army, then I do not care what protection you have, the sovereignty rests in the people of the world as a whole, and in the end they can impose upon our people anything they wish to impose. So I say the conception of a world state is fundamentally different from this Charter, and this Charter does not in my opinion move in that direction.

What we are trying to do is to establish a law between nations to which all nations shall conform, and under which all nations shall agree to contribute forces against any one who refuses to follow that law.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not follow the idea of establishing a law to which nations voluntarily agree. To me it is utterly inconsistent to say that a law is something to which there is only voluntary agreement. It seems to me that compulsion is inherent in the very idea of law.

Mr. TAFT. I do not think so at all. Go back to English history. Two parties contested before a jury. Suppose a member of family A murdered a member of family B. Family B came before the jury, and the jury said, "Yes; that is a crime." No one did anything about it. The decision of the jury simply justified family B in beating up family A in return, imposing its own punishment. That was the origin, in a way, of the common law. It is perfectly conceivable to think of a law without sanctions, if we wish to have it. Certainly a sanction can rest on the voluntary cooperation of the nations which join in the organization.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. It is true that in primitive times there was no authority of the state; the force of compulsion still rested with the family. But as societies were formed, that authority was transferred to the government, whether it was

that of a tribe or a state, and the compulsion was there. In place of the law of the jungle which originally existed among persons, and which exists today among nations, there was gradually substituted the rule of law with sanctions.

I admit that we may be quibbling over words; but it seems to me that the word "law" indicates something which can be enforced, unless, of course, we are referring to the moral law, or to customs or gentlemen's agreements, or something of that sort. In using the word "law" I have always assumed that it was compulsory.

Mr. TAFT. I believe that law can exist without sanctions. The moment sanctions are imposed by an international body—

Mr. FULBRIGHT. This Organization provides for force. It is true it is limited by veto but we are certainly providing for sanctions.

Mr. TAFT. Only if the nations themselves are willing to supply forces. They may agree to furnish the force, or they may refuse to furnish such force. The furnishing of forces rests on the same voluntary consent upon which compliance with the law rests.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I will admit that this is the first step, and it is not complete. My only point was that it was a step in that direction. The Senator probably heard the statement of the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] yesterday, in which he drew an analogy between the origin of the British Parliament and the Assembly. What conclusion would the Senator draw from the suggestion of the Senator from Georgia that this Assembly could be regarded as the beginning of a parliament?

Mr. TAFT. I disagree entirely. I do not think it is a step in that direction, and I would not be for it if I thought it were. This Charter is based upon the sovereign equality of individual states, and so long as it is based upon that premise, and that is its basic principle, I believe it is not a step toward a world state. I believe that the failure of the Senator to accept that premise as the basis of the Charter shows that he is not really entering into the spirit of this particular Charter in voting for the Charter.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. I do not believe that it can be said that the senior Senator from Georgia misunderstands these questions. I certainly interpret his remarks exactly as I have indicated. He did say that we were not setting up a superstate. I do not see the inconsistency between having a legislative body, which he compared to the Parliament, and the statement that this is not a world state, in the sense in which the Senator uses that term. I certainly did not say that I expected to establish in the world a state similar to the United States Federal Government. I do not believe that we are compelled to make a choice at this time between one or the other of the two positions. I believe that the world Organization is a step toward the establishment—

Mr. TAFT. It is based on the sovereign equality of independent nations. I say that that is the very basis of the Charter, and what distinguishes it from a world state. So long as that principle

remains, we are in no danger of a world state.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. But the word "sovereignty" in the sense in which it has been used is perfect nonsense. We talk about the sovereignty of Belgium, Holland, and all the other countries. What good was it? What good was our sovereignty in the international field when, in spite of all we could do, we could not stay out of two wars? Even though we win the war, our people are still subject to very great difficulties and suffering. There is a lack of power in the people of this country and the Government as it exists to protect themselves. It is not a case of giving up sovereignty or anything else. This is an effort to acquire a power which does not exist today in the Government of the United States.

Mr. TAFT. I fully agree that the Charter does not mean giving up any sovereignty. But the Senator is disappointed with it because it does not. He wants to give up sovereignty.

Mr. FULBRIGHT. No. I want to acquire power to prevent war by the delegation of power. That is what I think would be accomplished by the Charter.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. SALTONSTALL. I do not wish to prolong this discussion; but it is my conception that the Charter and the world organization are similar to the situation which existed in this country between 1776 and 1789. We had a confederation of States, as opposed to a National Government, under which the States delegate certain powers and give up certain sovereignty. Is not that the Senator's conception of this organization?

Mr. TAFT. I believe that the differences are greater than the similarities when compared with the confederation of States. They attempted to set up a kind of legislature. They had no effective executive. Their organization attempted to create a nation in theory, but in practice the means set up were not sufficient for that purpose. Here we do not attempt to create a nation in fact or theory. I do not believe that the parallel between the Thirteen Colonies and the world is a good one. The people of the Thirteen Colonies were substantially the same kind of people. They had substantially the same background, the same standard of living, and the same ideas. They were in effect one people, probably to as great an extent as we are today.

On the other hand, if we try to combine the world, America would be ruled by a majority of people who have no conception whatever of American ideals, American standards of living, or American government. I say that the parallel between the Colonies and the world today is utterly and completely fallacious.

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

Mr. TAFT. I yield.

Mr. HATCH. I certainly do not wish to prolong the debate, but I think the Senator has made a valuable contribution in what he has said. I wonder if I correctly understand him. I believe that what the Senator has said is that as

to internal affairs, there is such a thing as internal sovereignty. Is that correct?

Mr. TAFT. That is what I conceive sovereign equality to mean. It means that we cannot be interfered with in our own country. It means that the Senate and the House of Representatives govern the United States, and not some one over in Europe.

Mr. HATCH. There is nothing in this charter which would delegate one iota of that internal sovereignty.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is absolutely correct; and that is one reason I am for it.

Mr. HATCH. I should like to go one step further. The Senator also recognizes, does he not, that there is what has been termed by others external sovereignty, relating to our dealings with other nations of the world, and which does not affect our own internal affairs.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct.

Mr. HATCH. The Senator is saying that in that field we must delegate certain powers; and that we have never had, and no other nation has ever had, complete independent sovereignty in external affairs.

Mr. TAFT. We agree voluntarily to modify various rights which have always been considered to be sovereign rights in the international field. However, of course, so long as we remain independent, there is always the possibility that we may not keep our promise. The United States always has kept its promises; but the ability not to do so is perhaps of some advantage. My hope is that we may reach such a point that every nation will keep its promises and the world public opinion will insist upon such performance.

Mr. HATCH. Earlier the Senator said that he was willing to go further than that; that he believed in the rule of law and order and justice in world affairs, and was willing to establish the necessary machinery, even though it might involve a delegation of external sovereignty to accomplish that purpose.

Mr. TAFT. The Senator is correct. The point I am making is that if we set up a world state we shall be subject to control in this country of our internal affairs by the rule of a majority of people who have not the faintest conception of what American principles are.

If the people of the world exercised the same sovereignty over the people of this country which our National Government exercises over our States, we would have no freedom in America.

The majority in the law-making body would be made up of people with different political ideals, different religious ideals, different economic ideals. I cannot conceive of a responsible American statesman willing to subject the great principles we have developed in this country to destruction by an alien majority.

A world state might bring peace, but it would be the peace of dictatorship and it would not last long. A few years would bring a world-wide civil war of ideologies. Any international organization which is worth the paper it is written on must be based on retaining the sovereignty of all States. Peace must be sought, not by destroying and consoli-

dating peoples, but by developing a rule of law in the relations between states.

This charter moves in the right direction. Under it we can work constantly toward the establishment of a rule of law between nations. Under it we can work toward a world opinion so strong that anyone who refuses to abide by that law will be an outcast, who can only look forward to the fate which has been suffered by the aggressors of Germany and Japan. Under the charter, with wise leadership, and with a genuine desire by the leading peoples of the world to be truly tolerant and truly unselfish, we can hope for a future of peace and prosperity.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive F, the United Nations Charter?

All in favor—

Mr. LANGER. 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:

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

The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive F, the United Nations Charter?

Mr. BILBO. Mr. President, on the 25th day of April 1945, there assembled in the city of San Francisco men and women representing the best brains and best patriotism of 50 nations of the earth, whose populations represent more than 80 percent of all the inhabitants of the world. Our great Nation was represented by the outstanding statesmen of our time, and this body was represented by two of the most intellectual and keenest brains on the floor of the Senate—CONNALLY, of Texas, and VANDENBERG, of Michigan—one a Democrat, and one a Republican, whose patriotism has never been questioned. After 9 weeks of conference and consultation the representatives of 50 nations of the earth unanimously adopted the world's greatest political document, a Charter proposing perpetual peace in the world for all time

to come. I have not been able to give my consent to the offering of an amendment or reservation to this document. It is not perfect because nothing by mortal man is perfect, but it represents the hopes, dreams, prayers, and desires of more than three-quarters of the human beings of the world. I have great faith in the ultimate success of the Charter because I believe that it will receive at the hands of the peoples of these 50 nations of the earth that patriotic, sympathetic, earnest, and honest cooperation which will perfect the document as the years go on, and as its defects are discovered.

The human race has at last realized that with the advancement of science and means of destruction another world war will mean the destruction of all civilization and of all people of the world. I assert that nothing in life will give me more pleasure than to cast my vote for the adoption, on the part of the people of this Nation, answering the prayers and hopes of the fathers and mothers of all this country, of this great document which we believe will usher in the millennial dawn.

Mr. REVERCOMB. Mr. President, throughout this week we have been listening to a discussion of the treaty which has come to be known as the United Nations Charter. It is a treaty which has for its express purpose the maintenance of peace for the future years. The entire country, and I believe all the people of our Nation, have had brought home to them poignantly the goodness of peace. They earnestly desire peace for the future and seek the fulfillment of that desire. That is quite natural, because there is no community or home in this land which has not felt the stroke of sorrow which war always brings. This Congress must listen to the desire of the people. This country and its people feel that there should be some forum in which the nations of the world may discuss and settle the problems and issues which arise between them. I myself long ago expressed the view that such a forum should be established in which, through peaceful means, such issues might be determined. But, when we, as representatives of the people, proceed to enlist this country in such a plan and subscribe to it, doing so with the high hope that it will be workable, and that we will do our full part in the attainment of the purpose for which the instrument is established we owe to our own people of the United States the very high duty of seeing to it that this Nation's independence shall be preserved, and that the sovereignty of the United States of America shall remain in the people.

There were several problems which presented themselves to those interested in the maintenance of an independent America and in our processes of government. I say to you, Mr. President, that the reading of the Charter, and more than that, the hearings which were held by the Committee on Foreign Relations, and the discussions which have taken place upon the floor of the Senate by those who brought forth this Charter as our representatives, give us assurance that the sovereignty of America and the independence of our country are not en-

dangered by the terms of this charter or the adoption of it.

Naturally, we turn to the question of what power will be given to the representatives of the United States in the world organization, and also to what extent the armed forces and the resources of this country may be used by an organization established for the purposes contained in the charter.

Study and the revealing debate which has taken place have brought forth these facts: This Charter is not self-executing. It requires future implementing legislation. It requires future legislation to fix not only the powers and the limitations of the representatives who will take part in administering the new organization. Even legislation will be required fixing the appointment of our representative and the method of his appointment. Likewise, the Congress will act later upon the question of the number of troops and the armaments to be used in effectuating the purposes of the Charter and also the extent to which such troops may be used. Some have maintained that this subject should be taken care of by treaty, and others have maintained that it should be handled by joint action of the two Houses of Congress. For my own part, it makes little difference so long as the agreement with respect to the number and use of troops is the action of the Congress, the representatives of the people of this country.

It is wise that the determination of what powers are to be given a representative, and to what extent we will use armament under the Charter, should be delayed until a later date. We must know what other nations are willing to do. The question of just how far we will go will be determined by us later. The charter itself is nothing but the basis of a world undertaking to bring about, primarily, peaceful settlements of disputes which may arise between nations of the world.

As to the matters with reference to the use of force, I may say that they will be dealt with in good faith to the Charter, and likewise in good faith to the people of America, when the time comes to act upon that subject.

So today, in voting upon the Charter we have here nothing but the adoption, I repeat, of the foundation or framework of a plan that is being submitted to several nations, and first to the Government of this Nation. By the adoption of the Charter, our Government does not undertake to say to what extent its representative in the world organization shall exercise binding power on behalf of this country. We shall later determine that at the proper time.

There is one phase of the Charter to which I now address my remarks. I refer to the so-called veto power. I think it is a wise provision. I have differed with some concerning the provision in the Charter with regard to the veto on the use of force. There have been some who felt that the veto power, so-called, should not exist in the Charter. The veto power simply means that the five permanent members of the Council must unanimously agree before force may be used. In other words, this Government,

or the government of any of the five so-called permanent members, may veto the use of force in any case. I think that provision is a sound one. I think it is a very practical one. We know, Mr. President, much as we hope for peace, and much as America will strive for peace, that any strong armed nation which may desire to go to war can precipitate war. Unless the veto power exists in the charter the charter might be the very ground work for the making of war in the future if some strong armed nation of the permanent members moved to make war. Therefore, I am glad that the veto on force has been included in the charter.

In the last analysis, success in the maintenance of peace for us will depend upon the foresight and wisdom of the men who are entrusted to represent this country. While this is a new venture for us in Government it is not new in the history of the world. It is not unlike the alliance which was entered into after the Napoleonic wars when the countries of Europe, tired of war, entered into a treaty to prevent war, and to stand together for the purpose of striking at any nation which might become an aggressor against those who had entered into that treaty. For perhaps the longest period of years in the history of Europe, there was no general war. But, in the end the kings, the rulers, and their ministers, who were members of that alliance, subverted it to the purpose of making safe their own regimes within their established boundaries. Instead of working for the purpose of keeping peace they subverted the organization's work to what is known as power politics, and after a few years war broke forth in all fronts of Europe when the action of the men who had control of the machinery broke down in character and in purpose. So I say to you, Mr. President, that in the end, whether peace shall be kept will depend on the wisdom of those who are entrusted with this work.

Today the United States of America will enter into this venture with the high hope that peace will be maintained. But I assert, Mr. President, that we must not, however high our aspirations and our hopes may be, permit this country to become weakened, or to become undefended in our own might. Today we have the greatest navy that sails upon the waters of the world, the greatest air armada that flies the skies, and the most effective army that ever marched to battle. America must remain strong in her own might and in her own right. While we call upon the world to be at peace, and while we subscribe to peace, yet we must be secure in our own strength lest someone break the bounds and become an aggressor with force and arms endangering our existence.

There comes to me the admonition in the words of Victor Hugo—it is an admonition I give now to my own countrymen:

Be like the bird who, pausing in her flight
awhile
On bough too slight,
Feels it gives way beneath her, yet sings,
Knowing she hath wings.

And so, Mr. President, while America subscribes to the purpose of peace, and

works to that end, she must remain a strong America. She must retain her sovereignty. Her laws and her destiny must be kept in the hands of her people of today, and in the hands of their children through the years ahead. Mr. President, I shall vote for this Charter with the hope that its declared purpose for peace may be attained, and I shall continue to stand for a strong America secure in her own strength.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, in connection with the charter which is before the Senate, I wish to discuss two specific matters, first the question of the future of subjugated and oppressed peoples, and second, the future of the world court. I propose to discuss those two specific subjects because I think there is no hope for permanent peace in the world unless we remove the causes of war, economic, diplomatic, and political, and unless we provide machinery and the jurisdiction for its operation which will permit the application of the rules of reason and judicial processes to the settlement of international disputes.

I think that today we must think of the world of a hundred years from now, certainly of the world of a half century from now. If we are to be realistic about the great task that lies ahead for the human race, it seems to me we must realize that we cannot maintain peace in the world if oppressed peoples are not to be made free.

Mr. President, I believe always in talking in terms of specific instances, therefore, I wish to discuss for a few minutes the problems of Korea. I wish to use the people of Korea as an example of an oppressed people who I think will always be a challenge to the peace of the world unless the world under the San Francisco Charter permits Korea to be free.

There is a country on the other side of the world which I think we ought to take some time out to look at and think about. In American terms it is not a very large country—just a little larger than Utah or Minnesota. Its population numbers about 25,000,000. It does not have any army, now, or navy, either. It cannot do much to help us win the war—not yet, anyway—but it may have a lot to do with how well we shall be able to keep the peace.

The name of that country is Korea. Right now it is under the heel of the Japs, where it has been for a full generation. A lot of Americans have forgotten about it, and a lot more are hearing about Korea these days for the first time. Out in my State of Oregon we are interested in Korea's past and even more interested in its future. For we know that what happens to Korea is going to make much difference in whether we can make a peace settlement in Asia that will stick, and we on the Pacific coast are vitally concerned with peace in the Pacific.

We remember, out in Oregon, that Korea has a history. We pass over its 4,000 years before the United States was ever born. We know that nations rise and fall. Korea had its best days about the time of Queen Elizabeth in England, and then the Japs under their first great militarist, Hideyoshi, set out to conquer

them, and to go from there on to add China, India, and the Philippines to the Empire of the Rising Sun. This happened in 1592, and Hideyoshi thought he would sweep through Korea the first summer and be on his way into China. As a matter of fact, in 7 years of fighting he never got beyond Korea, and never conquered it.

But when we out in Oregon think of Korean history, we do not go back that far. We let the historians salute the Koreans for taking the Pearl Harbor blow of the sixteenth century, and stopping the Jap armies cold. Our knowledge of Korea starts with the nineteenth century, when the United States went into Korea to shake it out of its feudal past and bring it into the orbit of the western nations.

After Perry opened up Japan, American ships sometimes bumped against the coast of Korea, and several of them had trouble. Finally, in 1882, our Commodore R. W. Shufeldt sailed into Chemulpo Bay, right up to the front door of the capital city of Seoul, and arranged a treaty of commerce and mutual aid. Early in the next year the Senate confirmed that treaty. We were thinking mostly of the commerce, and the Koreans were thinking mostly of the mutual aid. We got the commerce, and we let them take the mutual aid on trust.

That is, we did until 1904, when they really needed some help. In that year the Japs pulled their sneak attack on Russia, and sent troops through Korea to attack Vladivostok. Those troops were never withdrawn. When the Treaty of Portsmouth was signed here in this country, with President Theodore Roosevelt's help, Korea was casually handed over to the Japs as a protectorate. Of course, the Koreans protested, but the State Department refused to receive their mission until after the treaty had gone into effect. Five years later, in 1910, Japan incorporated Korea into its Empire, with all pretense of its independence dropped. We were the first country to close our diplomatic offices in Korea, and transfer all relations to our Embassy in Tokyo.

Through all the years since then the Koreans have fought in periodic revolutions for their freedom. In 1919 they formed a provisional republic, and have maintained it ever since. They have fruitlessly asked over and over again for recognition and help from the United States and other major powers. They have warned that Japan was using Korea as a base for an eventual attack on China. They have pointed out that as Hideyoshi's dream of conquest started with Korea 350 years ago, just so does the modern Jap plan outlined in the famous Tanaka Memorial depend upon Korea as the essential bridge between Japan and the continent. They pointed out the network of rail lines and highways the Japs were building in Korea, through country where their only use could be as military supply routes. But their pleas have all been turned aside. Through all the period between 1905 and 1941 we preferred appeasement of Japan to justice for Korea. We thought if we

let the Japs alone with the conquests they had, they would be satisfied to stop. Pearl Harbor was the answer to that.

The only point in raking up these dead coals from the past is because they have a definite bearing on the future. I think they have a definite bearing on the San Francisco Charter. Korea will play the same major strategic role in the future of Asia that it has in the past. For the 1,500 years the Japs nursed dreams of military expansion Korea kept them bottled up on their own islands—until Korea was turned over to Jap control. In 1895 China and Japan fought a war for the control of Korea. In 1904 and 1905 Russia and Japan fought for the same reason. Japan won that time, and the invasions of Manchuria in 1931 and China in 1937 were the direct results.

The question now is what the future of Korea is going to be. Will it be a base left in the hands of the Japs for a comeback in another 25 years? The answer to that was given by Roosevelt and Churchill when they promised that all of Japan's conquests were to be taken away. Is Korea to be handed over to China or to Russia, to become in their hands a threat aimed at one or the other of them? The answer to that question, too, ought to be "No," in terms of the Cairo pledge that "Korea shall, in due course, become free and independent." It is only an independent Korea that can serve the needs of stability in Asia and help establish lasting peace. As a free nation, without either the strength or the will to attack its neighbors, Korea will serve again as it has throughout its 4,000 years of history before 1905, as a buffer state. It would be the padding necessary to keep its ambitious neighbors apart.

This is the sort of function for Korea Sumner Welles had in mind when he wrote in his newspapers' column, after leaving the State Department:

With the restoration of Korean independence, one of the great crimes of the twentieth century will have been rectified, and another stabilizing factor will have been added to the new international system which must be constructed in the Pacific.

It is important, then, that that Cairo pledge of independence to Korea should be kept—important not only to 25,000,000 Koreans, but to us here in the United States, and to all nations that hope to see the peace of the future preserved.

The reason this speech is being made is not to review history. Nor is it to invite us to congratulate ourselves because in freeing Korea we have found a way to help establish a lasting peace. In these busy times I would not be taking up the Senate's attention if everything were going so well for Korea.

The fact of the matter is that there is grave danger we shall miss our cue in this drama that is unfolding in the East. It looks very much as though we are going to resurrect two generals we buried long ago in the European war—Generals Too Little and Too Late. We are paying altogether too little attention to the urgencies of the Korean problem, and when we finally get around to studying it, we are very liable to find we are too late.

Right now Korea is not a nation—so far as we are concerned. It is simply a rebellious province of Japan. No Korean delegates were seated at San Francisco—though the Korean Provisional Republic earnestly requested it be granted that same privilege that was given to Argentina and to Ethiopia and to Turkey and the rest. But Korea could not be there, for Korea has no government that has been recognized by our Department of State. Consequently, Korea has no voice in the settlement of its own future. And it has no effective way of warning the western democracies that they seem to be drifting into the same kind of appeasement policy that was adopted toward Japan in 1905, and that may well have the same eventual results.

Members of the Senate will appreciate that Russia as well as Japan has a strong interest in Korea. Senators have heard the charge of the Korean Provisional Government that a secret agreement was signed at Yalta giving Korea to Russia, and Senators have read Under Secretary Grew's denial of the charge. I shall accept the denial. Senators have also read Prime Minister Churchill's subsequent statement to the House of Commons that while there were no secret agreements of that sort made at Yalta, there were many intimate discussions of a sort that could not be revealed. It is altogether possible that the truth lies between the charge made by the Korean Provisional Government and the candid admission of the former British Prime Minister. From the trend of events we may well assume the likelihood that in the near future a Communist Korean government will be unveiled in Siberia or in Yenan and recognized by the Soviet Union as the true representative of the oppressed masses of Korea. Once that step is taken the result will be very much like the surrender of Korea to Japan in 1905.

We do know for certain that thousands of Korean exiles have been welcomed, educated, and trained for war and government in Siberia. We know that when Japan has been driven from Korea these Siberian exiles will be returning to their homes. We can hope that their effect will be only to create a bond of friendship and trade between Korea and the Soviet Union. As such they could help establish prosperity for a free Korea and make it easier for Russia to secure the ice-free ports it needs in that country, without military, political, or economic domination. This is a positive contribution of real value which the Korean Communist exiles might be able to make.

But they will play such a role only if it is a free and democratic Korea to which they return. Their influence will be beneficial only if Korea has a truly representative government, and is supported in its independence by the friendship of the United States and the other democracies of the west. This is the condition I propose that we ought to bring about.

While the initiative still remains in our hands, I propose that the United States recognize the Korean Provisional Republic as the provisional government of Korea. I think we should at the same

time promise the Korean people that just as soon as conditions permit we shall supervise a free election by which they may choose a government wholly of their own choice. And I believe we should then stand beside and behind that government with a real pledge to support its independence and give it a chance to rebuild the country the Japs have ravaged and exploited for over 35 years.

If we continue simply to drift along waiting for events to take their course, we can be confident of what course they will take. If we abandon Korea, it can scarcely fail to drop like a ripe plum into Russia's lap. If, on the other hand, we speak up boldly now and place the seal of our approval and support on Korea's determination to be free, we shall be taking a positive step that will help Russia along with all the rest of the world. For we shall be helping to assure that the Orient of the postwar years will be stable and will remain at peace.

I think the recognition of the Korean Provincial Government is not something that should be longer delayed, and I speak on it today, Mr. President, because I think Korea offers us a great and specific example of a future problem that is going to confront the United Nations of the world if they truly function in keeping with the spirit and the intent of the San Francisco Charter. If we keep faith with the charter we must see to it that in the decades ahead the world frees its suppressed and oppressed peoples. We cannot have a free world without its being a world of free people. We cannot have lasting peace if some peoples are oppressed and enslaved. Tyranny and exploitation are breeding grounds of war. I recognize that these great world changes to which I allude cannot come overnight, and should not come overnight, because the world will have to grow in the habits of peace. Under the San Francisco Treaty the great powers of the world have the chance to develop the procedures, rules, and policies to make possible the settlement of these great racial problems—for that is what they are in part—these great problems of oppressed peoples, in an international court where judicial processes and rules of reason will prevail.

Mr. President, I think I would be false to realism if I did not, in the midst of this historic debate, point out that all the San Francisco Charter does is to give men an opportunity to become civilized. It gives men an opportunity, in the course of the decades immediately ahead, to recognize that freedom is not an empty phrase, that freedom is a dynamic concept, that freedom does not exist in a world in which any part of the world is inhabited by oppressed and suppressed peoples.

Mr. President, that brings me to the second major part of my speech on the San Francisco Charter. I use Korea as only one example of the problems which lie ahead in connection with making the world truly free. That freedom cannot be accomplished through war. I am one who believes that it can be accomplished only to the extent that we accept and

devote ourselves to the objectives of a great international court, a court which I hope by the end of the next half century will be given jurisdiction over many disputes which have heretofore been denied an international court. So, in this second part of my speech I wish to use the World Court as another specific example of the great challenge which this treaty offers the peoples of the world.

Mr. President, the subject on which I now wish to speak lies at the very heart of any approach to organization for peace. I am speaking of the settlement of disputes between states, and address myself particularly to the World Court—the judicial organ of the United Nations. The charter provides in chapter XIV for the establishment of an international court as one of the principal organs of the new organization. The statute of the Court is annexed to the charter and forms an integral part of it, so that ratification will cover both documents.

Whether we look upon the charter as being primarily a method for enforcing the peace, or as a method for furthering and achieving international cooperation, or as a combination of the two, which it probably is, it is impossible to avoid the elementary conclusion that peaceful international relations must have a solid and firm foundation in law. It is an often repeated truism that the achievement of peace means the substitution of the rule of law for that of force in international relations.

The focusing of attention on the problem of international security and the power of the Security Council to repress threats to the peace tend to obscure the fact that the Charter not only attempts to regulate the use of force in the interests of all but also provides for actual decisions by a court of law. The decisions of the International Court of Justice are not likely to prove as sensational as the acts of the Security Council in a crisis, but they will form part of the quiet operation of the organization by which the habit of peaceful international cooperation will be developed. The criticisms which may be leveled at the political organs of the organization cannot be directed against the Court. Here there is no veto by the great powers; here there is no danger of a deal dictated by power politics or the expediencies of the moment. The Court will be composed of truly independent judges, owing their offices to no one state. Its decisions will be rendered in accordance with international law, as recognized by all civilized nations, and its conduct of cases will be regulated by the strict rules laid down in its statute. If states wish to have an impartial settlement of their legal rights, they may go into the Court with absolute assurance that this is exactly what they will get.

In giving our advice and consent that this charter be ratified, we should, I believe, realize that the organs provided for the carrying out of its purposes are as yet rudimentary in form, and that we should regard this step as the first in a series which must be taken if the United Nations Organization is to cope with the

complex conditions of present-day international society. This is true of the Court.

It is true that the international judiciary as an institution now has a substantial history behind it. The Charter states in article 92 that the statute of the new court is based on that of the Permanent Court of International Justice, which was organized in 1920 and which functioned with distinction until the outbreak of the present war. The Report of the Committee of the San Francisco Conference which dealt with the judiciary lays stress upon the importance of maintaining the link of continuity with the traditions and jurisprudence of that Court. It is significant that all of the international institutions and experience of the past 25 years, the institution which the nations represented at San Francisco most wanted to preserve was the Permanent Court of International Justice. The report of the President to the Senate states that there was unanimous agreement that it had rendered effective service and had made an excellent record. Fifty-one States had been parties to the Court's Statute, and the exercise of its jurisdiction had produced general satisfaction throughout the world. But 16 of the States parties to the old statute, including enemy States, were not represented at San Francisco, while a number of members of the United Nations who were represented at the Conference were not parties to that statute, for example, the United States and Russia.

So far as enemy States are concerned, no difficulties were anticipated, since changes in the old statute could have been dealt with in the peace treaties, but a different solution would have been called for with respect to the neutral states. It was argued that a statute to which they were parties and the Court operating under it could not be changed and taken over without their consent, and yet it was obviously not feasible to include them in the deliberations of the San Francisco Conference of the United Nations.

Although not a member of the League of Nations, the United States signed the Protocol of Signature of 1920 to which was attached a statute under which the new court functioned, and in 1923 President Harding asked the Senate for its advice and consent to ratification. The Senate in 1926 stated certain reservations and conditions under which the United States might ratify. Over the course of 9 years negotiations were carried on with the states which were parties to the statute of the Court and with the League of Nations. The statute was revised in an attempt to meet the views of the Senate, but in a final Senate vote of January 29, 1935, the necessary two-thirds majority required for approval was not secured. The fact that the United States was not a member of the League of Nations to which the Permanent Court of International Justice was related was no doubt a principal reason for the objections to our participation. It is well to note that a series of distinguished citizens of this country have been closely identified with

it. These include Elihu Root, a member of the advisory committee of jurists which drafted the Court's statute in 1920, and John Bassett Moore, Charles Evans Hughes, Frank B. Kellogg, and Manley O. Hudson who have served as judges of the Court. In fact, at all times in the Court's history it has listed an American citizen among its roster of distinguished judges.

Nevertheless, Mr. President, in spite of the fine record and traditions of the Permanent Court, the Hague Court of Arbitration, and of other distinguished international tribunals, the international judiciary must, I believe, as a judicial system, thus far be regarded as a primitive form of legal institution. I take satisfaction, however, in the belief that in this particular field advances have taken place in world thinking that bring us to the threshold of perhaps the greatest material achievement yet accomplished in the direction of organizing world peace and security. This opportunity which lies before us, and which I believe the Senate should not overlook, lies in strengthening and broadening the jurisdiction of the Court.

The basic jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice was over cases voluntarily brought before it by agreement of the parties. This kind of jurisdiction was, of course, nothing new. States had in numerous instances submitted their differences to arbitral tribunals by agreement, and the United States submitted many such cases in the period between the two wars and made many treaties agreeing to do so.

I cite as examples of arbitrations in which the United States participated recently the United States-Mexican Claims Commission, the United States-German Claims Commission, and the United States-Turkish Claims Commission. The claims arbitrated by these commissions ran into the thousands.

The mere fact of instituting a permanent world judiciary did little or nothing to bring to adjudication cases which would not have been submitted in any case. Even in 1920 there was a strong feeling that this was inadequate, and the statute drafted in that year by the Advisory Committee of Jurists which included Mr. Root, contained a provision that the Court should have jurisdiction without special agreement in four defined categories of cases, namely, those concerning: (a) The interpretation of a treaty; (b) any question of international law; (c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation; (d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

However, this article proved to be unacceptable when submitted to the League organs, despite eloquent appeals by representatives of countries which today are our heroic allies, and which have suffered most grievously in the present war.

As a compromise there was approved as paragraph 2 of article 36 of the statute a provision under which such states as desired to do so might sign declarations accepting the jurisdiction of

the Court in advance and without special agreement in cases of the categories mentioned, and as respects other states signing similar declarations. States which have signed declarations under the optional clause, for example, Mr. President, include almost all the countries of the world: Albania, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bolivia—I could go on down the alphabet, and it would be found that the majority of nations have signed such declarations. Such declarations were signed at one time or another by upward of 40 countries, including three of our great allies in this war, China, the United Kingdom, and France. In addition, many treaties contain provisions that questions arising from their application should be referred to the Court. In these ways there was achieved a very wide submission to the Court's jurisdiction, waiving the necessity of special agreements.

At San Francisco the attempt was renewed to obtain general compulsory jurisdiction and the records of the meetings indicate that the effort was eloquent and determined. The report of the committee which dealt with the judiciary records that a majority of the states actually favored compulsory jurisdiction. However, as some delegates felt that such a provision would jeopardize their countries' or other countries' acceptance of the Charter, the compromise of 1920 was again adopted in substance. The question of jurisdiction was thus in effect passed back to the individual states, and it is one which we cannot, in conscience, avoid. It is, in my judgment, Mr. President, the next great step which I think should be taken in implementing the Charter.

Moreover, in addition to providing for possible acceptances of jurisdiction under paragraph 2 of article 36, the Conference inserted an additional paragraph providing that declarations already in existence as among the parties and applying to the old Court shall continue in existence and shall apply to the new Court. Thus, the new Court will start on its way with a substantial number of its members obligated in advance to submit to its jurisdiction.

Mr. President, a quick check of a standard treatise on the World Court indicates that 19 states will be so bound upon ratifying the treaty. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point a list of the states which my study leads me to believe will be automatically bound under the optional clause upon ratifying the Charter, the total number being 19. The number may not be exact, but I think it is relatively so.

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

STATES AUTOMATICALLY BOUND UNDER THE OPTIONAL CLAUSE UPON RATIFYING THE CHARTER—TOTAL NUMBER, 19

Australia, Bolivia, Brazil, Canada, Colombia, Denmark, Haiti, India, Iraq, Luxemburg, Netherlands, New Zealand, Nicaragua, Norway, Panama, El Salvador, South Africa, United Kingdom, Uruguay.

Other countries would probably be included, but their declarations expired during the present war, and they were not in a position to renew. France, for instance, was in such a position.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, the Conference did one thing more. A resolution recommending that members of the Organization make declarations under the so-called optional clause was approved by a committee of the Fourth Commission, and finally by the plenary conference; and, as the Members of the Senate know, the fourth commission was assigned jurisdiction within the Conference of juridical problems. It was divided into two committees, one on the world court and the other on miscellaneous legal problems. I am pleased to find in studying the record of the conference that the votes, both in the fourth commission and in the plenary conference, were without dissent. That does not mean that the votes were unanimous in the sense that all voted. Some refrained from voting.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Oregon yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. What was the specific question on which the vote was unanimous?

Mr. MORSE. That was in regard to a resolution recommending that members of the organization make declarations under the optional clause. Also it should be noted that prior to the San Francisco Conference a number of important American organizations placed themselves on record as favoring general compulsory jurisdiction. These include the American Bar Association, the Federal Bar Association, the Inter-American Bar Association, and the American Society of International Law. In addition, a number of prominent individuals have endorsed this concept. They include the senior Senator from Vermont [Mr. AUSTIN] and former Associate Justice Roberts of the Supreme Court.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Because the Senator has not mentioned it, I assume that the American delegation did not so put itself on record.

Mr. MORSE. Earlier in my remarks, I explained that the American delegation did not so put itself on record.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. MORSE. And I am sure the very able and distinguished senior Senator from Michigan will be able to explain to the Senator from Colorado, as he explained on the floor of the Senate yesterday, as I understood his remarks, why they felt that the compulsory jurisdiction question should be separated from consideration of the charter itself. As I understand it, they felt that it should not become involved in consideration of the Charter, but that the Charter should be considered independently, and the Senate of the United States should at a later date decide whether it wished to adopt the policy of having this country accept compulsory jurisdiction of the court.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I take it from the remarks just made by the Senator from Oregon that he believes that question is a senatorial question and should be raised by treaty.

Mr. MORSE. Decidedly so; and let me say to the Senator from Colorado that I am sure I shall make that clear before I close my remarks, and I am sure the resolution which I am going to offer at the close of my remarks will leave no room for doubt in regard to it.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I would refresh the Senator's memory on the fact that Mr. Hackworth, speaking for himself and possibly for the State Department, wrote a memorandum to the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan which, to me, is not entirely clear in all its aspects; but certainly it contains a strong intimation, if not a direct statement, that such matters might be handled by the action of the whole Congress or by action on a treaty. The Senator does not understand that senatorial opinion is controlled by an opinion from Mr. Hackworth.

Mr. MORSE. Certainly not the opinion of the junior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MILLIKIN. In the Senator's opinion, the whole question remains open for future decision by the Senate.

Mr. MORSE. That is why I shall introduce a resolution at the close of my remarks which I hope will bring forth a full debate upon the subject next fall.

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

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. The Senator from Colorado referred to Mr. Hackworth's letter. Of course, it was Mr. Hackworth's personal opinion which was expressed in the letter, but I believe that inherent Mr. Hackworth's letter is a clear intimation that the matter is one for Congress to settle, because he indicates textually that precise fact. He indicates his own slant of mind in respect to what the congressional decision should be, but I think he concedes that it is a congressional decision.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator further yield to me?

Mr. MORSE. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I, of course, have no objection to any personal opinion which Mr. Hackworth may have. I merely want to make sure that there is no what might be called official opinion by the delegates to the convention, or by the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, or by the distinguished senior Senator from Michigan which might give official face to Mr. Hackworth's opinion and make it in any way binding upon the Senate.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, I am sure Mr. Hackworth could not bind the Senate. So far as I am concerned, the importance of Mr. Hackworth's observation, at least from my own point of view, lies almost exclusively in the fact that it forecloses the possibility, from Mr. Hackworth's point of view, that ad-

herence to the court could be ordered by a Presidential executive order without consultation with Congress or the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. Hackworth's memorandum, as I interpret it, refers to one category of cases upon which he bases the belief that the President could submit this country to the Court without reference to Congress. The basis of Mr. Hackworth's conclusion is the traditional handling of claims by means of diplomacy when this Government is not confronted with the possibility of additional responsibility or additional liability being imposed upon it as a result of that kind of a reference. At the moment I am not prepared to dispute the correctness of that opinion. However, if I read his opinion correctly, he establishes an alternative so far as the submissions of other types of jurisdiction to the Court are concerned. He says, on the one hand, that if Congress prescribes the procedure, we shall adhere to it. If Congress does not prescribe the procedure, we shall refer it to the Senate. I do not intend to engage in a debate on the subject, but it is perfectly obvious that so far as the treaty-making power of the Senate is concerned, Congress cannot change it in one way or the other, for that power rests in the Constitution.

All that I am driving at, I may say to the Senator from Michigan, is the end point that nothing contained in Hackworth's memorandum, or nothing that has been said here on the floor of the Senate, forecloses full good-faith discussion with reference to what action in the matter the Senate shall take in the future.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I agree with the Senator from Colorado. Mr. Hackworth's statement, so far as I am concerned, does, however, foreclose the State Department from ever suggesting hereafter that these decisions can be made exclusively by Executive order through the White House.

Mr. MILLIKIN. That is true, excepting in that narrow line of cases to which I have referred.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Yes.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I should like to propound a question to the Senator from Texas. I wonder if the Senator heard this discussion.

Mr. CONNALLY. I ask the Senator to excuse me at this time.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I share the views of the Senator from Colorado and the Senator from Michigan on the point that any future action taken in regard to accepting compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court, so far as this country is concerned, involves a matter which must come to the Senate of the United States in the first instance.

Mr. President, I could cite a long list of experts in the field of international law, and quote from them in support of the view which I hold, namely, that if the World Court is really to become a vital and effective force in the future in maintaining world peace through the exercise of judicial process, its jurisdiction must be enlarged, and countries

of the world must be willing to submit themselves to its compulsory jurisdiction.

I shall not take the time of the Senate to quote from a great many experts and authorities on international law, but for the RECORD I should like to read a brief quotation from Professor Lauterpacht, a distinguished British authority on international law, in his book, *The Function of Law in the International Community*, which says at page 429:

There is a glaring contradiction in the idea that in a society of states which are ex. hypothesi independent of one another, and in relation of equality to each other, one state may legally claim the right to remain judge in a dispute in which the rights of another state are involved—a contradiction which is not solved but accentuated by the rights of other states to disregard any decision thus reached, and in turn to set themselves up as judges on the disputed right * * * the existing rule, that the jurisdiction of international courts is in principle voluntary, is upon analysis nothing else than the right to exercise jurisdiction over a foreign state, not in minor matters * * * but in international relations proper.

In the report of the meetings of the 1920 Committee of Jurists, which made the original draft of the Court's statute, Mr. Elihu Root's remarks are reported as follows, on page 230:

The hopes of the world rested upon the realization of the rule of law. The creation of institutions with this object contains the germ of future development. Legal decisions based on previous decisions, of the same kind, it is this way that progress is possible. The world would become accustomed to act according to law. This does not apply to decisions taken by the Council. The Committee therefore should try to induce the nations to agree to a provision by which every question relating to the interpretation of a contract or a principle of law must be settled by judicial means.

Mr. President, the issue as between voluntary and compulsory jurisdiction is the difference between shadow and substance. Nothing whatever is gained by merely stating that law must replace force as the governing factor of international relations. So long as states have the option of withholding their legal disputes from adjudication, this remains an empty phrase, of which we have had too many in the past. In spite of the undeveloped character of its institutions, international law itself is a well-developed body of law, capable of playing a great role if regularly called upon and obeyed by states, and capable of much greater development if we will but make use of it. The mechanism for the selection of judges is such that only those of the highest capacity and integrity have any chance of sitting on its bench.

Mr. President, the materials and procedures are at hand, but they are of little use if we refuse to utilize them in cases of real importance. We need to know in a given case what the applicable rule of law is, and only a court can tell us that.

As a people we have long placed our faith in the law. As a lawyer and legislator I feel that the best hope of a stable world order lies in the development and strengthening of the rule of law. This

means, as a practical matter, the development and strengthening of the jurisdiction of the Court.

The adoption of the present article 36 of the statute, containing the so-called optional clause, leaves the way open for the achievement of general compulsory jurisdiction. If all states sign declarations under the optional clause, the same result will be achieved as if general compulsory jurisdiction had been incorporated in the statute from the outset.

It is very much to be hoped that this will be done. It is very important that the United States do its part to bring this to fulfillment, and in order to facilitate this, Mr. President, and in order to dispel any doubts about the attitude of the Senate, I am filing a resolution to be considered when we reconvene, proposing that the United States accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the World Court.

A substantial number of countries, including some of the great powers, will bind themselves automatically in this way upon ratifying the Charter, by virtue of declarations already in force. Many other countries will soon take the same step, and it is important that the United States take a leading part in this as we did in making the charter in San Francisco. We must show the world our interest and sincerity in developing the new system of international law and order. Other states have reason to wonder how sincere we are in adopting a system which we have always rejected before; and this would reassure them, would doubtless lead to imitation by many other states, and be in perfect accord with our own beliefs and practice. We could hardly do it before our people accepted the international organization; having accepted the Charter it is the logical next step, and will be an inspiration to the world.

Should this be done, Mr. President, we may occasionally have to take an adverse decision that we will not like, but I can see no alternative to war other than a system under which the various countries submit their disputes to the rule of law and, if they prove to have been wrong, in accordance with decisions by impartial judicial minds, the nations should accept the verdict, even if they do not like it.

Mr. President, I have spoken on only one of the great forces of the charter, the World Court. I believe it is such a creative and dynamic power for giving life and strength to a war-sick world that through its jurisdiction and procedures is to be found our best hope for bringing law and order into international relations. In ratifying this charter we are taking an important step along a long and hopeful road with a goal which has yet to be reached by the human race in its struggle to become civilized. Although we flatter ourselves by referring to our society as civilized, objectivity should force us to admit that resort to war is man's self-indictment of his primitive state. Have not the destruction, misery, blood, tears, and death which man has visited upon himself in the present holocaust of war, unequalled in all

of history, finally taught the peoples of the world that if they are to reach the goal of the civilized state they must learn to live in peace?

Law and order, based upon rules of reason, are the instruments of peace. The San Francisco Charter, in the form of the treaty which it is our privilege as the representatives of a free people to ratify today, points the way to civilization. Through the processes of its general assembly, Security Council, Economic and Social Council, Trusteeship Council, and World Court, rules of reason and just decisions can be made to prevail over the primitive weapons of economic exploitation, suppression of weaker peoples, military might, and periodic resort to war. The hour is historic, the obligation sacred, the challenge great.

In keeping faith with the hour, the obligation, and the challenge, I offer to the Senate of the United States for early consideration and action following ratification of the treaty now pending before the Senate the following resolution:

Resolved, That the Senate hereby recommends that the President of the United States deposit with the Secretary General of the United Nations, whenever that official shall have been installed in office, a declaration under paragraph 2 of article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice recognizing as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes hereafter arising concerning:

- a. The interpretation of a treaty;
- b. Any question of international law;
- c. The existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation; and
- d. The nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

Provided, That such declaration should be for a period of not to exceed 5 years, and should exclude from its operation:

- a. Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of specific settlement; and
- b. Disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of the United States.

Provided further, That the President be and hereby is requested to furnish the Senate for its information a copy of any declaration filed by him pursuant to this resolution.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to submit the resolution and ask that it be referred to the appropriate committee. I do so with the firm conviction that the resolution fixes the great responsibility of the Senate of the United States to keep faith with the spirit and intent of the San Francisco Charter, namely, that we will cooperate with the nations of the world in substituting rules of reason and principles of international law and justice in the settlement of international problems of the decades of the future. Only by keeping that faith can we establish a world of permanent peace.

There being no objection, the resolution (S. Res. 160), submitted by Mr. MORSE, was received and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. VANDENBERG. Mr. President, before the Senator from Oregon takes his seat, will be yielded to me?

Mr. MORSE. I am glad to yield.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I am sorry that I missed the Senator's discussion of the first point he submitted. I was called from the floor by a committee meeting. It was my understanding that he was urging in a general way that this institution must in no sense freeze a static world against an opportunity for peaceful change in behalf of oppressed peoples of the world.

Mr. MORSE. That is my thesis.

Mr. VANDENBERG. May I ask the Senator whether he called attention to article 14 in that connection?

Mr. MORSE. I did not specifically.

Mr. VANDENBERG. If the Senator will permit I would like to say very briefly that article 14 is, in my opinion, the direct and specific answer to the Senator's prayer. Very little attention has been paid to it in this debate. It is very brief, and I want to call attention to its language:

The General Assembly may recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations, including situations resulting from a violation of the provisions of the present Charter setting forth the purposes and principles of the United Nations.

When we turn to the principles and purposes of the United Nations we find among other things a dedication to the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples. Therefore article 14 actually may be read as follows:

The General Assembly may recommend measures for the peaceful adjustment of any situation, regardless of origin, which it deems likely to impair the general welfare or friendly relations among nations, or which threaten to violate the principle of equal rights and self-determination of peoples.

Mr. President, while article 14 carries with it only the power of discussion and recommendation in the Assembly, I think article 14 is the heart and core of the promise of this great adventure in behalf of the disappointed and distressed peoples of the earth, those particularly who may find themselves in distress and disappointment as the result of the expedient liquidations of this war. I think that this is our guaranty that we are not underwriting a static world, but that we do propose to create an outlet for the peaceful settlement and the peaceful adjustment of disputes of this character, of situations of this character, so that the world may progress in liberty and freedom by the process of peaceful change.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I want to thank the Senator from Michigan for his excellent contribution to the discussion. I am in complete agreement with him. In fact, the article to which he refers I think is one of the great inspirations that is to be found in the San Francisco Charter. Under that article I think the oppressed peoples of the world can take hope, and I am convinced that the implementation of that article is going

to result during the next 50 years in many peoples not now free finding their freedom under the democratic and judicial processes of the Charter.

Mr. VANDENBERG. I should like to add that I place such importance upon article 14 that I say now, as I said at San Francisco, that under no circumstances would I have signed this Charter without article 14 being in it.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, the question now before the Senate is whether we shall give our approval to an instrument fashioned through the joint efforts of 50 nations at San Francisco, and which is an expression of the hopes and desires of many peoples for peace and security, or whether we should reject this instrument and in so doing snuff out present hopes and aspirations of the peoples of the world seeking through international cooperation to keep the peace in the future.

It is my judgment that the American people should join with other peace-loving peoples in every effort to prevent future wars, and, accordingly, I am voting for the ratification of the Charter of the United Nations.

In voting for ratification, it is with full realization that it is not an automatic instrument of peace and justice. It is but an initial step that may prove futile. We, however, must do our utmost to make it a success.

The Charter is admittedly imperfect. The organization for international consultation and cooperation in the interest of peaceful settlement of disputes, created by the terms of the Charter, contains in itself no assurance that the world will be spared the holocaust of another war. Time alone will demonstrate the efficacy of the new league as an instrument of peace.

To all who approach the subject with unbiased minds and who are disposed to examine into it without passion or prejudice, it must be apparent that the avoidance of future wars will depend not on the words of the document formulated at San Francisco, not on the present declarations of its advocates and supporters, not on the mechanism of the Security Council and the General Assembly, not on the International Court of Justice which may render judgment when disputes are brought before it. Avoidance of future wars will depend upon the peoples themselves.

Any nation whose leaders really seek, plan, and cherish peace can attain peace if their inalienable rights to be free are not infringed upon through force exercised by other nations. When one nation fails in its dealings with another and violates the fundamental principles of justice and freedom it thereby seeks and flirts with war, and in such cases war is inevitable. We must realize that in the final analysis the avoidance of wars in years to come will depend on the disposition of the leaders and rulers of the great powers.

The charter has no curative powers itself. It is merely a mechanism for consultation, mediation, and adjudication. To achieve the goal of a peaceful world requires a fair, just, but firm atti-

tude on the part of the United States with reference to Russia, Great Britain, France, China, and the other states. It means setting up a high standard of international morality for every state to comply with, the utmost patience in the attempt to reconcile conflicting views, the fostering of mutual confidence in the fairness and good faith of the member states, and, above all, the constant exercise of the virtues of justice and charity.

As we look upon the world today with poverty, misery, destruction, and destitution on every side, we cannot fail to be impressed by the feeling of helplessness that now grips so many peoples; helplessness respecting their chance of freeing themselves from tyranny and oppression. We see the false philosophies of which they are the victims. It is the most disheartening feature of the present situation.

Indeed, a feeling of anxiety, and fear, and uncertainty as to what the future holds in store respecting security, the preservation of freedom, and of democratic institutions and fear and uncertainty as to the avoidance of future wars is manifest here in our own country as we debate and vote for this Charter, extending to the governments of the world an opportunity to establish permanent peace by the application of the principles of justice and freedom. This state of uncertainty and fear for the future is evidenced by the very fact that, while we are praying and hoping for world peace, we are in innumerable ways making plans to defend ourselves against future wars by providing an Army and Navy larger than ever before dreamed of in peacetimes, by planning for the obtaining of military bases in many parts of the world, and by proposing a peacetime draft, which was never before seriously proposed in the history of our country.

In ratifying this charter and committing our country to participate in an international organization designed to promote and, if possible, to achieve security and world peace, we must not for 1 minute suppose that military and naval preparedness has thereby become unnecessary and undesirable. Any such delusion would be the height of folly.

The Secretary of the Navy, James Forrestal, has expressed my thought in a recent speech to the graduates of the Naval Academy, wherein he states, referring to the difficult task of creating the mechanism to reduce the risk of greater wars:

I resist the temptation here to use such phrases as "guaranteeing future peace" or "insuring against war," because in my view there is no automatic way of insuring against war or of guaranteeing peace and I think it is unwise to encourage the accumulation of such expressions. They tend to diminish the very watchfulness, care, and prudent statesmanship which are the real guarantors of peace.

Again:

The most dangerous thing for the United States to do, next to a decision to abstain from such a world organization, would be to assume that simply because a document has been written or a plan drawn for international organization the evolution of the plan into a living and viable instrument will be automatic.

Notwithstanding all the confusion and skepticism in the world today, we must not abandon hope. Indeed, this Charter has distinct possibilities, and it presents an opportunity for right-minded, conscientious peace and freedom-loving leaders of the people to work together in the promotion of world peace.

Mr. BRIDGES. Mr. President, each Senator, we may be sure, is equally devoted to the hope of universal and enduring peace. We are all equally sincere in our search for instrumentalities to prevent a recurrence of the catastrophes which have rocked the world twice in our own generation. We echo the passionate hunger for peace that is in the hearts of the American people and the plain people of all the world.

The work done in San Francisco was a great contribution in the right direction, the direction looking to a peaceful world; and I compliment my colleagues who were members of the American delegation for their sincere work.

As never before in the history of human kind, free peoples everywhere stand united for peace. For the first time in the history of our own Nation, there is a completely nonpartisan and unanimous effort to find the way to a lasting peace. What we are doing in this Chamber reflects the prayers of our own people that at last peace on earth shall come to pass. In discussing the United Nations Charter now before us for ratification, we therefore stand arrayed not as antagonists, but as friends in a common task.

The European phase of the war alone has cost mankind about 60,000,000 casualties. Some 14,000,000 of them were deaths. There is no formula to compass the total of suffering and chaos called World War II. The only sinister certainty, as we survey the havoc wrought, is that if there is another war it will be even more terrifying and destructive.

Hundreds of thousands of Americans killed and wounded to achieve victory in Europe, hundreds of thousands more who have sacrificed and will continue to sacrifice their blood for victory in the Pacific, are the witnesses to this momentous debate. In the solemn presence of these beloved witnesses, in our eagerness to head off a repetition of the tragedy, it is only natural that we should reach out eagerly for every straw of hope. In our desperate yearning for peace perhaps it would be natural for us to ignore the defects of the Charter and focus attention on its promises.

Yet, there is no one among us who does not see clearly his duty to so search this Charter that all the people may have the opportunity to know all of its faults as well as its goodness. This is a turning point in the history of our government and our people. We are about to enter upon a program of world cooperation such as we have never before attempted. The deflection from our prior course is so great that we must not make it blindly. The effect of this document can be to chart the course of the world for untold generations to follow us.

The emphasis here has been upon the noble purposes of the Charter. To me

it seems that those who know the document best should have equally emphasized its shortcomings so that the people may know that the road to the achievement of the hopes of the Charter will be a thorny one. Knowing its shortcomings, the American people would be better prepared to make a full and earnest effort toward the accomplishment of the charter purposes.

I feel no restraint in addressing myself to some of the defects of the Charter as well as to its virtues. I could stand here today and speak only of its virtues. That would be the simple, easy thing to do, but that would not be meeting my duty as a Senator as I see it. To remove any doubt concerning my position, let me express the conviction that the document does not go far enough. I need yield to no one in my stand for the acceptance by the United States of its responsibilities in a world shrunken to a community of neighbors by scientific progress. My stand today for peace is as unwavering as has been my stand for the elimination of the German and Japanese hordes who would have ruled us all with an iron hand. I am meeting my duty to put a light upon the defects of the Charter because some of those defects can be so contrary to the principles for which our country has fought and still fights.

I shall skip over the myriad lesser "infirmities," to use the word of the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], and touch on a few of the major and basic defects.

The only acts of aggression or breaches of peace which the charter is sure to be geared to suppress are those committed by small and weak nations that is to say, by the nations which are least able and least likely to kindle another world conflict.

Even in those cases, Mr. President, investigation and preventive action can be arbitrarily paralyzed by any one of the five big powers which are permanent members of the Security Council. Thus, any small nation which enjoys the patronage, or serves as the tool and puppet of one of the big powers is as immune to interference as the Big Five themselves.

Let us face the fact: In the Charter we have an instrument for arresting acts of war by countries which lack the power for making war. The menace of large-scale conflict does not reside in quarrels of small countries by themselves. Such quarrels can be limited and isolated. The menace lies rather when the small powers act in the interest of a great neighbor and are provoked in their act by that neighbor. But in that case the veto privilege which makes the big power immune to United Nations action can operate to make the small satellite nation immune. The preventive machinery works smoothly until the point of real danger is reached, the point where a nation strong enough to precipitate a world war is involved, and then it can go dead.

We may assume, in fact, that every small country could be under temptation and pressure to seek a big power patron. Only in that way can it obtain an indirect share in the monopoly of con-

trol vested in the Big Five. One of the faults in the charter, Mr. President, is that its punitive and coercive leverage could be applied only against a truly independent small nation. At the price of its independence, one of these nations could free itself from the coercive authority of the charter, by the simple expedient of making a deal with a veto nation and placing itself thereby under its umbrella of immunity to United Nations discipline.

Therefore, it seems to me that the inevitable conclusion is that the charter can encourage the enlargement of zones of influence. This could result in a five-nation monopoly under the Charter which could have the right to impose a course of action on all member nations. The 45 beyond the pale of the monopoly could have no power to exact action or good behavior on the part of the Big Five.

Several times in the course of the discussion of the San Francisco Charter, a comparison has been drawn with the adoption of the American Constitution. It has been rightly said that old Ben Franklin voted for the Constitution notwithstanding its defects, and that the Constitution has worked out magnificently.

It seems to me that this comparison ought not to be used, for our American Constitution was sound in its over-all principles. It was democratic. It provided its own machinery for revision to any extent and was soon rounded out with a Bill of Rights that, in practice, has been its crowning feature. Most important of all, Mr. President, the American Constitution went to great lengths to guarantee genuine equality to the States entering into the Union.

We know that neither Ben Franklin nor the other members of the Constitutional Convention would have tolerated a Constitution by which two or three or five of the States were given a veto power over all the rest. There has never been a document, and there is none today, which can even approach, let alone surpass, the Constitution of the United States.

Mr. President, to prevent a repetition of World War II is not the same as preventing a world war III. We cannot go along on the theory that Germany and Japan will be the only sources of aggression in the days ahead of us. The end of the war with Japan should see both Germany and Japan so utterly, so completely defeated that it will be impossible for them to make war for generations to come.

Where, then, does the great danger of a third world war lie? It lies in the tensions and disagreements and conflicts of interest in Europe and the Pacific of the Big Five. These are precisely the privileged nations under the Charter. It is clear that where the interests of the Big Five are concerned, the Charter can take us back to the threat of war. As the Charter is framed, any one of the Big Five can prohibit interference by another.

Within recent months a threat of British force curbed French policy in Syria. A show of Anglo-American force curbed

Tito's ambitions, and, presumably, the Russian policy in the Trieste area. Had the charter been in operation, it could have offered no alternative situations unless France and, presumably, Russia had consented to interference.

One of the greatest failings of the charter is that it makes no attempt to write fundamental law. I do not mean to say wholly that the wise procedure would have been to include specific laws, but I do think reference should have been made to the basic moral code that no man should fall upon his neighbor. For example, the high principles expounded in the Atlantic Charter are the type of moral code to which I refer. I, for one, have not forgotten how the Atlantic Charter lifted the hearts and the hopes of all the world.

Statesmanship has been defined as the art of horse trading with other people's horses. The Charter can provide a legal cover for this horse trading. Calling as it does for unanimous agreements among the Big Five, it means that the Charter can cause each of the five to close her eyes and her heart to what the other four may elect to do in the spheres of influence which they may carve out for themselves. The Charter could cause the Big Five to resolve into a continuous game of give and take in which the things given and taken could belong to the smaller nations of the world.

It must be made clear to the American people that the Charter makes no provision for the disarmament of nations. In my opinion, as the charter stands today, it might even encourage the continuation of the present armed might of member nations. Our hope is in the Charter; but until we know for sure that our hopes will not be deceived, we have no choice but to be prepared for any eventuality.

I am very glad that provision for amending the Charter was finally inserted, but I regret that the method will not be more democratic. No such document could be written which would not require change upon reflection or change by future events. The framers of our own Constitution were very mindful of that truth. Their provision for amendment of the Constitution by a democratic process gave us a guaranty that the document itself would never be threatened by extreme difficulty of amendment.

My record testifies to the sincerity of the hope I held that all the lofty principles of the Atlantic Charter would be effectively incorporated into a permanent charter for world peace. We all recognize that some compromise is necessary to find a beginning for a going world organization. Yet there was a time in this war, Mr. President, when the country's leaders could have demanded and received subscription by our allies to the freedoms for which American boys fight. That was a long time before the meeting in San Francisco. That was when our righteous might was turning the tide on every battle front of the world. That is when our allies were dependent upon help from America. To me, the hesitancy of our Government, the hesitancy of our leaders to take the moral leadership of the

world at that time will always be a sad commentary.

Mr. President, I have discussed some of the defects of the Charter. As I see them, they constitute the reasons why we must proceed under it with a thorough understanding of the strength of the charter and of its weaknesses. These defects are the errors and omissions which the future must correct and fill in. I have no illusions about the document, and I consider it vital that the American people shall have no illusions about it.

It is my hope that the Organization to be established under this Charter will make a complete study of the criticisms of the charter made during this Senate debate. The criticisms made here are not to disparage the document, but to enlighten the members of the coming world organization as to what the American people would consider constructive amendments.

Mr. President, it seems to me that no man can refuse to marvel at the sight of representatives of 50 great nations of the world sitting together in discussion of common problems and creating this charter, as they did at San Francisco. To me, one of the finest points of the charter is the fact that men who represent the hopes and the power of all these nations of the world will, in this organization, live in an intimate and continuous relationship. Every world event will be on their agenda. There can be no denying that the peace of the world, when the present fighting is done, will depend upon Great Britain, the United States, and Russia. To me, it is hopelessly significant that the representatives of these nations can, through years of conversing together as the leaders of a world organization, help to bring about a meeting of the minds of free people everywhere.

Mr. President, I support and shall vote for the Charter. Frankly, I had hoped for the privilege of voting for a stronger and more democratic document. When the Charter is ratified and the world Organization is created, the hopes of the American people must rest upon the good faith of all the member nations. The success of the Charter must rest upon prayers of all the people that the members of the Organization will continually work for its betterment. Everywhere the people are clinging to the Charter as their hope for lasting peace. They pray that as nations have had the good sense to meet and work together at San Francisco, they will have the good sense to work together without selfishness in the permanent Organization. It seems to me that the nation that breaks faith with the hopes of the people will be condemned by free peoples everywhere.

If the Charter and the world Organization are to rid the universe of war and to bring happiness and peace to the hearts of men, the delegates must labor to bring about a charter which is perfect so that "that which is in part shall be done away."

Mr. TAYLOR. Mr. President, to be perfectly frank, I had not intended to

say. I am confident that nothing I could say would shed further light upon the subject of the United Nations Charter; indeed, in view of the learned speeches which have been delivered by my distinguished and able colleagues, I feel that it would be presumptuous on my part to attempt to do so. However, as the time has passed Senator after Senator has asked me if I intended to speak. I would reply in effect, "No, I do not think I could contribute anything worth while." They would say to me, "Yes, but when the historians read over the debates, what will they think when they find that you did not say a word?"

Mr. President, that is quite an inducement. Perhaps we should talk to the historians so that they will know what we were thinking about when we voted on this great instrument, and yet the suggestion did not entirely convince me. One Senator said, "What will you grandchildren think when they read the RECORD and see that you said nothing at this great time in history?" So I have decided to capitulate. I do not yet know my grandchildren. Perhaps I shall not know them for several years. Nevertheless, I feel impelled to say a few words so that they may at least say, "Granddad had something to say about the Charter."

In view of the fact that I am now talking to my future grandchildren and to the historians of the future, I feel more or less as though I were a voice from the grave.

Mr. President, it has been my custom that if I saw that a fight was won, I would not jump in merely to try to claim a part of the glory. I am frank to say I have uttered several thousand words on the subject of the treaty. I did so before it was written. I made my speeches on the subject of the Charter while I was running for office. I told the people of my State that I would vote for the Charter even before I knew what it might contain. I told them that even though it might not be perfect, certainly it would have to be vicious indeed if it were not better than nothing at all.

Mr. President, at one time we tried nothing at all. We refused to participate in the League of Nations and our refusal brought us only war, despair, and destruction. I cannot see how we have much to lose by adherence to the United Nations Charter, and certainly if it turns out to be a success we will have everything to gain.

As has been repeatedly said on the floor of the Senate, another war would bring an end to civilization. That statement was made before the present war even started. Science is progressing at such an unparalleled rate that I feel that if another war should engulf the world, civilization would actually be wiped out.

Mr. President, I know that the charter has its faults. It is not perfect. It would not be a solid roof over our Nation or other nations of the world. But we do not need a solid roof in order to prevent bombers from taking to the air. All we need to do is to prevent the bomber climbing into the air and being in a position to bomb us. After the bomber

once gets into the air, nothing can stop the bombs from falling. That is how I feel about the Charter. It may be full of loopholes; it may not be perfect; but I am hopeful that it will serve as a step in keeping the bombers of the future from going into the skies in the first instance.

It has been said, and I believe well said, that this charter is not, and is not intended to be, a static instrument. It is open to change. It is a growing thing. Even as we debate I believe it is growing. I am certainly convinced that the chances for its successful operation are becoming better. I refer especially to the results of the British elections. I feel that the liberal trend which has been recently manifested in England will make easier the execution of the provisions of the Charter which contemplate that colonies and dependent peoples shall eventually have their freedom. Certainly the recent action of the British people will make easier the eventual realization of such hopes. So, even as we discuss the charter, it is growing. I am sure that the fact that the Labor government has come into power in Great Britain has given new courage to the genuinely democratic forces in Spain. I imagine that Francisco Franco is trembling in his boots. For that, I am not sorry. I imagine that in Greece the democratic elements are encouraged by the new development which has been indicated. I imagine that in India those who have put up a long and courageous struggle for the freedom of India are encouraged at this moment.

True, I do not expect the new British Government to abrogate totally and unconditionally the statement of Winston Churchill when he said, "I have not become the King's first minister to preside over the dissolution of the Empire." I do not expect them to dissolve the Empire, but I foresee that they will give dependent colonies and countries an opportunity to achieve a measure of self-government so they can become self-respecting members of the British Commonwealth of Nations comparable to the position held by Canada, Australia, and New Zealand. So it is very encouraging to me to see that even as we debate, and before we have time to vote, the things for which the Charter stands are coming closer to realization.

Mr. President, the senior Senator from Ohio (Mr. TART) said that he felt wars were more apt to be started by political sore spots than by economic sore spots. I think the Senator from Ohio got the cart before the horse. We very seldom have political sore spots if there are not economic sore spots to begin with.

So I see in this peaceful revolution in Great Britain an opportunity for the English people to enjoy a higher standard of living. It seems to me that they have issued an ultimatum that they have had enough of lords and dukes and earls, and I am glad of that, because I have very little sympathy for them. Many of them no doubt are very nice people. I had the pleasure of lunching with Lord and Lady Halifax, and they were certainly lovely people to meet, apparently very democratic in their behavior, but their ideas

the fundamental things for which they stand, that is, perpetuation of a particular class in the country whence they come, those ideals are not democratic.

I have found the same thing to be true in the United States Senate. Frankly, if I had known what a fine group of men were here in the Senate, I might never have come here. It was my worry that they were not as good a group of men as I find them to be that spurred me on to come here and save the country. [Laughter.] I have found that most of them, almost all of them, have the interests of their country at heart. I could not say for certain that any of them do not actually have the interests of their country at heart. I believe a majority of them are completely wrapped up in the welfare of their constituencies and of the Nation. But I find that I am forced heartily to disagree with a great number of them about the things which they feel are for the benefit of our country. So perhaps even though these gentlemen may all be honest in their convictions, it is well that I came here, from my standpoint, to try to see that the liberal ideals in which I believe are victorious, rather than the ideals of those who are more inclined to believe in the status quo.

Mr. President, before the charter was written I told the voters of Idaho that I was for it. I think those who framed it have done a good job. It is not perfect, but it is a good job. I am frank to admit that I have been disappointed that Argentina was admitted to the United Nations Council. I do not believe in appeasement at any time, in any way, shape, or form.

For that reason I also have been somewhat disturbed to read in the newspapers that we are sending sugar to Franco's Spain. I have very great sympathy for the people of Spain, but I do not believe we are going to gain freedom for the democratic people of Spain by sending sugar to Franco with which he can bribe the people.

I have been a little worried over the fact that we have appointed as our representative to the Security Council a man whose background has been associated with United States Steel. We know, of course, that United States Steel has a great interest in armaments, and war naturally means prosperity for a concern of that kind. However, I have seen our new representative on the Security Council in the galleries of the Senate almost daily since we have started the debate on the Charter. That would seem to indicate that he has a genuine and sincere interest in the welfare of this organization.

Mr. CONNALLY rose.

Mr. TAYLOR. Understand, I do not mean to say that I have questioned the motives Mr. Stettinius might have, but there was that worry in my mind.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. TAYLOR. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. When Mr. Stettinius became connected with the Government in an official capacity he divested himself of his interest in United States Steel and

all corporate connections, and has no official connection with these organizations.

More than that, at San Francisco Mr. Stettinius rendered very distinguished service as the head of the American delegation and as president of the entire Conference. I feel certain that I can assure the Senator that he is wholeheartedly in sympathy with the objectives and purposes of the Charter, and I am sure he will make a very patriotic and diligent and faithful representative of the United States on the Security Council.

Mr. TAYLOR. I am glad to hear the distinguished Senator from Texas say that. It further adds to my confidence that Mr. Stettinius will make an able and worthy representative of this country.

I voiced my fear, not to question Mr. Stettinius, but rather to say to others in our country who might have felt the same doubts I entertained, that he is going to do a good job. As I have said, the very fact that he has been here interested in this discussion, evidently trying to ground himself firmly in the fundamental principles surrounding the charter and the wishes of Senators, and the construction they might place upon the Charter, has given me a great deal of confidence in him, and certainly I shall never question his sincerity of purpose or his fitness to occupy his new position. I have not questioned it now. I have merely voiced a fear which had at one time been with me.

Mr. President, I am sure that whatever I have had to say will not in any way make my name immortal. Try though I might, I could think of no way by which I could firmly tie my fragile bark, newly launched as it is, to the great ship of state which is certainly carrying the names of our distinguished colleagues, the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], across the seas of time and into the records of immortality.

Mr. CORDON obtained the floor.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President—

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield to the Senator from Oklahoma, who has some remarks to make at this time.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I rise to express the hope that a vote may be had on the resolution of ratification on this day, and I promise to delay the Senate for but a few moments.

The vote will come, I hope, shortly, on a resolution which reads 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. President, when the vote shall be taken and my name is reached I shall vote "yea."

This is not the first time, however, that the United States Senate has been called

upon to consider a proposal having for its purpose the prevention of war. In 1919 the Senate considered and voted upon the ratification of the treaty of peace with Germany. After a rather lengthy consideration of that treaty and after 17 reservations had been agreed to by the Senate, and became a part of the resolution of ratification, the vote was had on November 19, 1919. When the vote was cast it was found that 39 Senators had voted "yea" and 55 Senators had voted "nay." Immediately a motion was made to reconsider, and the treaty remained before the Senate until March 19, 1920 when again a resolution of ratification was voted on by the Senate. At that time, March 19, on the amended resolution for ratification, the Senate voted 49 for ratification and 35 against ratification. The Constitution requires that two-thirds of the Senators present must advise and consent to ratification, hence ratification was denied. At the termination of that roll call a motion was made that the treaty be returned to the President, and on that resolution 47 Senators voted "yea" and 39 Senators voted "nay." Upon the adoption of the resolution the treaty, of course, was returned to the President of the United States.

Mr. President, following the rejection of the treaty, we had a bitter political campaign in which, in my section of the country, the League of Nations was the paramount issue. In the two conventions of the major parties platforms were adopted. The Democratic convention was held at San Francisco from June 28 to July 6 of 1920. The Democratic Party, acting through its representatives, adopted a plank relating to the League of Nations which, without reading, I ask permission to have printed at this point in connection with my remarks.

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

LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The Democratic Party favors the League of Nations as the surest, if not the only, practicable means of maintaining the peace of the world, and terminating the insufferable burden of great military and naval establishments. It was for this that America broke away from traditional isolation and spent her blood and treasure to crush a colossal scheme of conquest. It was upon this basis that the President of the United States, in prearrangement with our allies, consented to a suspension of hostilities against the Imperial German Government; the armistice was granted and a treaty of peace negotiated upon the definite assurance to Germany, as well as to the powers pitted against Germany, that "a general association of nations must be formed, under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guarantees of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small states alike."

Hence, we not only congratulate the President on the vision manifested and the vigor exhibited in the prosecution of the war, but we felicitate him and his associates on the exceptional achievement at Paris involved in the adoption of a League and treaty so near akin to previously expressed American ideals and so intimately related to the aspirations of civilized peoples everywhere.

We commend the President for his courage and his high conception of good faith in steadfastly standing for the covenant agreed to by all the associated and allied nations at war with Germany, and we condemn the Republican Senate for its refusal to ratify the treaty merely because it was the product of Democratic statesmanship, thus interposing partisan envy and personal hatred in the way of the peace and renewed prosperity of the world.

By every accepted standard of international morality, the President is justified in asserting that the honor of the country is involved in this business; and we point to the accusing fact that before it was determined to initiate political antagonism to the treaty, the now Republican chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee himself publicly proclaimed that any proposition for a separate peace with Germany, such as he and his party associates thereafter reported to the Senate, would make us "guilty of the blackest crime."

On May 15 last the Knox substitute for the Versailles Treaty was passed by the Republican Senate; and this convention can contrive no more fitting characterization of its obloquy than that made in the Forum magazine of June 1918 by Henry Cabot Lodge, when he said:

"If we send our armies and young men abroad to be killed and wounded in northern France and Flanders with no result but this, our entrance into war with such an intention was a crime which nothing can justify. The intent of Congress and the intent of the President was that there could be no peace until we could create a situation where no such war as this could recur. We cannot make peace except in company with our allies. It would brand us with everlasting dishonor and bring ruin to us also if we undertook to make a separate peace."

Thus to that which Mr. Lodge, in saner moments, considered "the blackest crime," he and his party in madness sought to give the sancity of law; that which 18 months ago was of "everlasting dishonor," the Republican Party and its candidates today accept as the essence of faith.

We endorse the President's view of our international obligations and his firm stand against reservations designed to cut to pieces the vital provisions of the Versailles Treaty, and we commend the Democrats in Congress for voting against resolutions for separate peace which would disgrace the Nation. We advocate the immediate ratification of the treaty without reservations which would impair its essential integrity; but do not oppose the acceptance of any reservations making clearer or more specific the obligations of the United States to the League associates. Only by doing this may we retrieve the reputation of this Nation among the powers of the earth and recover the moral leadership which President Wilson won and which Republican politicians at Washington sacrificed. Only by doing this may we hope to aid effectively in the restoration of order throughout the world and to take the place which we should assume in the front rank of spiritual, commercial, and industrial advancement.

We reject as utterly vain, if not vicious, the Republican assumption that ratification of the treaty and membership in the League of Nations would in any wise impair the integrity or independence of our country. The fact that the Covenant has been entered into by 29 nations, all as jealous of their independence as we are of ours, is a sufficient refutation of such charge.

The President repeatedly has declared, and this convention reaffirms, that all our duties and obligations as a member of the League must be fulfilled in strict conformity with the Constitution of the United States, embodied in which is the fundamental require-

ment of declaratory action by the Congress before this Nation may become a participant in any war.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, the Republican Party held its convention at Chicago in that year. The convention was held from June 8 to 12, and in that convention a plank relating to the League of Nations was adopted. Without reading the plank I ask permission to have the text printed at this point in connection with my remarks.

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

(C) LEAGUE OF NATIONS

The Republican Party stands for agreement among the nations to preserve the peace of the world. We believe that such an international association must be based upon international justice, and must provide methods which shall maintain the rule of public right by the development of law and the decision of impartial courts, and which shall secure instant and general international conference whenever peace shall be threatened by political action, so that the nations pledged to do and insist upon what is just and fair may exercise their influence and power for the prevention of war.

We believe that all this can be done without the compromise of national independence, without depriving the people of the United States in advance of the right to determine for themselves what is just and fair, when the occasion arises, and without involving them as participants and not as peacemakers in a multitude of quarrels the merits of which they are unable to judge.

The Covenant signed by the President at Paris failed signally to accomplish this great purpose, and contained stipulations not only intolerable for an independent people but certain to produce the injustice, hostility, and controversy among nations which it proposed to prevent.

That Covenant repudiated to a degree wholly unnecessary and unjustifiable the time-honored policies in favor of peace declared by Washington, Jefferson, and Monroe, and pursued by all American administrations for more than a century, and it ignored the universal sentiment of America for generations past in favor of international law and arbitration, and it rested the hope of the future upon mere expediency and negotiation.

The unfortunate insistence of the President upon having his own way without any change and without any regard to the opinions of majority of the Senate which shares with him the treaty-making power, and the President's demand that the treaty should be ratified without any modification, created a situation in which Senators were required to vote upon their conscience and their oaths according to their judgment against the treaty as it was presented or submit to the commands of a dictator in a matter where the authority and the responsibility under the Constitution were theirs and not his.

The Senators performed their duty faithfully. We approve their conduct and honor their courage and fidelity, and we pledge the coming Republican administration to such agreements with the other nations of the world as shall meet the full duty of America to civilization and humanity in accordance with American ideals and without surrendering the right of the American people to exercise its judgment and its power in favor of justice and peace.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. I should like to state also that in the Democratic convention the nominees were James M. Cox, of Ohio, for President, and Franklin

D. Roosevelt, of New York, for Vice President. In the Republican convention, Warren G. Harding, of Ohio, was nominated for President, and Calvin Coolidge, of Massachusetts, was nominated for Vice President.

Mr. President, after the convention had met the Republican nominee, the winner in that campaign, in accepting the nomination at Marion, Ohio, on July 22, 1920, made an interpretation of the League of Nations, because he knew, and the country knew that, although the Senate had defeated the resolution of ratification twice, that such action was not final. So Mr. Harding interpreted the League of Nations in his address. At this point in the RECORD I ask that one paragraph from his speech of acceptance be printed in connection with my remarks.

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

If the supreme blunder has left European relationships inextricably interwoven in the League compact, our sympathy for Europe only magnifies our own good fortune in resisting involvement. It is better to be the free and disinterested agent of international justice and advancing civilization, with the covenant of conscience, than be shackled by a written compact which surrenders our freedom of action and gives to a military alliance the right to proclaim America's duty to the world. No surrender of rights to a world council or its military alliance, no assumed mandatory, however appealing, ever shall summon the sons of this Republic to war. Their supreme sacrifice shall only be asked for America and its call of honor. There is a sanctity in that right we will not delegate.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I have reasons well to remember that campaign in 1920. In that year I made a campaign for Congress in my congressional district and won the nomination. I was a candidate for Congress, of course, in the November election. The paramount issue was with respect to the League of Nations. In the beginning my State apparently was strongly in favor of the League of Nations. On March 19, the date of the last vote in the Senate both Senators from my State voted in favor of ratification. I am glad to be able to record that the two Senators who were then representing my State of Oklahoma have been here on the Senate floor almost constantly since the present debate started. Those two distinguished former Senators are Thomas P. Gore and Robert L. Owen. I am delighted that they are here with us still.

However, Mr. President, although the two able Senators from my State voted for ratification, in the election held in November of 1920, Oklahoma cast an adverse vote. My State cast its electoral vote for the election of Warren G. Harding by a majority of approximately 30,000. Five of the eight Democratic nominees for Congress from my State were defeated—defeated in districts that ordinarily are Democratic. In that November election the voters of my State stated that they did not want the Senate

further to consider the resolution of ratification of the Treaty of Versailles.

Of course, with that landslide against the Democratic Party I was defeated in the election. I have a source of gratification, however, that in almost 40 years of public service that was the only time that I ever became a political casualty.

Mr. President, the defeat I suffered in 1920 did not in any way serve to dampen my ardor in favor of the development and maintenance of an international tribunal having for its purpose the prevention of war. So, as a Senator, I am glad to be here today when I hope the resolution will come before the Senate for final action.

Mr. President, in spite of the fact that America claims to be a great peace-loving nation, I wish to record that we have been in war about once every 25 years since we aspired to become a nation. The United States came into being through the war beginning shortly after the signing of the Declaration of Independence. We fought that war and won it, and the people of that time, no doubt, thought they were to have permanent peace. Not so, however. In less than 25 years after we had established our new government we found ourselves in another war, the War of 1812. Then about 25 years after that war we found ourselves in still another war, the Mexican War in 1845. Less than 25 years after that we had the War Between the States, from 1861 to 1865. About 25 years after that we found ourselves engaged in the Spanish-American War in 1898. Then less than 25 years later we found ourselves in World War I; and exactly 25 years after that we now find ourselves in the greatest war of all, World War II.

While the United States has a record in war, it likewise has a record for peace. I remember the Bryan so-called peace treaties made in the early days of the Wilson administration. I have briefly referred to the fight for the League of Nations, in which millions of our people joined enthusiastically. Shortly after Mr. Harding became President he proposed a disarmament conference. It was known as the Harding-Hughes Disarmament Conference, and was held in Washington. In that Conference the United States took a prominent part in trying to induce the nations of the world to disarm, to limit the building of battleships, to limit the raising of armies, and to stop the making of equipment for war.

Following the Harding-Hughes Disarmament Conference we had another conference, sponsored by President Coolidge. At that time Mr. Kellogg was Secretary of State, and the treaty which was proposed was known as the Kellogg-Briand Peace Pact. As I remember, in that treaty the nations of the world—and most of them signed the treaty—solemnly agreed to renounce war as an element of national policy.

During the administration since 1933 we have had the Roosevelt good-neighbor policy, especially applied to the Western Hemisphere; and, so far as we could, we tried to have it extended to the entire world.

I shall not undertake to discuss the treaty pending before us. We have had much discussion, and I believe that every phase of that treaty has been well interpreted, and the various vital points have been brought out very clearly.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a statement by a prominent citizen of this Nation and the world. The statement is entitled "One of Many," and was written by Eleanor Roosevelt.

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

ONE OF MANY

(After the death of President Roosevelt, these words—deeply moving in their quiet restraint, and eloquent in their message—appeared in Mrs. Roosevelt's syndicated column.)

When you have lived for a long time in close contact with the loss and grief which today pervade the world, any personal sorrow seems to be lost in the general sadness of humanity. For a long time all hearts have been heavy for every serviceman sacrificed in the war. There is only one way in which those of us who live can repay the dead who have given their utmost for the cause of liberty and justice. They died in the hope that, through their sacrifice, an enduring peace would be built and a more just world would emerge for humanity.

While my husband was in Albany and for some years after coming to Washington, his chief interest was in seeing that the average human being was given a fairer chance for "life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness." That was what made him always interested in the problems of minority groups and of any group which was at a disadvantage.

As the war clouds gathered and the inevitable involvement of this country became more evident, his objective was always to deal with the problems of the war, political and military, so that eventually an organization might be built to prevent future wars.

Any man in public life is bound, in the course of years, to create certain enemies. But when he is gone his main objectives stand out clearly, and one may hope that a spirit of unity may arouse the people and their leaders to a complete understanding of his objectives and a determination to achieve those objectives themselves.

Abraham Lincoln was taken from us before he had achieved unity within the Nation, and his people failed him. This divided us as a nation for many years.

Woodrow Wilson was also stricken and, in that instance, the peoples of the world failed to carry out his vision.

Perhaps, in His wisdom, the Almighty is trying to show us that a leader may chart the way, may point out the road to lasting peace, but that many leaders and many peoples must do the building. It cannot be the work of one man, nor can the responsibility be laid upon his shoulders, and so, when the time comes for peoples to assume the burden more fully, he is given rest.

God grant that we may have the wisdom and courage to build a peaceful world, with justice and opportunity for all peoples the world over.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, as might be expected, all Senators have received many telegrams and letters from their respective States. I presume I have received my quota. I have gone through the letters and telegrams and selected those which I might describe as typical. I have tried to avoid

duplication. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks a number of telegrams and letters which I have received on this question. I ask that the dates on the letters and telegrams be omitted, because they have all been received recently. Also, I ask that my name be deleted, in order to save space in the RECORD. I ask that only such parts of the letters as are indicated be printed.

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

TULSA, OKLA.

I hope you are going to vote in favor of the San Francisco Charter, which hopes to put a stop to future wars in this world.

Sincerely,

ELLEN L. GOEBEL.

OKLAHOMA CITY.

I hope you will see fit to work for the ratification of the peace Charter, as passed at the San Francisco Conference.

Respectfully,

MRS. ORA WHITE.

OKLAHOMA CITY.

I hope you will ratify the peace pact when it comes to the Senate.

Respectfully,

C. E. SMITH.

I feel the world charter is a decided step in the right direction, and I personally would like to see it ratified.

Mrs. E. K. RAMSEY.

OKLAHOMA CITY.

I'm counting on you to support the United Nations Charter when it comes to the Senate.

Respectfully,

L. M. SMITH.

ENID, OKLA.

Please place yourself on record as favoring ratification of United Nations Charter.

Do it now.

FRED H. RIEGER.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

I want to urge you to vote for the United Nations Charter, which is soon to be voted on by the Senate. The people of the country are united behind the charter and are determined to make it succeed.

Sincerely,

MIRIAM MILLER.

GUTHRIE, OKLA.

I urge you to vote for ratification of the San Francisco Charter, and all supporting measures.

Sincerely,

MARY RUTH HYDE.

EDMOND, OKLA.

As a citizen of Oklahoma, I want to urge you to do all possible toward ratification of the world Charter as it is. I'm sure my husband overseas would make the same request.

Sincerely,

(Mrs.) MAXINE D. CROUSE.

ENID, OKLA.

May I ask you to use your influence and your vote to see that the Charter soon to come in for your consideration is passed at the earliest possible moment. It seems to me America should take the initiative and set an example to the rest of the world in making this effort toward permanent peace. It prob-

ably is not perfect, but it is a beginning and we can grow from that.

Sincerely yours,

(Mrs.) LILLIAN F. KING.

EVA, OKLA.

We heard by radio this morning that you are opposing the Bretton Woods monetary agreements. So we don't know how you feel about the San Francisco Charter, looking toward world peace. We hope you can conscientiously give it your active support, and I believe most of your Oklahoma fellow citizens would agree with us on that point.

Most respectfully,

CAROLINE A. HENDERSON.
W. E. HENDERSON.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

The war dads of Oklahoma are depending on you to make sure that President Truman and Secretary of State Stettinius include the American War Dads in the list of organizations sending observers and advisers to the San Francisco meeting.

L. D. LACEY,

State President, American War Dads.

BOISE CITY, OKLA.

Sixty Methodists attending local church Sunday voted I should wire you urging the ratification of United Nations Charter.

E. B. McMAHON.

TEXHOMA, OKLA.

We, the Methodist Youth Fellowship of Texhoma, Okla., wish to advise the ratification of the San Francisco world peace Charter.

GINGER PRESTON, Secretary.

EDMOND, OKLA.

Dear Senator: Believing that the ratification of the world Charter by the United States Senate at the earliest possible date is of paramount importance that such action will strengthen the influence and prestige of this country as a dominant force for world peace and security; believing that the organized good will of the world is now in the process of turning an important page in the history of human progress in which undertaking America by prompt action is privileged to continue her leadership, we the undersigned urge you to use your influence to the end that the world Charter be speedily ratified by the United States Senate. Your fellow Oklahomans.

Fred McCarrel, Mr. and Mrs. D. L. Meagher, Mrs. R. B. Handley, Nellie C. Broad, Mrs. Starr Otto Doyel, Mrs. H. R. Corey, Emma Plunkett, Emma Estill, Harbour W. A. Henderson, E. C. Hafer, Edna Jones, Margurete McGuire, Vernon Johnson, Dwight M. Davis, F. L. Fordice, Mary Alice Bolt, Marval D. Evans, Cliff R. Otto, Fred H. Ives, Guy C. Chambers, A. G. Hitchcock, L. B. Ray, M. L. Bast, Jessie Dhnnewby, Ethel Derrick, L. Jestonn, H. Hampton, E. L. C. Cantrell, Leda B. Brooks, Verona Hall, Mollie Ruth Bottoms, G. C. Watkins, Blanche Sommers.

OKLAHOMA CITY, OKLA.

The Oklahoma Girls State of 1945, sponsored by the American Legion Auxiliary, heartily endorses the Charter written by the Security Conference recently held at San Francisco. We believe the charter provides ways and means for international peace and world security. We, who represent the youth of Oklahoma, desire peace and security. The Oklahoma Girls State earnestly requests your support of the charter. A resolution favoring universal military train-

ing was adopted by the house and senate of Girls State.

LOU CAROL DOUDICAN,
Governor of Girls State.
Mrs. E. S. DUNAWAY,
Director of Girls State.
MARYLU SWEATT,
Speaker of the House.
MONTA MAE CHAPMAN,
President of the Senate.

THE METHODIST CHURCH,

Lamont, Okla.

It is good to hear that opposition to the San Francisco Charter is almost negligible. More than likely this letter is only one of a number of Oklahoma letters requesting you to do all in your power to see that the Charter is unanimously adopted by the United States Senate.

It was gratifying to hear that many of the amendments upheld by the Federal Council of Churches were adopted by the Conference. I hope it will not be too long before an amendment for international disarmament will be added to the charter. Thus, I wholeheartedly oppose a peacetime conscription bill. This, even though I have applied for the Navy chaplaincy.

Thank you for your letter of January 17. I appreciate your consideration of my convictions.

Sincerely,

IRVING L. SMITH.

AMERICAN WAR MOMS,
DURANT CHAPTER No. 15.

The Durant chapter of the American War Moms of the armed forces of the United States of America is trusting your judgment in voting on the world Charter. We will be back of you. Our prayers will be with you.

Yours in service,

Mrs. L. A. WISE,
President.

ENID, OKLA.

You hold an enviable record as a member of this national body of our Government. Your influence is urged in the following matter:

This is really what appears to be an optimistic hour in international history. The long and well thought out plans by 50 national heads having in mind the averting of further war has culminated in a proposed world Charter. The hope is that the Congress of these United States will carefully and speedily adopt it. This, in my mind, is the most significant move for a peaceable world that has yet been proposed.

May God intervene in this very crucial time in our Nation's history and keep us clear from this manner of turning the minds of our young men into channels that are not in harmony with peaceable home living.

With sincere good wishes for your continued success, I am,

Very truly,

(Rev.) CHAS. E. HEISEL.

BARTLESVILLE LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS,
Bartlesville, Okla.

The Bartlesville League of Women Voters believes that each one of us has a responsibility in building peace. We have studied and familiarized ourselves with the Charter for peace based on justice and security for all nations. We feel confident that it can be made to work if implemented with agreements and action necessary for full participation.

We urge immediate ratification of the Charter and also passage of the Bretton Woods agreements.

Yours truly,

ISABEL HULING,
Mrs. RAY E. HULING,
Corresponding Secretary.

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA.

My husband and I strongly desire that the United Nations Charter for peace be ratified immediately; also, that the Senate pass the Bretton Woods agreements.

Most sincerely,

Mrs. BERT SUTTON.

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA.

I favor the ratification of the San Francisco Charter without reservation or amendment. This is the most important document ever to come before the Senate, and I do not believe its progress should be retarded in any way. I have reasons to believe that you share my views on this subject.

Yours very truly,

A. O. HARRISON.

WEATHERFORD, OKLA.

We are counting on you to give full support to the San Francisco Charter.

Very truly yours,

Mrs. J. L. CERMAK.

WILBURTON, OKLA.

I am glad that Oklahoma is one of the States which desires ratification of the San Francisco peace Charter by the United States. It is the desire of myself and my mother that this charter shall be ratified within a short time. We believe it to be the best solution offered to a troubled world. There are others also who approve of the ratification. We appreciate your effort in this vital matter.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. LOFEETA MITCHELL.

TULSA, OKLA.

As member of Tulsa League of Women Voters, I respectfully solicit your unreserved support of the San Francisco Charter for United Nations, without any further delay which amendments will bring about.

Sincerely yours,

Mrs. W. W. STUMPH,
Chairman of Publications, League of Women Voters.

PHILLIPS UNIVERSITY,

Enid, Okla.

I was more than pleased to get your letter in answer to mine registering my sentiment for the United Nations Charter; and against the idea of passing immediately peacetime conscription for our youth. I did not expect a personal letter, for I know how busy you must be these days.

Cordially,

ROBERT G. MARTIN.

TULSA, OKLA.

As one who sincerely believes that the United States must assume a larger role in world affairs, and continue to exert its influence in helping to bring about a better and safer world, I urge your approval of the United Nations Charter, without amendments or reservations.

I have no illusions regarding the perfection of this Charter, but it seems to be the best document that 50 nations can agree on. Certainly it is a step in the right direction.

I feel sure that you will cast your vote for ratification of the Charter without changes.

Sincerely yours,

HAZLE STEADMAN,
Mrs. H. V. Steadman.

EDMOND, OKLA.

This is just a note to urge you to help affect a quick ratification of the Charter—to delay will mean Russia's not declaring war on Japan.

Sincerely,

LULA NAGEL.

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA.

Will you support the San Francisco Charter? It is our conviction the charter should be ratified and we hope you will favor it.

Sincerely,

Mr. and Mrs. DON E. SMITH.

PHILLIPS UNIVERSITY,

Mid, Okla.

Word has come to me, and it may be entirely wrong, that you who represent us in the Senate may not be in favor of the San Francisco Charter. For some time I have intended writing to you expressing an opinion or two about some of the issues up now for decision. This Charter ratification is one; the other is peacetime conscription.

Cordially,

ROBERT G. MARTIN, Ph. D.,
Professor of Old Testament, Director
of Personnel.

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA.

Please vote "yes" on the United Nations Charter.

Sincerely yours,

EBBA H. SMITH.

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA.

Will you vote for the United Nations Organization? We believe in it and want you to support it. We feel it is very important that our Oklahoma Senators support the United Nations Organization.

Mrs. JAMES PORTER.

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA.

I believe that it is imperative for the Senate to ratify the Charter for an international organization. Will you vote to support the charter?

Sincerely,

Mrs. A. K. WILHELM.

FIRST PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,

Bartlesville, Okla.

In the very near future you will be given the opportunity to work for the future peace and prosperity of America and the world, by voting for the constructive cooperative measures which our representatives have formulated at San Francisco. Your vote is important and is necessary for a two-thirds majority for the organization of a real international organization. This is a real forward step and means that the men who have given their lives in this war have not done so in vain.

Every voter in Oklahoma is counting upon you at this time.

Sincerely,

ROY M. SMITH.

THE PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH IN

THE U. S. A., SYNOD OF OKLAHOMA,
Oklahoma City, Okla.

The United Promotion Committee of the Synod of Oklahoma, Presbyterian Church in the U. S. A., met in Oklahoma City a few days ago, and voted unanimously in favor of a postwar organization among nations for enforcement of peace, and to that end urges you to help ratify the Charter recently formulated at San Francisco.

While the committee is not the whole synod, it functions practically as an executive committee, and being composed of some twenty-five members from various parts of the State, is fairly representative of our church which has more than 31,000 communicants in Oklahoma with a considerable constituency additional.

Yours truly,

L. C. WALTER,
Stated Clerk.

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA.

Will you vote for the United Nations Organization? I believe this Charter should be ratified by the Senate immediately.

Mrs. W. E. FEISH.

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA.

Will you vote for the United Nations Charter? The Charter is a wonderful beginning toward a world peace organization.

Very truly yours,

Miss ALICE EAKIN.

YALE AVENUE COMMUNITY

PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH,

Tulsa, Okla.

Along with many others I am very much concerned about the new United Nations Charter which has been presented to the Senate by President Truman. Although it is reported that most the Members of the Senate are in favor of the passage of this tremendously important measure, I realize that there are many possible eventualities which could interrupt its passage or destroy its usefulness.

Certainly no one will claim perfection for the Charter, but it is clear to me that it is the product of much serious thought and effort on the part of a group of the outstanding representatives of the nations of the world. Improvements will need to be admitted to it as a result of the international experiences which will be gained by using it. Attempts on the part of the United States Senate to amend the Charter or to attach riders to it may work to defeat its present purpose and to delay the coming of the time when it begins to be effective.

Therefore, I want you to know that I am strongly in favor of the ratification of the United Nations Charter with a minimum of debate.

Sincerely yours,

J. IAN FRASER.

YOUNG WOMEN'S CHRISTIAN

ASSOCIATION,

Bartlesville, Okla.

The board of directors of the Bartlesville YWCA in regular session of Monday, July 2, passed unanimously a motion that the board go on record as favoring the United Nations Charter, and instructed me to write to you. We urge that you vote for this Charter and give its passage your fullest support.

Will you write me giving a statement of your action on the United Nations Charter, which can be read to the board of directors.

Very truly yours,

LUCILE BAILEY,
Secretary, Board of Directors.

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA.

I am a school teacher and a voter in the State from which you are elected. It is my sincere hope that you will be in favor of the work of the San Francisco Conference when it comes before the Senate to be ratified.

Sincerely,

VIRGINIA EDWARDS.

WAYNOKA, OKLA.

As citizens of the United States of America and as residents of the sovereign State of Oklahoma, we, the undersigned, herewith respectfully advise you that we wish favorable action taker by yourself when the vote is taken regarding the Nation's attitude toward the San Francisco Charter. Since you are at this time known as a doubtful, we electors of our area are watching you and weighing you in the scales of public judgment. The will

of the people in your State is still your obligation in Congress.

Yours very truly,

James P. Lahr, Russell L. Floyd, Mr. and Mrs. J. P. Lahr, W. E. Lahr, Kate Lahr, Mrs. Gala Michael, Mrs. R. H. Wilson, Mrs. J. C. Peter, Mrs. John Terry, Mr. John V. Terry, Mrs. E. W. Bixler, Mrs. J. J. Wagner, Mrs. Chet Bixler, Mrs. Betty Heuen, Mrs. Galen A. Rogers, Miss Florida A. Rogers, John Paul Weeke, Mrs. John P. Weeke.

UNITA, OKLA.

I am writing to you urging your support of the peace Charter. Please do all you can for its passage.

Very respectfully,

MARY E. VALENTINE.

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA.

Will you vote for the ratification of the United Nations Charter? Any move to establish a stable international governing body is a good thing and worthy of the support of our great Nation.

Sincerely yours,

DOROTHY D. HILLYER,
Mrs. John C. Hillyer.

BARTLESVILLE, OKLA.

I want to urge you to vote for the United Nations Organization Charter as it is presented to the Senate. The eyes of the world are upon us and it should pass 100 percent. Will you please advise me how you intend to vote?

Sincerely,

Mrs. ELLIS MARTIN.

OKLAHOMA CITY UNIVERSITY,

Oklahoma City, Okla.

FOR WORLD ORGANIZATION

In view of the passion for order that initiated it;

In view of the misery endured through ages to obtain it;

In view of the unanimous approval given by those who framed it;

In view of the practical provisions that characterize it;

In view of the stability and security promised by it;

In view of the vision of peace it presents to millions,

We, the undersigned members of the faculty and staff of Oklahoma City University, by our signatures, indicate that we favor the San Francisco World Organization Charter, and hereby urge each of the United States Senators from the State of Oklahoma to support its adoption by the United States of America.

Clinton M. Allen, Dean, Law, Art, and Sciences College; Blanche Hanna; Edna B. Stevenson, Art Director; Mary A. Silken, Summer Faculty; W. H. Davis, Bursar; Veva Wood, Department of English; James J. Hayes, Head of the English Department; Theron C. McGee, Philosophy and Religion; L. A. Jones, Philosophy and Religious Education; Lloyd B. Drake, Physics and Chemistry; James Neilson, Professor, Public School Music; John F. Hedges, Department of Economics; T. Anne Garst, Secretarial, Liberal Arts.

WEATHERFORD, OKLA.

Please cast your vote in favor of the San Francisco Conference plans.

Sincerely,

Mrs. J. E. FRIESEN.

TULSA, OKLA.
As a member of the executive board of the Tulsa League of Women Voters, I cannot urge you too strongly to vote for the ratification of the United Nations Charter.

Sincerely yours,

JULIE S. HOLLOWAY.
(Mrs. R. Cass)

COMMITTEE ON WORLD PEACE,
SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION,
Waco, Tex.

This is to inform you that the Southern Baptist Committee on World Peace, on behalf of 5,500,000 members of the faith, is urging immediate adoption of the UNCTO World Charter as voted at San Francisco. We feel profoundly convinced that the United States should continue to lead in the movement to avert another war and seek to induce the world to enter upon an era of international cooperation. We trust you will be among the foremost in expressing what we believe is the firm will of the people in this regard.

Most sincerely,

J. M. DAWSON, Chairman.

TULSA, OKLA.

In the newspaper poll of Senators published last Sunday I was pleased to note your name among the Senators who signified that they intended to vote for the United Nations Charter.

I hope that you will lend your active support to the Charter in the Senate debate and work for its speedy ratification, so that the United States may be the first member of the United Nations in time as well as importance.

Thank you for your stand on this greatest of present issues.

Yours truly,

EVELYN P. WHEATONFALL.
(Mrs. Robert C.)

TULSA, OKLA.

The writer has two sons in the Army. That honor qualifies him for active membership in a now Nation-wide organization, the American War Dads.

I am a member of Douglas Workers Chapter, No. 46, here in Tulsa.

This letter is sent with the hope that you will agree that, of all those who will be qualified advisers at the San Francisco Conference, none could possibly be more sincerely desirous to help formulate plans to prevent future wars than the father who would represent all American war dads.

You are requested to contact President Truman and Secretary of State Stettinius immediately and let them know that your war dad constituents—through their chosen representative from the National Association, American War Dads—should be asked to serve at the San Francisco meeting.

The suffering, agony, torture, and wholesale slaughter of our precious sons must never again be repeated.

Respectfully,

WILLIAM K. CARR.

AMERICAN WAR DADS,
PAUL WADDLE CHAPTER, No. 55,
Lawton, Okla.

At a regular business meeting of Paul Waddle Chapter, No. 55, American War Dads of America, on April 20, 1945, it was passed on as follows:

Be it resolved that this chapter go on record instructing the secretary to write our United States Senator and implore him to call on the Secretary of State immediately and request that there be an official adviser from the American War Dads present at the World Conference at San Francisco.

Feeling that the War Dads of America in giving of their sons and daughters to go over there and sacrifice their lives in this

great struggle, that they in turn should be given the privilege of representation at this meeting to promote the interest of those same boys' and girls' future.

Respectfully submitted,

JACK TRENNARY, President.
F. M. BRANDON, Secretary.

CHelsea, OKLA.

I am writing you in reference to the San Francisco Conference now in progress. It is my desire that a peace agreement and terms for world cooperation be in accord with the recommendations of the Cleveland Church Conference held early in this year. Not only that, I should like to see the Senate of the United States of America demand that any steps along these lines be in agreement with Christian principles.

Very truly yours,

N. D. NETTLETON,
Pastor, First Presbyterian Church.

CLASSEN HIGH SCHOOL,
Oklahoma City.

By the reports that come to us through the newspapers, we are inclined to believe that a strong feeling is developing throughout the United States, asking for some young man in the armed services to sit at the peace table or take part in the San Francisco Conference.

Of all the young men that I know who are now in the armed services (a sergeant or below) none would fill this position better than John Pratt III, son of Mr. and Mrs. John F. Pratt, Jr., of 3221 North McKinley, Oklahoma City, Okla. I'm rather inclined to believe that Mr. Pratt's legal residence is Pauls Valley.

John is now a private, Company E, One Hundred and Third Infantry, and is with General MacArthur in the Philippines. As a senior in Classen High School he could discuss national events as but few young men I have ever known, and, too, he is well posted on international affairs.

I want to suggest his name for this place, should the President decide to send a soldier to either of these meetings.

Yours very truly,

C. E. GRADY.

SAND SPRINGS, OKLA.

Since the San Francisco Conference is soon to begin and is of such far-reaching importance may I express to you my personal desire and prayer that it will be truly successful from the standpoint of justice and Christian principles of righteousness.

I hope that the nine points of Christian ethics that have been recently recommended to the leaders of the Conference will be embodied into all the proceedings and decisions.

Will you not use your influence to help achieve those lofty and difficult ideals of universal peace and brotherhood. I assure you that many are behind you with prayer and supplication to God.

Yours sincerely,

GEORGE C. DE VORSS,
Youth Director of Church of God
in Sand Springs.

Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma. Mr. President, I am glad to state that up to this time I have not received a single letter or telegram from Oklahoma asking me to vote against ratification. Every letter and every telegram which I have received has been in favor of ratification.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I do not intend to enter into a general discussion of the Charter or of its specific provisions, except as to those provisions which provide for the quantum of concurrence necessary for decision in the two bodies, the Assembly and the Secu-

rity Council. This particular phase has not been generally discussed on this floor, except with respect to the provision for veto by one of the five permanent members of the Security Council, and yet, in my opinion, there is no provision in the charter calculated to do more to advance the ultimate success of this program than those wise provisions for concurrence of two-thirds of the membership voting in the determination of any important question.

During this debate some of my colleagues have taken occasion to discuss the question as to whether the provisions of article 43 of the treaty, providing for contribution by the member nations of armed forces and facilities, and providing for agreements to effectuate that contribution, shall be deemed by this Nation to require an executive agreement, a joint resolution, or a treaty. I shall not enter into a discussion of that question. I call attention to it only because in the course of the debate on this subject there were those who placed themselves on record as being opposed to the provision of our own Constitution requiring concurrence by two-thirds of the Senators present and voting on the question of ratification of a treaty. I recall that those who criticized that constitutional provision were also most fervent and eloquent in their support of the Charter. It is intriguing to me to find that opposition with reference to a provision in our Constitution having to do with that most important relationship, a treaty between our Nation and another, and to find the individual entertaining that view so wholeheartedly supporting the Charter which contains the same provision as to quantum of concurrence necessary with respect to any decision of consequence to be made. I shall not further discuss the incongruity. I mention it only because to me it is an intriguing situation.

Mr. President, I call attention to the second section of article 18 of the charter:

2. Decisions of the General Assembly on important questions shall be made by a two-thirds majority of the members present and voting.

The section then specifically sets out certain matters which are deemed to be important. Only on unimportant questions, Mr. President, may a majority vote of the General Assembly control the decision.

With reference to the Security Council, which is composed of 11 members, 7 are necessary to a decision; and with reference to the more important questions, those 7 must include the 5 permanent members.

Mr. President, in view of the general provision obtaining in parliamentary law that a majority of votes is sufficient for a decision and in view of the fact that that majority vote is sufficient for a decision in all legislative matters in this country and in most other countries where representative government prevails, it becomes a question of interest as to why the majority-vote principle was not adhered to when this Charter was framed.

I believe I can explain—I know I can do so to my own satisfaction—why the majority-vote principle was not adhered to. I believe it is most important to the success of this Charter that we realize the reasons behind the decision which was made. I believe it will help us in the days and years ahead, those trying times when we must make this program work, when we must vitalize it, when we must go forward as far as may be toward a realization of the ideal which is set out in the statement of its purposes.

Generally speaking, Mr. President, I agree with those who contend that the decision of the majority should be controlling. But when we consider whether that principle should prevail in this Organization, we must not forget that the Organization itself goes into a new field of relationships, that those who are parties to this agreement are peoples with different traditions, different racial histories, different systems of law, and difference interests. As has been said earlier today, Mr. President, the members of the United Nations Conference must yield up some of their international sovereignty if they are to get concert of action. That is something new in this world. It is going to be a thing most difficult to do—most difficult, Mr. President, for us to do. When we consider that in the deliberations which will go forward under the provisions of this Charter there will be upwards of 50 nations, with 50 different viewpoints, 50 different sets of traditions, attempting to reach agreement on matters affecting international relationships, we realize the difficulties which lie ahead. Were the rule that a bare majority would be sufficient for decision in such a body, there would be altogether too much chance for precipitous and ill-considered action. There would be altogether too much chance that a large minority might feel it was being imposed upon by a majority just a little larger than the minority. There would be every reason to expect a dissatisfaction, a disappointment, a disillusionment which might well lead to a rupture of relations under the Charter. In my view it is far better that we have the requirement of a two-thirds concurrence, even though that means that we must go far more slowly in making decisions under the Charter. It is better that the Assembly meet and fail to reach agreement, and meet again and fail again; it is better that they come time after time, discussing, debating, yielding, until finally there is a full two-thirds agreement, before action is taken.

Mr. President, under this Charter, I submit, the rule should be that we make haste slowly. We make progress, certainly, in adopting the Charter. But the adoption of the Charter is not, in the last analysis, even a beginning of the operations under it; it is but the authority to begin. After its adoption, the machinery must be set up, and only then can we start on the long road which we hope leads upward.

When we consider the magnitude of the thing we seek to do, when we remember the long list of failures in like

attempts that history records, when we have in mind that the frailties of humanity still exist and that the adoption of this Charter does not mean a change in the hearts of men, then we recognize that the thing we seek to do cannot be accomplished solely by high ideals, by high resolves. If it comes to fruition it will come through practical, consistent, day-after-day, month-after-month, and year-after-year effort of human beings to understand each other, and to reach an accord.

Perhaps, Mr. President, there are those who may say that I am cynical when I view this Charter and the possibilities of its failure. I answer that I must assume that viewpoint when I recall that from time to time I go about this land of ours, as well as this Capital City of ours, and realize that for generations we have talked of equality before the law, and have sought a higher level of social relationships, and see that we still have cupidity, poverty, and discrimination. They represent the frailties of human nature, and those frailties exist all over the world. I look forward with doubt as to whether this Charter will succeed. But, Mr. President, where there is doubt there is uncertainty. Where there is uncertainty there may be, thank God, hope. I dare to hope with all those who will join with us that the senior Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG] has been pleased to call this new great adventure, may over the long haul become the habit of peace. But we must go slow. The provisions in the Charter requiring two-thirds concurrence before a decision may be reached, were, in my opinion, most wisely inserted. To me they represent, as nearly as may be, the Charter's greatest guarantee of ultimate success. The same applies with reference to the action by the Security Council. Seven of the total of eleven, or as nearly two-thirds as there may be, must agree before important decisions may be reached.

Mr. President, there is that other and most greatly debated provision in the Charter, namely, that, with regard to amending the Charter with regard to the use of force, and so forth, the vote must not only be 7 out of 11, but there must be unanimity of the vote of the 5 permanent members of the Security Council.

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

Mr. CORDON. I yield.

Mr. BURTON. I am interested in the Senator's discussion of certain special majorities required under the charter. While he is emphasizing the cases in which such special majorities are required, I wish to invite his comment on a number of cases in which special majorities are not required, thereby indicating that in certain cases a simple majority is deemed sufficient to meet the needs of the case. For example, I refer to action by the Economic and Social Council, action by the International Court of Justice, action by the Trusteeship Council, and action by the General Assembly on matters of minor importance. These constitute a large field in which we can rely on decision by a simple majority vote.

Mr. CORDON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Ohio for his contribution. I would have reached some of those points a little later, but I am glad that they have been brought up now, because the inclusion of those cases in which action may be had by a majority vote, emphasizes the wisdom of the provisions for the two-thirds concurrence which is required in the Assembly and in the Council. In the instances called to my attention by my colleague from Ohio, the bodies are selected groups. They will come together and meet over a period of time. They will become acquainted with each other. The subjects to be considered are, to a very great extent, noncontroversial internationally. In that field, wisely again, the Charter permits of a decision by a majority vote. However, in those controversial questions involving international relationships, the two-thirds rule will apply in every instance.

Mr. President, I return to the only remaining aspect of the Charter and the problem which I intended to discuss, namely, that deprecated and criticized provision which gives to the permanent members of the Security Council the power of veto.

I am one of those, Mr. President, who is committed to the view that that provision also is a most sound one. Let us remember that the Charter itself did not create the power of veto. The power of veto exists as a fact, and the provision in the Charter simply officially recognizes that fact. The number of people who are united socially and governmentally in the great nations themselves, constitute the power of veto.

It exists as a fact. It would exist independently of any recognition in the Charter, and those who framed the Charter in my humble opinion never showed greater wisdom, greater understanding of the international problems which are before us, than when they recognized the existence of the power of veto, and provided in the Charter a means within the Charter and as a part of the operation of the Charter for the exercise of that power. As a result of those provisions for veto, and for the exercise of that power, as they appear in the Charter, the veto of the great nations may be exercised legally and the Charter continue to function.

Mr. President, had the minds of those gathered at San Francisco reached agreement on a provision which did not contain the provision for veto, we might well have gone forward in high hopes under the charter and then found, to our sad disillusionment, and the disillusionment of the world, that on some decision made by the Security Council there was such a sharp difference of opinion by a nation having the inherent power to assert its disagreement, and that that nation would refuse to abide by the decision made. In that event, on that day and at that minute, our Charter would be torn into shreds and become a scrap of paper, and a distraught world would again face a tragic failure in its efforts toward world peace; but because that provision is in the Charter, because now a veto may

be registered, and registered in accordance with agreement of all nations, the Charter can continue to exist, and the nations can go on working toward a better world.

Mr. President, it may well be that when the veto power is used in the years ahead there may be bitter disappointment among the member nations of this Organization. It may be that disillusionment will come in the minds of men. It may be that we shall become hopeless as to the future possibilities of success. But at least the fabric of the Organization will still remain, at least we can still continue to strive for the ends we seek. At least, Mr. President, the new Organization can go forward in the knowledge that hot blood will cool, that stiff wills will unbend, that reason will prevail, that time is working with us who seek the objectives of permanent world peace.

We may go forward despite such a veto, however important the problem may be the solution of which was stopped by the veto. We may still go forward under the Charter—and that is the point—still seeking the achievement, still probing for ways and means to reach the end sought.

It is, Mr. President, through the elasticity of this Charter that I envision the hope that it may succeed; but it will succeed only if we and all the peoples of the earth recognize that the thing we seek lies far, far ahead, that we must crawl before we walk, that we must give and take, that we must forever remember that nations, although composed of individuals, have a curious individuality of their own, and that we must recognize the frailties of nationalistic viewpoints, and not be disappointed and not give up. With that realization, and by a steady and consistent action within the rules and the practices set up in the Charter, we may look forward and hope that the day may come when a new world will be born.

Mr. OVERTON. Mr. President, I have from the beginning favored and I do now favor the ratification of the Charter of the United Nations, and I am opposed to any reservations which may be offered thereto. I shall vote accordingly.

Mr. ANDREWS. Mr. President, as Members of the United States Senate we will soon answer the roll call for ratification on the United Nations Charter. Ours will be among the first of 50 civilized nations of the world to pledge the faith of our people to the objective embodied in that greatest human devised document of all times.

OUR CONSTITUTIONAL POWERS

Under article 43 we are pledging this Nation to make available to the Security Council of the United Nations such armed forces, assistance, and facilities as will maintain international peace and security. To implement and enforce this obligation will require other special agreements fixing the number and type of our available forces and their degree of readiness and their general location.

The question discussed more than any other by previous speakers is whether an additional agreement to be negotiated later by us—when the required number of

signatory nations have ratified it—must under our Constitution, first, be approved by a two-thirds vote of the Senate as a treaty, or, second, whether our share of the military forces could be authorized by the enactment of a resolution or bill passed by both Houses of Congress; or, third, whether or not sufficient power to meet our obligations in the case of armed aggression against us or other member nations could be authoritatively met by Executive orders of the President of the United States.

Article 45 of the United Nations Charter provides:

In order to enable the United Nations to take urgent military measures, members shall hold immediately available national air force contingents for combined international enforcement action. The strength and degree of readiness of these contingents and plans for their combined action shall be determined, within the limits laid down in the special agreement or agreements referred to in article 43, by the Security Council with the assistance of the Military Staff Committee.

Article 43, referred to in article 45, provides as follows:

1. All 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.

2. Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.

3. 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 or between the Security Council and groups of members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

It has been contended and perhaps will be contended if the Charter is ratified by the Senate that before the United States delegate agrees to any action being considered by the Council he should first secure the approval of the Senate. In theory this argument in favor of such a restrictive arrangement is that an agreement reached by the Council would have the force of a treaty and thus should be subject to Senate ratification by two-thirds vote. If the Council's decision may require actually the use of force by the United Nations it would be tantamount to a declaration of war, which requires the approval of both Houses of Congress. This argument seems to ignore the realities of the Charter as well as our constitutional procedure.

It is plain that under the Charter every one of the five great powers permanently represented on the Council possesses an absolute veto on sanctions be they economic, financial, or military. In other words, the Charter is not designed to be an instrument capable of coercing a major power even one that has plainly taken the path of aggression. Such coercion if deemed necessary could, and no doubt would, be applied outside the Charter. That will mean war, a war requiring the consent of Congress.

The question arises as to whether or not the coercive powers of the Council with respect to disputes among smaller nations should have something to say as to whether American military and air power are to be used against a nation that has violated its pledge under the covenant. We must bear in mind that under the Constitution the President possesses and has repeatedly exercised his authority as Commander in Chief to use forceful means to protect American interests in the far corners of the world, without seeking or getting permission of Congress. The earliest interpretation of the powers of the President on that subject was when the Constitution was new and the executive military powers were mostly in the hands of those officials who made the Constitution as exemplified in the early days with the barbaric pirates and scores of instances since then.

The authority of the American delegate on the Security Council to approve action by that body to punish acts of aggression of one nation against another clearly comes within the purview of this police power of the Security Council. The powers of our delegate would be exercised and would be equivalent to the President's constitutional power to use the armed forces in any immediate contingency that threatens peace of the world.

It should be emphasized that in almost every instance of outbreaks of aggression the American Government and the American public including the Congress will have had time to make up their minds as to the attitude the United States should take, and it is very doubtful that the American delegate will vote in favor of the action if the sentiment in this country is opposed to it. Communication between the delegate, wherever the headquarters of the United Nations may be, and the people of the United States would be swift and accurate. It is most certain that the President and Congress will be in daily and perhaps hourly touch with any troubled situation and the Security Council itself through radio, telegraph, and wireless, and could thus form an opinion upon which to base the proper sentiment and necessary action. The only difference in the manner in which those matters would be handled now as compared to the past will be that a dispute being considered by the Security Council will have the right of publicity thrown on it and it will thus be easy and not difficult for the American people to make up their minds regarding the merits of a dispute.

The Charter provides that each member of the Security Council shall have one representative; thus the member is the United States of America and not the individual who represents it. It is the United States that has one vote through its representative on the Council. Furthermore, chapter 23 of the Charter contemplates specifically that the Security Council shall hold periodic meetings at which each of its members may

if it so desires be represented by a member of the Government or by some other specifically designated representative. It is clear that at Dumbarton Oaks and at San Francisco it was always assumed that at important meetings of the Council the representative would be the Minister of Foreign Affairs or one clothed with similar powers and that at the most important meetings that representative would probably be the President himself and other heads of our Government. The misunderstanding, if there be such, is probably due to the fact that chapter 5, article 28 of the Charter says that the Security Council shall be so organized as to be able to function continuously. Each member shall for this purpose be represented at all times at the seat of the Organization. I contend that the whole context of the Charter makes it clear that its permanent official is in effect an ambassador dealing with routine operations and reporting through the State Department to the President, carrying out his instructions but making no independent decisions of his own on matters of policy or declaring a state of war. He is only a representative at the seat of the organization and while he might be designated by the President, on the advice of the Secretary of State, to be the United States representative of the United States at a meeting, the intent seems clear that when anything important is being considered the representative should be the Secretary of State or some other member of the Government or even the President himself. Our representative under the Charter under our Constitution would be a diplomatic agent appointed by the President and confirmed by the Senate, differing in no way from any other diplomatic officer; for to give him an independent power would be to impair the President's authority to conduct the foreign affairs of the United States and his authority as Commander in Chief.

Authority for the steps we are taking is to be found in our fundamental law:

The Constitution of the United States in article II, section 1, provides that the executive power shall be vested in the President of the United States of America. Section 2 provides, among other things, that "the President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States." Section 8, of article I, of the Constitution provides that "the Congress shall have the power to provide for organizing an army and disciplining the militia and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States." It is thus seen that the Constitution is clear as to the powers of the President to be exercised in all contingencies and operations of military forces that might arise with regard to our duties to the United Nations under its charter.

Even a State of the Union may under our Federal Constitution wage war against a foreign enemy. It is provided

in clause 3, section 10, of article I that "no State shall without the consent of Congress engage in war unless actually invaded or in such immediate danger as will admit of no delay." This would be exactly the condition, under which the United Nations would have to operate. It cannot be successfully denied that it has long been our policy under the authority of the Constitution for the President to resort to arms when the rights of citizens of the United States are being infringed or violated or "in such immediate danger as will not admit of delay."

There can be no serious doubt that the Congress can by statute authorize the various steps required to prevent or repel invasion or aggression upon a member nation when there is such immediate danger as will not admit of delay, nor can it be doubted that if the Congress is not in session that the President may act under such conditions in any emergency until the Congress can convene. He would be acting in self defense for the people of the United States in case of aggression upon our territory or to prevent a threatened attack or aggression upon the territory of a neighbor or member nation.

It must be admitted on all sides that a declaration of war must be met by a declaration of war by Congress.

We have learned a useful lesson—that among the democratic peoples of the world there should be a closer bond than the mere possession of a common enemy for the war's duration. There can be no better way to cement our common interest than to cooperate as closely in peace as when the emergency of war is upon us.

It will be infinitely easier to reach a common agreement on the practical measures required to carry out the essentials of the United Nations Charter while the United Nations are joined together in the common struggle than if the search for that agreement be postponed until after the war is all won and the blessings of peace have returned.

Lord Halifax recently asserted that "mankind will march to little purpose unless we try to achieve a better way of life in the future for all men, irrespective of who they are or where they live."

Very recently Dr. Wei Tao-ming, Chinese Ambassador to the United States, expressed the view that "When victory comes after the present war, we must continue to hold together, steadfast and unwavering, in order to win the peace."

OUR RESPONSIBILITY TO INSURE PEACE

Now that we know it, why can we not tell the American people that a minority of the United States Senate, and not the Versailles Treaty makers, were mainly responsible for the collapse of the League of Nations? History must ultimately record the truth that the American people were not willing to take the trouble and risk, the expense necessary to see that the Versailles Treaty should succeed before the world.

It is infinitely more practicable and economical to assume our share in effectively sponsoring a plan for insuring world peace than to again suffer the horrors of another useless war of blood, sweat, and tears and billions of dollars in tax money charged to loss and waste.

People of all countries know we are not a warlike Nation. We covet not the lands or possessions of any nation on earth; we expect no reparations or territory at the close of this war except bases to maintain peace. We have not only favored international justice; we have shown our faith by working for it in principle.

Through modern methods of communication and transportation, countries are much closer commercially, socially, and economically than were the Thirteen Original States when Washington cautioned us against "foreign entanglements." The world has grown so small that we are our "neighbor's keeper" whether we admit it or not. When our neighbor is in trouble, we are in trouble, for if he is subdued by a ruthless enemy we have to suffer with him.

Perhaps there are some Americans who are isolationists out of prejudice or mere obstinacy; many no doubt take that attitude through indifference as to the true nature of our responsibility. This certainly accounts for the isolationism of most Americans. In peace times the average American—secure in his own freedom—is naturally indifferent as to how other nations or peoples may govern themselves. He wants to be let alone.

Since the birth of our Nation, the American people have acquired political and economic powers faster than they had ever been acquired before by any other peoples. What we either did not know, or chose to ignore, was that vital political power is never acquired without the simultaneous acquirement of a commensurate responsibility.

In our world of the future we must learn that those who have the power to keep the peace have the responsibility to keep the peace, regardless of their personal preference. The power alone imposes the responsibility. Those on whom it is imposed may try to deny it or evade it, but they cannot abolish it. If they do, their own and our punishment is as inevitable as that the night follows the day. If they avoid the responsibility to keep the peace, there will be no peace for our people or the world. If there is no peace, there can be no freedom from fear, freedom from want, freedom of speech, or freedom of religion.

Peace will reign in this world only where and when the preponderance of the free, independent nations of the world are definitely committed to the support of law and order. When this war is over the United States will no doubt possess an unprecedented large share of all the military power remaining in the world. If that power is not committed to the support of interna-

tional law and order, we mak look for another World War within the next generation.

National self-complacency as we have known it in the twenties and thirties must not become dominant in this country again. The old idea that we are so removed from international strife and dictators that nobody will attack us was blown up at Pearl Harbor.

Democracy is not property. It is not a shore line, nor an island possession, nor maritime commerce. It is an ideal founded on centuries of trial and error in attempts at self-government and free and peaceful intercourse among nations. For us it is the basis of our American way of life, and when that is no longer safe, nothing we have is safe.

We have our faults, and they are many, but the obsession that we are a master race is not among them; and once the people of America decide that it is their duty to support and aid in enforcing law and order throughout the world, they will do just that. They are ready to do just that.

We have resolved that the awful sacrifice we are making in this terrible World-wide War shall not be bargained away at the peace table. Let it not be said that we failed to keep the faith with those who fell at Pearl Harbor, north Africa, the western front, Bataan, and Okinawa.

History has already recorded that we failed to keep the faith with our men who died to make the world safe for democracy on the soil of France and Belgium in the last World War.

We are now engaged in the awful task that definitely rests upon us and our gallant allies to make the world a safer place in which to live. That responsibility is both dangerous and expensive. Nevertheless, it is ours. We can try to evade it, but we cannot avoid it. Repudiation will inevitably bring a repetition of the punishment we and our sons are enduring now for having repudiated it 25 years ago.

We are again fighting for peace—a sustaining peace—not alone for our own America, but for peace-loving peoples everywhere. A nobler cause never sprang from human breast, and a Nation dedicated to such a holy cause can never die.

WOODROW WILSON'S PROPHECY AND WARNING

The Presidential train had just pulled into Pueblo, Colo., on the afternoon of September 26, 1919. It was the last public appearance of Woodrow Wilson as President of the United States. As usual, the President was talking extemporaneously in the fluent manner of the orator whose eloquence is wholly in the power of his thought and the smoothness of his diction. He had already on that western trip made 40 speeches in 22 days, across 17 States, and not a speech was written out in advance.

Mr. Wilson had previously expressed misgivings about the fulfillment of the pledges he had given to the American boys who had been led into war by him. Those pledges were deeply imprinted on his conscience. He regarded them as a

personal commitment. He had asked the young men of America to give their lives to a cause—a war to end war—and now he of the living was not succeeding in persuading his countrymen to adopt the steps necessary to prevent another war. The warning was pointed, the prophecy all too plain.

He said to his audience:

Stop for a moment to think about the next war, for I can predict with absolute certainty that within another generation there will be another world war if the nations of the world do not concert the method by which to prevent it.

What shall I call it—the final war? It might be the final arrest, though I pray only the temporary arrest, of civilization itself; and America has, if I may take the liberty of saying so, a greater interest in the prevention of that war than any other nation. America is less exhausted by the recent war than the other belligerents. She is not exhausted at all.

America has paid for the war that has gone by less heavily, in proportion to her wealth, than the other nations. America still has free capital enough for its own industries and for the industries of the other countries that have to build their industries anew.

The next war would have to be paid for in American blood and American money. The nation of all nations that is most interested to prevent the recurrence of what has already happened is the nation which would assuredly have to bear the brunt of that great catastrophe. It is not likely that, with the depleted resources of the great fighting nations of Europe, there will be another war soon, but unless we concert measures to prevent it, there will be another and a final war just about the time these children come to maturity; and it is our duty to look in the face of the real circumstances of the world in order that we may not be unfaithful to the great duty which America undertook in the hour and day of her birth.

The next time will come. It will come while this generation is living, and the children will be sacrificed upon the altar of that war. It will be the last war. Humanity will never suffer another, if humanity survives.

I do not hesitate to say that the war we have just been through, though it was shot through with terror of every kind, is not to be compared with the war we would have to face next time. There were destructive gases, there were methods of explosive destruction unheard of even during this war, which were just ready for use when the war ended—great projectiles that guided themselves and shot into the heavens went for a hundred miles and more and then burst tons of explosives upon helpless cities, something to which the guns with which the Germans bombarded Paris from a distance were not comparable. What the Germans used were toys compared with what would be used in the next war. Ask any soldier if he wants to go through a hell like that again. The soldiers know what the next war would be. They know what the inventions were that were just about to be used for the absolute destruction of mankind. I am for any kind of insurance against a barbaric reversal of civilization.

Woodrow Wilson's proposal was to prevent the very calamity which was brought on the world by Hitler, Mussolini, and Hirohito. Woodrow Wilson hoped to do that through the organization and operation of a League of Nations pledged to preserve peace by moral force if possible, but by military means if necessary. He saw in the Covenant of the League a constitution for the

peace-loving nations of the world. They would surrender no sovereignty. They would retain freedom to act under their respective constitutional processes, but they would remain pledged to contribute to an international police force as much of their military strength as they could mobilize in order to prevent or stamp out aggression.

America was the most powerful nation of the world at the end of the last war. When she decided to remain aloof from the League, the most powerful physical force in the preservation of peace was subtracted from Europe's aid.

The election came in 1920, and President Harding was inaugurated in 1921. He had a chance then to submit the League covenant with the Lodge reservations. He never submitted it at all. He turned his back on the ablest Republicans of that day—former President Taft, Mr. Root, Mr. Wickersham, and Charles Evans Hughes.

Woodrow Wilson well knew the defects in the Covenant of the League. No contract could be made to work if the parties to it wanted it to fail. No compact was worth while if the parties had not the courage or the will to enforce its provisions. The covenant was a self-correcting device by its specific provisions. It provided for constant check and recheck. But the United States did not join; Europe was abandoned, and so was the peace of the world.

One of the most remarkable events in modern history was the accomplishment of the United Nations Convention at San Francisco, where 50 nations, representing every civilized race and practically every religion and language on earth, met around the conference table and reached an understanding and signed a World Charter with a purpose, hope, and prayer that it would become a basis or ten commandments for a lasting peace among nations and people of the earth.

It required only 62 days. It required 5 months for the thirteen colonies speaking the same language, of practically one race and creed to formulate the Constitution of the United States which was admittedly far from being perfect and satisfactory to all the colonies. At Versailles many days were spent on the formulation of the League of Nations—likewise far from being satisfactory to all nations signing it, but admittedly a long step on the road to international understanding and world peace.

On the eve of Armistice Day, November 10, 1923, Woodrow Wilson was induced to make a speech from his home on S Street in Washington, D. C. It was his farewell; but he spoke clearly, briefly, and with his customary resonance. He said:

The anniversary of Armistice Day should stir us to great exaltation of spirit . . . although the stimulating memories of that happy time of triumph are forever marred and embittered for us by the shameful fact that when the victory was won—won, be it remembered chiefly by the indomitable spirit and ungrudging sacrifices of our own incomparable soldiers—we turned our backs upon our associates and refused to bear any responsible part in the administration of

peace or the firm and permanent establishment of the results of the war—won at so terrible a cost of life and treasure—and withdrew into a sullen and selfish isolation which is deeply ignoble because manifestly cowardly and dishonorable.

This must always be a source of deep mortification to us and we shall inevitably be forced by the moral obligation of freedom and honor to retrieve that fatal error and assume once more the role of courage, self-respect, and helpfulness which every true American must wish to regard as our natural part in the affairs of the world.

That we should have thus done a great wrong to civilization at one of the most critical turning points in the history of the world is the more to be deplored because every anxious year that has followed has made the exceeding need for such services as we might have rendered more and more evident and more and more pressing, as demoralizing circumstances which we might have controlled have gone from bad to worse.

The affairs of the world can be set straight only by the firmest and most determined exhibition of the will to lead and make the right prevail.

And so Woodrow Wilson did not win. Did he lose only temporarily? He always looked ahead for the verdict of history. He once said:

I would rather fall in a cause that some day will triumph than to triumph in a cause that I know some day will fail.

Today all the fortunes of the financially strong, all the prides of the politically ambitious, all the cautions of the nationalistically aloof, and all the material possessions of the Nation itself are forfeit as the lives of America's finest are being offered again on all continents and over the seven seas in a second great crusade to establish once and for all that man is ultimately his brother's keeper and that the future of civilization, indeed the peace of the world, must rest upon the spirit, if not the letter, of Woodrow Wilson's memorable pledges to mankind.

WE SHALL KEEP THE FAITH

A few days ago I stood with bowed head by the crypt in the basement of the Washington Cathedral at St. Albans where the mortal remains of Woodrow Wilson peacefully rest, and I thought of his prophecy that there would be another war within a generation if the League of Nations were not adopted. His efforts in behalf of the League of Nations and the cause of peace and to keep his pledge to the boys who fell in the First World War in that memorable speaking tour of the West overtaxed his frail body, and he died 5 years later at his S Street home in Washington, a martyr to the cause of peace. He was crucified in the cause of peace on a cross of political expediency as truly as was the Nazarene on the hill of Golgotha. The world knows that. We again have a chance to retrieve and establish, not a League of Nations, but the present United Nations Charter, although 80 percent of its provisions are in substance the same as those of the League document of 1919.

It has been truly said that poetry is the very essence of literature and only those poems are immortal which spring from the soul as an expression of the

heart. Near the end of the last World War, Col. John B. McCrae received mortal wounds in the battle of Flanders. Before passing on he penned this immortal poem, entitled "In Flanders Fields":

In Flanders fields the poppies blow
Between the crosses, row on row,
That mark our place; and in the sky
The larks, still bravely singing, fly,
Scarce heard amidst the guns below.
We are the dead. Short days ago
We loved, felt dawn, saw sunset glow,
Lived and were loved, and now we lie.
In Flanders fields.

Take up our quarrel with the foe.
To you from failing hands we throw
The torch. Be yours to hold it high.
If ye break faith with us who die
We shall not sleep, though poppies grow
In Flanders fields.

In a noble pledge of faith to those who fell in the First World War, C. B. Galbraith penned in poetry our reply:

THE REPLY

In Flanders fields the cannon boom
And fitful flashes light the gloom,
While up above, like eagles fly
The fierce destroyers of the sky.
With stains the earth wherein you lie
Is redder than the poppy bloom
In Flanders fields.

Sleep on, ye brave; the shrieking shell,
The quaking trench, the startled yell,
The fury of the battle hell
Shall wake you not, for all is well.
Sleep peacefully, for all is well.
Your flaming torch we bear;
With burning heart on oath we swear
To keep the faith, to fight it through,
To crush the foe, or sleep with you
In Flanders fields.

All over the world boys of this generation are also sleeping the last sleep.

After the First World War we failed to keep the pledge and the faith. God help us to keep it now.

In a few hours the United States Senate will have its chance to retrieve its error by underwriting a pledge that will be kept, for we have the power to enforce it. We have the duty to enforce it. The radio, telegraph, and cable are waiting to bear to the civilized world the news that America has kept the faith.

Mr. ELLENDER. Mr. President, as this debate comes to a close, our two distinguished representatives from this body, the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who so ably represented us at San Francisco, must be very happy over the fact that so few of the provisions of the Charter have evoked contentious debate.

As I recall, the only portion of the Charter that provoked some debate was article 43. I believe that all of us share the view that the agreements referred to in article 43 cannot become effective by mere Executive order, but that Congress must pass upon them to give them force. During the debate I expressed the view that such agreements cannot be given effect except by an act or simple resolution of the Congress. It is my belief that such agreements should not be considered as treaties, thereby requiring a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

By voting for this Charter we are entering new fields of international affairs. If we are to help save civilization, it is our bounden duty to take a leading part, as a member of the World Organization, in an effort to prevent future wars.

The purpose of the Charter of the United Nations is to prevent war. It can be made effective only to the extent that the peoples of the so-called Big Five Nations and their leaders desire peace. The purpose of the Organization may be compared to that of a fire department in one of our large cities. A well-equipped and well-organized fire department can save a city from destruction by fire. A well-organized and properly equipped World Organization can quickly smother a threat to world peace which, if permitted to spread, would again involve the world in a conflagration that would destroy civilization.

That the Charter is not a perfect instrument is admitted, but let us use it as a cornerstone upon which to build. The General Assembly provides the forum before which nations, through their chosen representatives, will be afforded the opportunity to plead their cause openly and publicly. Soon nations will learn more about each other, and in that way suspicion, mistrust, and misapprehension among nations will be dispelled. As they become better acquainted with each other, it is my belief that there will spring up among them more teamwork, to provide better methods of fostering world peace.

The International Court of Justice can become the chief instrument through which and by which disputes will be settled among nations. Under proper guidance, and in time, I can foresee the adoption of a code of rules and regulations founded on law, justice, and equity that will form the basis for deciding international disputes among nations in the same manner that the common law of England is used today in settling disputes among individuals. Such a method is feasible if nations are sincere in their desire to further peace among the peoples of the earth.

Mr. President, in order that this troubled world shall never venture into another global war, so long as I am privileged to remain a Member of this body I shall leave nothing undone to implement the Charter which we are about to ratify. We must not fail this time, lest we do a grave injustice to those who have made the supreme sacrifice.

I may say that so far I have received but one letter from my State expressing opposition to ratification of the Charter.

Mr. President, on May 29 I delivered a short address which was carried over radio station WMCA, New York, and WWDC, Washington, entitled "Where Do We Go From San Francisco." In that speech I expressed further views on this important subject, and I ask unanimous consent that it be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

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

WHERE DO WE GO FROM SAN FRANCISCO?

Ladies and gentlemen, the United States Senate must, without delay, ratify and approve the Charter of the World Organization that will be agreed upon at the San Francisco Conference. We have delegated some of our best talent to represent us at the Conference and it is up to us to back their decision to the limit.

I make that statement unqualifiedly and without knowing what the Charter will finally contain, but conscious of the fact that unless the United States is willing to participate in and become an active member of the Organization the world will soon again be plunged in a war that will destroy civilization.

I know that the Charter will not be perfect. Many of its provisions will cause much dissatisfaction among some of the nations of the world—even among our own people—but let us hope that in the course of time, and in the light of experience, the Charter will be amended so as to give assurance to the discontented. Let those who object to some of the stipulations in the Charter review the history of our own Federal Constitution. They should be convinced that its success can be duplicated in the World Organization, if participating nations are sincere in their desire for a permanent peace, founded upon law, justice, and devotion to the general welfare.

We should take a leading part in all of the activities and deliberations of the Organization. It should meet often. The General Assembly should be used as an open forum for free discussions among the representatives of the nations who have membership in the Organization. In that way nations can learn more about each other. Suspicion, jealousy, and greed can, to an appreciable extent, be dissipated, and as nations become better acquainted with each other, it is my hope and belief that there will spring among them more teamwork to foster world peace.

We should encourage the use of a World Court to settle international disputes among nations. I realize that it will require much time and effort to create a court that will inspire confidence among the nations of the earth. Under proper guidance, and in time, I can foresee the adoption of a code of rules and regulations founded on law, justice, and equity, that will form the basis for deciding international disputes among nations in the same manner that the common law of England is used today to settle disputes among individuals. Why is that not feasible if nations are sincere in their desire to further peace among the peoples of the earth?

As leading advocates of such a plan we could point with pride to our performance in the two global wars that engulfed the world in the last 25 years. We never have sought more territory for our own aggrandizement. All that we have asked for is to be permitted to maintain our own form of government and in return, accord the same right to other nations. We should be able to give convincing proof of the futility of war and the absolute necessity of settling disputes amicably in the future.

Until the world organization has been firmly established and has proven its ability to maintain peace, we should not agree to disarm. We should maintain a substantial navy, a sizable air force, and a fairly large mechanized army, not so much for our own protection but to assist in maintaining world peace.

We should, by all means, retain in trust such of the conquered islands in the Pacific, or portions thereof, as in the judgment of our Army and Navy advisers are necessary for our own security and to aid us in preserving the peace of the world.

We should assist in carrying out the common program of purposes and principles embodied in the Atlantic Charter, else the world may remain in turmoil and a lasting peace may become but a dim hope. The vexing Polish question should be amicably settled at an early date, and I do believe there is much merit to the proposed settlement tentatively agreed upon at Yalta. Let us not forget that the Curzon Line was set by arbitration, and it was when Russia was weak and unable to resist that the Poles extended their conquest from the Curzon Line to the east. Let it further be known that within this conquered territory only 7 percent of the population were Poles.

All nations should have free access to the seas. The Panama Canal, the Suez Canal, the Dardanelles, and similar channels should be open free from tolls to all nations except for such charges as may be necessary to retire existing obligations which may have been incurred for their construction and to pay the cost of their maintenance and operation.

We should take the lead in the establishment of world trade. No nation can cope with us in industrial production. We have demonstrated our ability in the last 4 years. For our own good it is imperative that we lower our tariff barriers by extending the Reciprocal Trade Agreements Act, as advocated by President Truman.

The Congress should enact without delay the Bretton Woods Proposals. One creating a monetary fund, to stabilize the value of all currencies in terms of each other, and the other establishing an international bank, the functions of which will be to finance the construction of long-range productive projects in war-torn countries. Both proposals involve an investment of about \$6,000,000,000 on our part and should go far toward building a durable peace and reestablishing without much delay a stable world trade. We have spent almost \$200,000,000,000 to fight the Axis Nations in an effort to preserve our way of life, and why we should quibble over an investment of \$6,000,000,000 in an effort to avert future wars, does not make sense to me. Those suggestions are not a cure-all but are essential to our own welfare. Before the world recovers from the shock of war my guess is that we will be compelled to venture still further in world affairs in our efforts to solve the problems of battered nations.

All peoples are looking to us for leadership. We stand in a position to blaze the trail, and we should not hesitate to take advantage of our situation while opportunity knocks.

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, in the beginning, let me make my position clear. In my opinion, the United Nations Charter is a treaty. This being true, the President of the United States has a legal right to see that this treaty is carried out, and, if necessary, may use reasonable force in seeing that it is properly executed. If any amendments are made in the future to the Charter, they will have to be submitted to the Senate for its approval.

I would not contend that the Senate alone can enact legislation which, under the Constitution, requires a majority vote of both Houses and the signature of the President. After having secured the necessary funds, I have no doubt that the President of the United States could use a reasonable amount of force to assure that the agreements of the United Nations Charter are put into execution.

Even though the President has the legal power to enforce this Charter, I would not hesitate to give to our Representative on the Security Council, through the President, the right to use a reasonable amount of our armed forces to enforce the United Nations Charter, and thereby cooperate with the other nations of the world in preserving world peace.

Mr. President, I have been intensely impressed with the unanimity of expression in support of the United Nations Charter during the past week. I have been pleased with the attitude of those individuals who were termed "isolationists" before our entrance into this global conflict. It is obvious that they recognize their breach of faith with our men who died in World War I. According to the expressions which are substantially unanimous from mothers, fathers, wives, and sweethearts of our men who have died in this war, it would be a breach of faith if this body failed to ratify this instrument which is conceded to be the only feasible means at this time of outlawing future global conflicts such as the one in which we are now engaged. It would be a breach of faith to our allies, whose sons have likewise paid the supreme sacrifice.

The Charter is not perfect by any means. I think most of us concede that fact. But it is a good beginning of a perfect means to be attained at some future date. We know that it is subject to revision. The Congress of the United States is aware of that fact.

At this moment we should pause in tribute to the late lamented President Roosevelt for having conceived and laid the foundation for the San Francisco Conference from which has come to the Senate for ratification this instrument to outlaw wars and invasion by ambitious dictators. He should also be commended in his choice of delegates whom he sent to the Conference to represent our Nation.

President Roosevelt was aware of the mistakes made after World War I. He realized, as, I think, most of us now realize, that if the United States had adopted President Woodrow Wilson's proposals for a League of Nations there would not have been a Second World War.

Japan never would have thrust itself upon China; Mussolini never would have thrust the Italian Army upon Ethiopia and Albania; Germany never would have marched into the Rhineland, Austria, Poland, Czechoslovakia, and other nations. But it is now too late to grieve over the mistakes of our leaders of a quarter of a century ago. They were probably conscientious in their opposition to this country's adoption of the League. But now we have tangible evidence to justify every feasible means of outlawing a repetition of this current catastrophe.

The American people, including the Congress, should constantly be mindful of the fact that this Charter will serve only as a guide to prevent future wars.

The instrument itself cannot prevent war. It is up to each of us to be ever mindful of our duty in supporting the principles of the Charter as outlined by the San Francisco Conference. It will be necessary that the Congress sustain the Charter now, and in the future, and appropriate the necessary funds for our share in its maintenance in an effort to prevent future Mussolinis, Hitlers, and Tojos from thrusting themselves upon the peace-loving nations of the world.

I have received through the mail numerous letters containing expressions in support of the adoption of this Charter. They have come from relatives and friends of soldiers, sailors, marines, and others who have died in this war. They have my assurance that it is my sole purpose to exert every effort possible to bring about the enactment of legislation which will help in any conceivable way to outlaw war.

I think the majority of the American people find comfort in knowing that President Truman, like Presidents Wilson and Roosevelt, is conscious of the necessity for cooperation between all peace-loving nations to effect a feasible program to prevent a recurrence of our present plight.

President Truman, like myself, was a soldier in the last war, and he knows the horrors that can be invoked by war. Nothing is ever accomplished by war but sorrow and suffering.

In listening to some of the opposition to the Charter as a whole, I have observed with intense interest their willingness to vote for its adoption regardless of the fact it contains certain provisions of which they do not approve. They realize the time has arrived when we must relinquish politics for the safety of our country and of future generations. This is no political issue. It is only one of preserving the lives and property of our people and the integrity of the peace-loving nations of the world.

Mr. President, as I speak in support of this Charter, I am not unmindful of some statistics and figures. The War Department has reported that our current casualty list exceeds one million. That is, dead, wounded, and missing, and many of these victims repose in unmarked graves on land, and in the seas.

This casualty list does not include the thousands of men and women who have become mental cases as the result of their experiences in this war. A psychiatrist in my own State of South Carolina informs me that approximately 5,000 men and women have become mental cases as the result of this catastrophe. These figures do not include entirely the home casualties. Many homes have been destroyed. The children of these victims, in many instances, are juvenile delinquents, which will inevitably thrust a crime wave upon our country.

These figures do not include the burdens thrust upon the taxpayers of this Nation. The public debt has enhanced beyond comprehension. Taxes have been increased beyond reason. Necessary foods and clothing have become

scarce. Transportation is impossible. Our freedom is curbed.

We do not know whether this Charter will work or not. I think we should give it a trial. If it does not work, we can then try for something better. At least future generations cannot say what this generation is saying about the opposition to the League. I do not believe there is a single man in this Chamber who would want to go into history with the responsibility of opposing what is conceded to be a feasible, cooperative arrangement at this time, as did those individuals who so ably and bitterly opposed President Wilson's League proposals some 26 years ago.

We must realize that this war does not end with the cessation of hostilities on the battlefield. The Congress has made provisions for some degree of support of the victims of this war.

I am heartily in favor of this Government making adequate provisions for all of its men and women whose lives have been handicapped as the result of their services to their country. But we must realize that all this is a tremendous financial responsibility to the Government.

A repetition of this financial responsibility of fighting a war and maintaining its victims after the cessation of hostilities would doubtless destroy our modern way of life if we should have to fight another war. The American people cannot stand a war like this one in the next generation. It is up to us, the representatives of the people, to try some means of preventing its recurrence.

Aside from the financial responsibility of the Government, we must consider the welfare of the American home. The mothers and fathers of this Nation and those of all peace-loving nations are not inclined to have their sons and daughters utilized as cannon fodder in a future war.

It is hard enough for them to realize the necessity of their Government invoking a program of compulsory military training so as to be prepared for defense of their country's integrity in the event of a stab in the back as at Pearl Harbor.

By this body doing its duty in taking the necessary steps to prevent the use of armed aggression, we are keeping the faith with those who have died as the result of the mistakes of our past leaders. And the fathers and mothers of the future cannot say that "If the United States Senate had performed its proper function, my son would not have died."

RESTORATION OF CITIZENSHIP TO THOMAS PAINE

Mr. MEAD. Mr. President, I wish to speak for a moment on a very important event which occurred in the city of New Rochelle, N. Y., just a short time ago. While it is not applicable to the question which is now before the Senate for discussion, it is of historic value, and it relates to one of the great minds which helped to lay the mudsills of the Republic which has become so powerful among the nations of the world.

Mr. President, I should like to call the attention of the Senate to the July 4th act of Mayor Stanley W. Church, of New Rochelle, in reinstating the citizenship of Thomas Paine, great American patriot, who 139 years ago was denied the right to vote in this country on the ground that he was an honorary French citizen, no longer entitled to citizenship in the United States of America.

Mr. President, we are all familiar with the history of Thomas Paine, author of *Common Sense*, called by many historians the catalyst that drew together the forces of revolution in this country and brought about the immortal Declaration of Independence. He was the first to use the term "United States of America." He was in effect the unpaid public relations man of this country and it is known that although his pamphlet, *Common Sense*, was read by almost every American, he turned back the proceeds from its sale to the revolutionary cause.

Belatedly, in February 1782, Robert Morris; Robert Livingston, then Secretary of Foreign Affairs; and General Washington voted to give Tom Paine, always a poor man, \$800 per annum out of the United States Treasury from the secret service fund. This was really in the nature of a retainer fee and a matter of finance. Due honor to Thomas Paine was never accorded until the recent act to Mayor Church in New Rochelle officially honored him as a great citizen of this country.

Thomas Paine was a maligned man, the target of fifth column Tories. Let me read an editorial in the *New York Times* of July 6, entitled "Citizen Tom Paine":

If Thomas Paine were alive today he could vote in his old home town of New Rochelle. This tardy justice has been done him by Mayor Stanley W. Church, 139 years after four election supervisors, perhaps equally scandalized by his reputed atheism and by his fervent belief in pure democracy, had refused to let him cast his ballot. The incident recalls the unhappy latter years of a liberator who outlived his time. Between 1802, when he returned to America from France, and 1809, when he died in poverty in Greenwich Village, poor Paine was grievously persecuted because he was thought to be, as Theodore Roosevelt once called him, "a dirty little atheist." The statement was wrong on three counts. He was a cleanly man until overtaken by age and discouragement; he was rather above the average height; and though he rejected all organized religions, including Christianity, he did, as he said in *The Age of Reason*, have faith in one God and hopes for happiness beyond this life.

The *New York Times* editorial continues:

His adopted countrymen forgot his famous pamphlets, *Common Sense*, published 6 months before the Declaration of Independence, and *The Crisis*, written in the field as Washington's ragged Continentals retreated through New Jersey. What the *Federalist Papers* later did for the Constitution these pamphlets did for American independence. Washington himself paid warm tribute to their author. But where other patriots were rewarded with lifelong esteem,

Paine lost almost everything, including his friendship with his once-revered commander. The fault was partly his. He was an impatient and suspicious man, never taking the trouble to mollify those who sincerely disagreed with him. Now it is possible to forget his small weaknesses and to remember his great virtues and services. New Rochelle has made a happy gesture.

The proclamation issued by the mayor of New Rochelle, which was mentioned in the New York Times editorial, is as follows:

Whereas 139 years ago the fair city of New Rochelle did do a grave injustice to a great American patriot, namely, Thomas Paine, America's godfather, author of Common Sense and The Crisis papers, by denying him the vaunted privilege of citizenship and the right to vote in this city on the ground, that as an honorary citizen of France, he had lost his citizenship in his adopted land; and

Whereas the city of New Rochelle is known for its support of all true American democratic principles and is today proud that Thomas Paine lived among us and would do him honor.

Now, therefore, I, Stanley W. Church, mayor of the city of New Rochelle in the State of New York, United States of America, do reinstate posthumously Thomas Paine, first citizen of America, to full citizenship and the rights thereof in this city from July 4, 1945, onward with the wish that all Americans do honor to his memory and follow his precepts in these times that try men's souls.

Given under my hand and seal on this 4th day of July 1945, at the Thomas Paine Memorial House, New Rochelle, N. Y.

STANLEY W. CHURCH, Mayor.

In replying to the proclamation of Mayor Church, Joseph Lewis, secretary of the Thomas Paine Memorial Committee, stated in regard to this noteworthy act:

By restoring citizenship to Thomas Paine, you have not only corrected a cruel mistake, one which cut deeply into the heart of this great and good man, but this proclamation of yours will contribute more than any other single act in securing for Thomas Paine the recognition he so richly deserves.

At long last, the American people are beginning to show their appreciation of the invaluable services that Thomas Paine rendered so unselfishly toward the establishment of the great Republic of ours.

And so I propose, Mr. President, that the Senate of the United States take notice and make part of the record of its proceedings in supporting Mayor Stanley W. Church, of New Rochelle, in his reinstatement posthumously of the citizenship of Thomas Paine, America's Godfather, author of the pamphlets Common Sense and The Crisis, protégé of Presidents Washington and of Thomas Jefferson. May he at long last have the honor due him as honored citizen of the United States as well as of the world, especially of France, which has long claimed him for the great liberal he was.

Mr. President, I have had the Legislative Reference Service look up the matter in the Library of Congress, and I ask that the letter written to me by Ernest S. Griffith, director of the Legislative Reference Service, be 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:

THE LIBRARY OF CONGRESS,
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SERVICE,
Washington, July 21, 1945.

HON. JAMES M. MEAD,
United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR MEAD: In response to your request relative to the denial of voting rights to Thomas Paine in New Rochelle, N. Y., 1806, we find no record of Federal repercussions in the affair. The supervisor, Elisha Ward, who denied Paine the right to vote, claimed that Paine was not an American. His only justification for this action was the incident when Gouverneur Morris, at the time he was Minister to France in 1793, had refused to secure Paine's release from a French prison on the ground claim that Paine was not an American. Ward conveniently overlooked the fact that Monroe, who succeeded Morris as Minister to France, had officially secured Paine's release.

Paine declared he would bring suit against Elisha Ward and wrote letters to Madison, Vice President Clinton, and others to obtain evidence. Biographers have been unable to locate any trace of the trial in the records of the supreme court at Albany, N. Y. Other research has failed to produce any record of Federal action in the case.

Very truly yours,

ERNEST S. GRIFFITH,
Director, Legislative Reference Service.

THE CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS

The Senate 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. MEAD. Mr. President, I am reluctant to take the time of the Senate, but the matter before it today is of so grave importance that I feel I should briefly voice my support of the work which has been accomplished at San Francisco and brought before this legislative body.

This is the most important session of the Congress I have ever attended in the long years of my service in both Houses. The work we do here today will live as long as time. The action we take at the end of this debate will be heralded throughout the world tomorrow.

There is a counterpart, Mr. President, of this history-making session to be found in the early life of our Republic. When the great minds of America gathered around the council table to draft the Charter upon which our Republic was formed they set for us an example which if followed by us will mean the success of the Charter we now attempt to formulate on the floor of the Senate. They gave us the formula, but, in addition to that, they supported it with all the faith and confidence they possessed. They worked for the adoption of that Charter throughout the Colonies which became the States of the Union. They lived and served throughout their lives that that Charter might become successful. If

with the same faith and confidence, the same eagerness to make a success of this Charter, we support the work so well accomplished at San Francisco, throughout our service in the Senate and throughout our lives in this Republic, we can expect that it will attain a high measure of success.

Mr. President, the great names that have come down through the history of our country will have another list added to theirs—the names of the men who gathered around the council table at San Francisco. This legislative body can take pride in the fact that two of our well-known statesmen were there and helped to write this Charter.

Mr. President, of course, I shall support the Charter. Of course, I have faith and confidence in its success. I am sure that our great Nation, the most powerful on earth, with the important part it must of necessity play in the reconstruction period following victory in the war of the Pacific, will be the most powerful and most potent body, the one that can assume the greatest measure of responsibility in making this Charter not only a reality but a success. Ours, therefore, is the chief responsibility in order that we may win a permanent peace.

Mr. President, there came to my office a short time ago a letter which contained what was in my estimation an unanswerable argument in support of the Charter. I wish to read a few excerpts from the letter. The writer says that we won World War I and then lost the peace. Then he proceeds to add that the United States was largely to blame.

World War I cost over \$186,000,000,000 and over 13,700,000 lives. World War II has already cost a single nation—the United States—much more than the total money cost of World War I. World War II has already cost a single nation—Russia—much more than the total cost in lives of World War I.

Mr. President, based on a careful study by two well-known university professors, we learn that World War II is of greater proportions than the combined total of all known wars of all ages throughout all the world. If we fail to win permanent peace, World War III will be even greater and even more hideous.

A captain in the United States Army, writing from north Africa, had this to say:

There is need, a great, thunderous, blood-stained need, for the people to generate the energy it takes to get things done in a pre-occupied democracy. Only the people can do it—the Congress alone never will. If I were there, knowing even the little I do, I would devote every day to winning the greatest of all victories—the victory of permanent peace.

Mr. President, because of the multitudinous duties of the Senate committee investigating the war program, of which I am the chairman, I must confess that I have not had adequate time and opportunity to prepare the type of speech that should be delivered on this occasion. I may observe, however, that any inadequacy or lack on my part has been well

filled by the masterful addresses of my colleagues who have preceded me. The eloquent appeal for this treaty made by the learned and able Senators who participated in the San Francisco Conference will long be remembered by the Senate, by the people of the United States, and by the leadership of the world.

Mr. President, some time ago in writing a letter to one of the boys who left my office for the war, I was able to vision the potentialities of this Charter in the light of the service he was rendering. I was able to go again in spirit to the battlefields of the world, as I did in the autumn of 1943. Then I went away from my office where I would not be disturbed and tried to answer that boy's question by telling him what this Charter really means. Mr. President, I should like to tell the Senate what I told that boy:

DEAR BILL: You certainly know how to write a forceful letter. Your brief note has asked a tremendously important question.

I'd been dictating replies to other correspondents most of the morning and going like a house afire because I had a committee meeting scheduled before the Senate convenes. Then I picked up your letter from the pile: "What does this United Nations Charter really add up to?" I started right in to tell you, and Miss Keefe's pencil raced back and forth on her pad as I talked.

Then I began to feel uneasy. Were these words that I was speaking a proper answer to this question? I looked at your short letter again. "Strike that out," I said to Miss Keefe. "He has the word 'really' here. He doesn't want to know what the United Nations Charter seems to mean. He's after the under-the-surface, honest-to-goodness real meaning. I am going to tell him just what I really think it means."

I sat staring at your letter. The language of the Charter kept echoing in my ears: "We, the peoples of the United Nations, determined to save succeeding generations from the scourge of war * * * to practice tolerance and live together in peace * * * as good neighbors * * *." That wasn't what I wanted. I didn't want to quote from the Charter, nor to paraphrase it. I wanted to tell you in my own words what the treaty really means. I want to convey to you the faith and confidence I have in this immortal document.

The answer won't be perfect—what answers are?—but it will at least be honest. It will represent the faith I have in the leadership that made it possible and the hope I have in its future.

That's why you put the word "really" in your question, isn't it? Because you don't want to be given a lot of high-sounding double talk which could mean anything—or nothing.

You were growing up in the years of the depression. You remember how some people tried to fool themselves with double talk then. Men—veterans of the First World War—were selling apples on the street, but prosperity, for the wishful thinker, was just around the corner. Well, it wasn't. Around the corner there was another veteran, and he was also selling apples.

You remember that very well. And you remember how, in spite of all our efforts, another world war loomed on the horizon like a hurricane, and steadily came nearer and nearer, and finally caught us up into its path. You know from vivid personal experience how that hurricane of war ripped you from the life you had led and flung you across

oceans and continents into an alien world. You know what it is to sleep in a water-logged fox hole, to advance in a desert storm under enemy fire. You know what it is to be wounded and helpless before charging tanks and strafing planes. You know what it is to see your comrades die.

Yes; you know evil when you see it, and no one can tell you it is good. But you know good too. You have shared in a common enthusiasm for a common purpose. You have gone on many a hazardous mission, playing your appointed part on the team with skill and devotion, knowing that each man was responsible for the lives of his fellows. It was a game of one for all and all for one; and the game was won, again and again, decisively. You know, and you will never forget, that self-sacrifice and heroism are not mere words, but realities, realities which form an essential part of the behavior of the common soldier.

These experiences have immunized you against hypocrisy. You and your comrades look at the home front and the postwar world without illusion. Is it all to be done again in another 20 years? Must we slip back into the twilight of a world between wars in which statesmen say one thing and do another? As we to be condemned to the irony of unemployment while millions are eager to work? Is there to be want in the midst of plenty? Must we fumble indecisively from one gray day to the next while the hurricane of the next war slowly and inexorably approaches?

That, I believe, is what you have in mind when you ask what the United Nations Charter "really" adds up to. It is what other servicemen have bluntly expressed to me on my visits to various theaters of war. It is what my own son, also a GI, has voiced frequently and with emphasis.

Does the United Nations Charter add up to a complete solution of the problem? No; perhaps not. The Charter is not a key to utopia. Words written upon paper have no power in and of themselves to alter the course of events. It is only the spirit of the men and nations behind those words which can do that. The Constitution of the United States would today be only a historical curiosity if the spirit behind it—the determination to establish and maintain a stable Union—had not been strong enough to overcome all obstacles.

Is there such a spirit behind this Charter? Only time, of course, can give the final answer. From my own observation and study, I am convinced that the people of this Nation, together with their elected representatives in the United States Senate, are overwhelmingly in favor of the United Nations Charter. We have learned in the harsh school of experience that no nation can stand aside from the march of world history. The logic of events has taught us two lessons, and we have learned them well: First that we are unavoidably and inextricably dependent one upon another, big nations upon small, small upon big, and each upon all the others; second, that the power of the United States carries with it rights and also responsibilities, both of which must be controlled and directed to the common good of all. On the one hand we are convinced beyond all doubt of the fact of interdependence to such a degree that this Charter can be called, in part, a declaration of interdependence; on the other, we are equally convinced that America has now come of age in the household of nations and that we must attack with courage and fortitude the problems of a great power.

One thing is very clear—we have finished with indecisiveness. No longer shall we sit in nervous apprehension while our domestic economy decays and foreign aggressors

openly make ready the weapons with which to enslave us. We intend to take and to hold the initiative, to work energetically both at home and abroad for the triumph of justice and of all the basic human decencies.

There is ample evidence that the peoples of other nations are as anxious as we to make effective international cooperation a living reality. They realize that a healthy economy and a reliable defense against unjust aggression can be assured only by such cooperation.

There has opened up before us, then, a new frontier. Time was, in the days of depression, when some spoke sadly of the old frontier of our Western States; progress, they said, had pushed that frontier steadily westward until at last it had fallen into the Pacific. There was, they complained, no new world left to explore and to develop; the covered wagons that had carried the pioneers to adventure had reached the end of the trail. It is evident now that the new international frontier lies just beyond the Golden Gate. This frontier presents a far greater challenge than the old frontier, for its problems are far more complex; but the rewards of success are also proportionately greater.

We will not fail to meet this challenge. We know, we are convinced, that isolation from the rest of humanity is impossible, that the necessary condition of security and of progress is advance on this frontier. We have made up our minds; we have hit the trail.

How rapidly we shall travel, how much we shall accomplish, will depend upon the amount and the quality of our effort. There can be no question of half-hearted efforts; the building of a united world is not a part-time job. There can be no question either of failing to employ our full resources of knowledge, of faith, of responsibility.

Knowledge, faith, responsibility. Knowledge, you may ask, of what? Faith in what? Responsibility for what?

No; on second thought I don't think you will ask. You realize that the common soldier of today was the common man of yesterday, and that he will be the common man of tomorrow. You know that man. We all know him. He is the man with a gun whose portrait we have seen thousands of times—slogging through mud, charging up a beach scarred with high explosives, standing at attention while a colored ribbon is pinned over his heart—casual, unpretentious, embarrassed by being called a hero. To this common man—and to his brother who has fought hard and well on the home front—the future belongs. He has won it in the greatest conflict of all history from the tyrants who plotted to enslave the world for a thousand years. We must know this man intimately, study his needs and his desires—in our own Nation and in each one of the United Nations. We must have faith in his capacities. We must seek to serve him with a high sense of responsibility.

Our opportunity is as great as it was unforeseen. When the dictators began this war no one could reasonably have predicted such an utter collapse of their evil designs. No one could have foretold that the slate would have been wiped so thoroughly clean. Let us be grateful to the divine providence that has given us this breath-taking opportunity to realize on a world-wide scale the ideals of all men of good will. Let us resolve to prove worthy of the task. To this great work let us give our complete devotion.

If we face the new frontier in this spirit, the United Nations Charter can serve us well—serve us as a chart serves the voyager in unfamiliar seas. It can show us how to reach the goal; it can never take the place of the will to reach that goal.

Mr. President, that is the conclusion of the letter I addressed to that serviceman.

As I started, I wish to conclude: I believe, Mr. President, that if we, the Members of the Senate, as we come now to the close of this debate, can be imbued with the spirit and faith and confidence of the great minds who drafted the Charter upon which this Republic was founded and if we can carry on during our legislative careers and during our lives the service which they performed so well, then by exemplifying their lives and their conduct and their service we, too, will make a success of the Charter of human rights and human liberties which we are giving to the world today.

Mr. WILLIS obtained the floor.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Mr. President, will the Senator from Indiana yield to me, so that I may propound a question to the distinguished senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations?

Mr. WILLIS. I yield.

Mr. MILLIKIN. Earlier in the day there was some debate as to who will give the consent, and how, to submit the United States to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. There was reference to an opinion on the subject by Judge Hackworth, which was submitted as a part of the Record yesterday. I should like to ask the Senator from Texas whether in the future the Senate will be fully free to reach its own conclusions and take its own actions with reference to those matters, irrespective of the Hackworth opinion.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, to make a short reply, I should say that the Senate would be entirely at liberty to choose its own course. It would not be affected by what may be done by some other branch of the Government.

Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, which is appendix B to the Charter, provides that—

2. The states parties to the present statute may at any time declare that they recognize as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the court in all legal disputes concerning—

Then it carries a category of cases.

Of course, the Charter does not undertake to determine how the states will express that adherence. So it is up to the Government of the United States to choose whatever course it may pursue.

The Hackworth opinion merely said that they were drawing on their own experience heretofore with relation to arbitration treaties, and that the custom had been where the United States was simply involved in a question of collecting claims from some foreign nation, the settlement of which involved no possible obligation on the part of the United States, the Executive, through the diplomatic service, would submit that matter to arbitration, but that in all other cases the President would follow whatever course the Congress should point out, either by submitting a treaty or some other proposal.

Let me read one paragraph—section 3, paragraph A—of the Hackworth opinion:

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.

That seems to make it clear that in such event the Executive would submit it as a treaty for the ratification of the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I did not rise to argue the Hackworth opinion. I simply wished to make sure that it could not possibly be construed in connection with anything which has happened in the Senate as an expression of senatorial opinion, and thus in any way binding on us in the future.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will say to the Senator it is not in any way binding. It is a matter which is left open to the Executive and to the Senate.

Mr. MILLIKIN. I thank the Senator.

Mr. WILLIS. Mr. President, in one of Carl Sandburg's stories for children, the principal characters are three boys—Eeta Peeca Pie, who was filled with wishes; Meeny Miney, who had suspicions working inside him; and Miney Mo, who was different. Miney Mo was all mixed up with wishes and suspicions.

In all seriousness, on this most serious day, it is possible from this literary work of art by Carl Sandburg to draw a parallel of the people of our great country. There are some Americans, like Eeta Peeca Pie, who are filled with wishes, and wishes guide them in their political thinking day in and day out. Unconcerned with the facts, disdainful of reality, these Americans go gaily along, agitating always for this or that reform, whether or not it can be operated within the framework of our Constitution, and whether or not it will work at all. There are other Americans, like Meeny Miney, who are filled only with suspicions. No matter what we in this body may do, there are some Americans who will question our motives, or will predict disaster ahead.

HAVE WE SOLD OUT?

We have, they say, either deserted America, deserted reason, or deserted our integrity. We vote, they say, for this or that legislation, not because we are trying sincerely to build a better America and a better world, but because of political ambition, or because we have sold out to the vested interests, or because we have been influenced by this or that untoward influence.

But, Mr. President, the vast majority of Americans are more like Miney Mo. They are filled both with wishes and suspicions. Possessing hope for the future, but cognizant of reality and having some regard for the lessons of recorded history, the plain Americans with whom

I am acquainted are all mixed up inside, particularly in their thinking in regard to international matters. And most particularly is this true in relation to current efforts to build the processes through which just and lasting peace may be sought. It was true in the years preceding our entry into this war.

Let us recall a bit of recent history as an example of this anomalous thinking and to refresh our memory about the people, to whom we all pay homage and for whom we, in the final analysis, work here day by day.

THE PEOPLE OPPOSE WARS

Back in 1940 and 1941 the American people revealed in every poll that they did not want to enter this present war. When they were asked the direct question: "Do you want the United States to become involved in World War II?" the people replied in the negative in overwhelming proportion. Yet, in polls made by the same organizations that would report the almost unanimous verdict to be against American participation in war, it would be shown that more Americans wanted us to repeal the Neutrality Act than not—a step toward war. Likewise, polls showed that originally more Americans wanted lend-lease passed than not, although the count was very close, and in my State, I am sure, more people opposed lend-lease originally than supported it. Americans, it became apparent, were wholeheartedly behind aid to Britain and aid to Russia, while at the same time registering violent opposition to American participation in the war.

We were, like Miney Mo, filled with wishes to keep out of the war, but we also had the suspicion that it would not be possible. So, not because we wanted war but because we wanted peace, and because we wanted to see one side win, and dared not let the other side win, we were edged into World War II long before the dastardly Jap attack at Pearl Harbor.

Now that the European phase of the war is over, it would seem that the American people would know exactly what they want, and would pursue that course logically, straight-forwardly, and without detours. But such is not the case. Current surveys of public opinion prove conclusively that the American people, even in their thoughts concerning our efforts on this Charter, on Bretton Woods, and on many other moves to make a permanent peace, are filled with wishes and suspicions.

Between 80 and 90 percent of the American people, apparently, want us to vote for the San Francisco Charter. Yet, a recent Gallup poll showed that, when questioned about the efficacy of this Charter, only approximately 30 percent of the people thought it would prevent war. Many of the people, the survey showed, are in favor of the Charter, but do not have the slightest confidence that it—or any other agreement made among nations—will last any longer than has any other treaty of recent decades.

Mr. President, I am endeavoring to analyze the mind of the common people of America and gather out of their

confusion and here state their fundamental desires. After all, it is the common people of America who have made this country great. Out of their ranks have come the captains of industry, the statesmen, the generals, and especially the common soldiers who have brought us victory in this war. They will have to pay the bill. The common people of this country, Mr. President, want peace, as you, I, and every last one of us want peace. They hate war as they hated war before we entered into this one, as most of them hate it as it goes on, and as they will hate it when it is over. Yet they have their suspicions, not only toward fellow Americans but toward other nations. We have been, luckily, a wary people in some respects, yet in others we have not been sufficiently cautious.

AMERICA DIDN'T CAUSE WAR

Few Americans can be persuaded to believe that anything we did, or did not, in the fateful years following World War I, had, or would have had, much effect on the ambitions and schemes of the war-mad rulers of Japan, Italy, and Germany who brought this plague upon us. The common man still wants us to be kept out of the wars which have consumed Europe for centuries.

What he faces, however, is the ugly fact that twice in this generation we have become involved in wars in Europe, and he is ready to join in an extreme effort, if need be, to prevent another such catastrophe.

In my humble judgment, Mr. President, the average man in my home State—the average man everywhere in America—wants us to adopt and support this charter, implementing it in every reasonable way, but at the same time safeguarding the interests of our own Nation.

WE SAFEGUARD OUR INTERESTS

I have given countless hours to the study of this problem. I am convinced that in accepting this Charter we have safeguarded those things which the common man wants to have made certain:

First. We have protected the sovereignty of the United States of America. This Charter does not merge our interests as a Nation in a common body with the other nations of the world. It does not set up a superstate. The sovereign right of the United States of America is protected. We have not merged our ideals with the baser ideals of the world. We have, for the purpose of cooperation, selected only those on which we can agree. The dignity and courage of America are magnified.

Second. The power to determine to what extent the American soldiers may be used in other parts of the world is retained in the Congress of the United States. And if, in the judgment of the Congress of the United States, the acts of the Security Council are not in accord with the high purposes of the preamble of this Charter, the right of the United States representative to veto the use of force is reserved. Whatever may be the thoughts of the legalistic minds,

that is the thought of the common people of America.

Third. The so-called common man, filled with wishes, hopes that while we protect the United States we can help build a new spirit of cooperation, and usher in a long and prosperous peace in the world.

LINDBERGH STILL RIGHT

The average American, Mr. President, is a peace-loving, kind, and charitable person. I believe that Charles Lindbergh in a recent interview expressed the average man's thoughts when he said:

I have always believed that America's destiny should be kept independent of the endless wars between European nations. But to make ourselves independent of Europe's welfare is impossible. The civilization which is falling to pieces in Europe is our civilization. We are bound to our civilization as a man is bound to his own family. Whether or not he takes part in the quarrels of his parents, no man worthy of the name turns back on them in trouble.

Besides, as far as the present situation is concerned—

He continued—

the question of retirement is past. We have taken a leading part in this war and we are responsible for its outcome. We cannot retire now and leave Europe to the destructive forces which it has let loose. Honor, self-respect, and our own national interests prevent doing that.

The common man, Mr. President, realizes that in the end we took on a great portion of the job of reducing Germany to a shambles. The common man believes that it is our humane duty to help bind up the wounds caused by that destruction in the lands over-run by this war. In that belief, I supported the Bretton Woods legislation for economic rehabilitation of these lands.

Yes, the common man today, more than ever, believes in safe-guarding the interests of America. It is a virtue, not a crime in his eyes, to think of America first before we attempt to carry the burden of the whole world. For the weak cannot support the weak, nor the blind lead the blind.

A NEW ISOLATIONISM

Mr. President, America today is drifting into a new isolationism, not by any means a matter of our choice, nor is it the first time we have found ourselves unique among the nations of the world. Back when great statesmen wrote the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution, the United States was the only representative republic on the face of the planet. Europe was ruled by kings, while Asia was ruled by despots, but our struggling little Government, through the will and loyalty of its people, emerged unscathed from that dark and stormy period. Today America has become the last great nation of the world which puts her complete faith in the philosophy of freedom, a philosophy which recognizes inherent rights in every citizen—freedom of speech, freedom of press, freedom of religion, freedom of enterprise. It was that philosophy that in a century and a half made this country

the greatest nation on the face of the earth. It was that philosophy that made America strong enough to win this war.

No matter to what extent she may be restricted in this new isolationism, the common man will fight to the end for the preservation of the ideals of America. Therefore, we must keep our country strong militarily, economically, morally, and spiritually.

By keeping our country strong militarily, I mean that we should be sure that our Army and Navy—maintained as separate services—shall be abreast or ahead of all the other nations in scientific research and developments, and that our Nation shall be fully garrisoned and ready for action in all our newly won outlying stations in the far Pacific and those leased in the Atlantic which are necessary for fulfillment of our future responsibilities.

By keeping strong economically, I mean that the administration should take steps to cut the amazing and outlandish Federal expenditures, many of which are wasted on foolish projects even down to this late date.

If we believe in this American system, how can we continue to preserve it if our manufactured products, our machinery, our raw materials, our food-stuffs, plus billions of dollars—all needed here at home—are used to make the communistic and socialistic systems of Europe seem successful while we break the capitalistic system at home?

If we are to be strong economically, we cannot long continue to be an insolvent America. Prolonged deficit financing will do more to open the way for social revolution than any other single factor that could be named on the home front. We profess intentions of economy in government, but the fact is that Uncle Sam now employs more than three and one-half million persons, the greatest number of Federal pay-rollers in our Nation's history.

By keeping strong morally, I mean that we must work always for social justice in our own land—for the alleviation of the problems between labor and business, between races, and between people of different religious creeds. We must continually press toward the goal where our sense of justice applies alike to the humble and the great, to the poor and to the rich, to the weak and the strong.

By keeping America strong spiritually, I mean that we should ever be jealous of the great ideals which actuated the founding fathers in giving our Nation a distinctive place in the world. We must always be aware that freedom urges the minds and the souls of men to the attainment of their highest aspirations. Nor should we ever forget that faith in God and the practice of Christian ethics are inseparably linked to a free society. Freedom is the precious pearl which men appraise too lightly until it is lost; then they are willing to lay down their lives to recover it.

The safety of America lies in our reliance on our own security and reliance on our own strength and virtue, rather than in charters and compacts and treaties. The best political systems, leagues, or

conferences would not be enough unless based on a dynamic strength of character and the power of Christian ethics.

Mr. President, this Charter will be supported, perhaps, without a single negative vote among those of us who strove with all our might to keep this country out of war. Many of us opposed entry into the former League of Nations. President Franklin D. Roosevelt, himself, was the last most vigorous spokesman against the entry of the United States into the League of Nations. We believed that proposal would have involved us forever in the quarrels in Europe, because it would have placed on us responsibility to maintain the territorial integrity of the countries of Europe. Americans repudiated that as our national obligation, Americans will never subscribe to that obligation unless in the far distant future the cause of justice and right and freedom point to that course.

Mr. President, when I consider this Charter through the mind of the average American, I am filled with wishes and doubts, considering the condition of the world. No statement could be more illogical on its face than the sentence attributed to Gen. Dwight D. Eisenhower—"We are going to have peace even if we have to fight for it." But that sentence expresses the hope and determination of most Americans. We do crave peace for ourselves, for our children and our children's children, above the most precious possessions to which man can aspire.

LET'S WORK—AND PRAY!

We in our day owe it to our civilization to make at least our effort to set up some institution through which nations can resolve their differences rather than by resort to the cruel arbitraments of war. In spite of our fears and suspicions, we are going to make a start to extend the area of agreement among nations in the hope that it may spread throughout the world.

Mr. President, on the day when we opened the seventh war loan drive there was gathered in front of our Nation's Capitol a great body of people, who came there to honor the marines who raised the flag on Mount Suribachi on Iwo Jima. Three of the marines who made that desperate and heroic effort were present and reenacted there the raising of the same flag. Standing in the great crowd were two men, sun-tanned, battle-scarred, war weary. They, too, had been in that engagement. One of them turned and said to a lady of my household, as marines raised the flag, "Woman, do you realize it took a hell of a lot of dying to put that flag there?"

Mr. President, in the thought and in the memory of those who have given their lives to raise the American flag of freedom throughout the world, out of our duty to the more than 100,000 brave American boys who have died only that somehow we might have a better world in which to live; that we might forever protect the children of our land; that we may make America more secure in a troubled world, I shall vote for the charter.

If we shall have postponed World War III for only a few brief years, our efforts will have been well worth while.

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I shall vote for the Charter without fear or misgiving. It is constitutional, for its very purpose is to strengthen us and give to the world that opportunity for liberty and security provided for us by the very documents which created our Nation.

I shall vote for it with the hope that, by our first endorsement, other nations will be led quickly to act likewise, thereby putting into being the Charter organization, which is now the only hope for a continuing peace in this troubled world.

Mr. President, let me caution that after our almost unanimous vote for the Charter today we cannot merely sit back and feel and say, "Everything is fixed now, everyone is safe." No; our people are entitled by their sacrifices in this war and others to more than that. We and all other nations must give the Charter organization the all-out support of all our people—sincere, honest support, continuing for years to come—in order that this world organization may be a growing, living instrumentality, capable of handling world problems in a fair and effective way.

So, Mr. President, with my vote in favor of the proposed plan goes not only my hope, but also my belief, that the Charter organization will actually work.

Mr. DONNELL. Mr. President, there was today received and laid upon the desk of the clerk of the Senate an important message from the President of the United States. This message has been properly referred, but I understand has not yet been read to the Senate. I wish to read the message, which is brief. It is a message from the President, from Potsdam, to the senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR], dated July 27, 1945, and reads:

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 special agreements with the Security Council referred to in article 43 of the charter. It was stated by many Senators that this might be done in the United States either by treaty or by the approval of a majority of both Houses of the Congress. It was also stated that the initiative in this matter rested with the President and that it was most important to know before action was taken on the Charter which course was to be pursued.

When any such agreement or agreements are negotiated it will be my purpose to ask the Congress for appropriate legislation to approve them.

This completes the message. I call to the attention of the Senate the appropriate language in article 43 which is involved in the message from the President. Article 43 recites:

1. All 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.

2. Such agreement or agreements shall govern the numbers and types of forces, their degree of readiness and general location, and the nature of the facilities and assistance to be provided.

3. 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 or between the Security Council and groups of members and shall be subject to ratification by the signatory states in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.

Mr. President, as I read the message of the President of the United States communicated a moment ago to the Senate, it appears to me that it is subject to one of three possible constructions. One of those constructions is that the President will request some type of congressional action in the making of these agreements to which article 43 refers, and under that construction, that whether action by the Senate in advising and consenting to a treaty shall be required, or whether action shall be required by both Houses of Congress, is not intended by the President to be, at this time, decided. That is one interpretation, as I read it, which can be placed upon the message of the President of the United States. In other words, that he will request some type of congressional action, but does not at this time undertake to say whether it will be action by the Senate on the theory that a treaty is necessary, or whether it will be joint action by both Houses of Congress.

The second of the possible constructions of the President's message, as I see it, is that the President will request of either one House, that is to say the Senate, or of both Houses, at his own option, the legislative action which he mentioned in his message.

And a third possible construction is that the President means to say that he will request action by both Houses of Congress.

I recall the concluding sentence of his message again because to my mind it is highly important:

When any such agreement or agreements are negotiated it will be my purpose to ask—

What? The Senate? No—

it will be my purpose to ask the Congress—

And I interpolate the fact that the Congress consists not alone of the Senate but of the two Houses.

it will be my purpose—

What?—

to ask the Congress for appropriate—

What? Ratification? Advice or consent? No—

for appropriate legislation to approve them.

So, Mr. President, I present the view that the message of the President of the United States today is subject, as I have indicated, to any one of these three constructions, all of which contemplate that he will come to one branch or perhaps both branches of Congress for approval of what he terms legislation, but does not indicate to you or to me whether or not

the theory of the President is that a treaty is required or that a treaty is not required.

This sentence of his message is subject to future interpretation, and perhaps the interpretation of one man is as good as the interpretation of the other.

I do not mean to imply, Mr. President, in the slightest that there has been any attempt on the part of the President of the United States to mislead the Senate in the slightest. You and I realize that today the chief magistrate of our great Nation is thousands of miles away engaged in important conferences, without the benefit of being here present. He has upon his shoulders manifold burdens. I undertake to say that he has given to us a statement here which, however clear in his own mind, is nevertheless susceptible of these various constructions.

Mr. President, the reason I rise at this time in connection with this message is that I do not think that the Senate of the United States should be morally or in any other sense bound by this message from the President when we vote upon the Charter. I shall vote as I indicated yesterday, in favor of advising and consenting to the ratification of the Charter with the Statute of the International Court of Justice thereto annexed. I undertake to say that by my vote I do not want it understood that I have consented to some interpretations susceptible of three meanings, as I see it—perhaps susceptible to more or less. I do not want my vote to be interpreted as precluding me, as one of the Senators of the United States, when this question shall arise before our body as to whether or not a treaty is required to put into effect these agreements under article 43—I say I do not want my vote, with the President's message before me, to be understood as an acquiescence on my part to the construction that he has put or to some one else's interpretation of that construction which may be made later.

Mr. President, in order, therefore, that there may be no such silence as on my part might inferentially constitute a species of moral estoppel hereafter, I rise to express this point of view that by our vote this afternoon we are not consenting to or acquiescing in the expression of the opinion contained in this message.

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

Mr. DONNELL. I do, yes.

Mr. BARKLEY. Without commenting upon the necessity for the letter or statement made by the President, and without in any way intimating whether I disagree or agree with the Senator from Missouri as to his alternative interpretations, does not the Senator from Missouri agree that in view of the President's letter, whatever may be his interpretation on other forms of ratification, it certainly indicates that he will not attempt to by-pass Congress by putting it on the ground of an executive agreement?

Mr. DONNELL. I agree with the Senator in that construction of the message.

Mr. BARKLEY. I feel that that was the purpose of the letter. There was some fear that the President might undertake to by-pass Congress altogether by an executive agreement, and I think the object of this letter is simply to disabuse anyone's mind of any fear or suspicion that he would pursue that course.

Mr. DONNELL. I think the Senator may well be correct in his construction. Nevertheless, I believe that the proposition which I enunciate is still sound; for 3 months from now, when the question shall arise before the Senate as to whether these agreements must be concluded by treaty, or may be concluded by joint legislative action of the two Houses, regardless of our innermost thoughts as to the purpose of the President, the words of this instrument, the words upon this sheet of paper, are the words which will control. Any Senator is entitled to his construction. It may well be that at that time some eloquent Senator, sincerely and honestly, will rise and read this sentence:

When any such agreement or agreements are negotiated it will be my purpose to ask the Congress—

Which consists of two Houses—
for appropriate legislation—

Not ratification, or advice and consent—
to approve them.

It may well be that the distinguished Senator who will then rise will believe that the President's meaning was that joint action of the two Houses of Congress is necessary.

It is not my purpose this afternoon to undertake to argue whether such an agreement as is mentioned in article 43 of the charter must be made by treaty or not. As I see it, that question is not before us this afternoon. Any Senator who desires may, of course, bear that question in mind; but as I see it, it is not necessary to decide that question here today.

In my opinion there is very much to be said in favor of the view that the agreement or agreements mentioned in article 43 must be made, and can only be made, a treaty receiving the ratification—or perhaps more technically correct, the advice and consent—of the Senate. The very fact that the word "ratification" is used in article 43 is to my mind very significant. It is true that the Constitution of the United States does not use the word "ratification" in connection with treaties. It is true that the words "advise and consent" are used in the Constitution. Nevertheless, is there a Member of this body who has not himself at times referred to the process by which treaty is acted upon by the Senate as being the ratification of the treaty? I take it that a word is customarily interpreted by the courts according to its ordinary acceptance; and when the word "ratification" or the expression "ratification by constitutional processes" comes before the Senate, to my mind there is strong argument—perhaps not conclusive—in favor of the proposition that action by the

Senate, which we refer to as ratifying a treaty, was intended by those who drafted the instrument.

Mr. President, the conclusion at which I arrive as to the possible—and perhaps probable—meaning of the word "ratification" or the expression "ratification by constitutional processes" as applied to the United States is very strongly corroborated by the testimony which was given by a distinguished witness before the Senate committee. I shall not take long to read this testimony, but I think it is of such vital importance that it should be again read. This testimony was given by Mr. Dulles. I am not unmindful of the fact that the distinguished Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], who served with such great honor to himself and credit to our body at San Francisco, telephoned to Mr. Dulles the other day to secure from him his then interpretation. Nevertheless, I read to the Senate from page 469, and following, of the testimony on the Charter.

Senator MILLIKIN. Thank you. If I understood you correctly, Mr. Dulles, I thought you said that the Senate will have an opportunity to ratify the special agreement having to do with our contribution of force and material.

Mr. DULLES. Yes, sir.

Senator MILLIKIN. Is that your opinion?

Mr. DULLES. That is not only my opinion, but it is expressly stated in the Charter that the agreements are subject to ratification by the states in accordance with their constitutional processes.

Senator MILLIKIN. Then it is your opinion that to comply with our constitutional processes, that separate agreement would have to come to the Senate for ratification?

Mr. DULLES. It is, and that was the view of the American delegation. I think there is no doubt whatever about that.

Senator MILLIKIN. Is there any doubt about that, Mr. Dulles?

Mr. DULLES. No.

Senator MILLIKIN. And no disagreement of opinion on that?

Mr. DULLES. No.

Senator MILLIKIN. I take it that by ratification you mean "ratification by the method of advising and consenting to a treaty?"

Mr. DULLES. That is correct; by a two-thirds vote of the Senate.

Senator MILLIKIN. The reason why I asked the question is that you are, of course, aware of the fact that there is a large dispute as to who is the legitimate field for so-called executory agreements and treaties. You are definitely of the opinion that the special agreement referred to will have to be handled by supplemental treaty rather than by an executory agreement?

Mr. DULLES. I have no doubt whatever about that.

It is possible that upon reflection Mr. Dulles may have concluded that in his own mind there was predominant merely the contrast between congressional action on the one hand and Executive action on the other; but certainly that was never even intimated or suggested by him in his testimony.

Mr. President, I see rising at this moment on the floor of the Senate the distinguished chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee. I desire to read from page 470 of the testimony before the committee:

Mr. DULLES. It is clearly my view, and it was the view of the entire United States delegation, that the agreement which will provide for the United States military contingent will have to be negotiated and then submitted to the Senate for ratification in the same way as a treaty.

Senator MILLIKIN. I should like to ask if that is the opinion of the chairman of the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. It is most certainly the opinion of the chairman of the committee.

Our constitutional process is for us here at home to decide. There is no question in my mind that that means that the agreements must be ratified just like treaties are ratified, because they are with foreign countries. They are vital, they affect our Military Establishment, so they would have to be ratified by the United States Senate.

I thoroughly agree with Mr. Dulles that there was no question ever raised, so far as I know, in the Conference as to that effect.

Finally, with respect to the Conference, I call attention to the language of the distinguished Senator from Michigan at page 7991 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD for July 24. At that time he stated as follows:

Mr. VANDENBERG. So far as my own interpretation is concerned, I think the record should be completed in respect to the constitutional point submitted by the able Senator from Montana regarding the form in which the basic agreement for force, as contemplated by the charter, shall be handled in the United States in behalf of the United States.

First, I wish to say that it never remotely occurred to me, either at San Francisco or since, that the language used in the charter at this point did not refer to a treaty to be brought before the Senate of the United States for ratification, precisely as indicated by Mr. Dulles in his testimony, and as supported by the able Senator from Texas in his interpretation.

So, Mr. President, I emphasize the point that there is strong reason for the view that the agreements under article 43 of the Charter do come under the category of treaties and must be ratified in that manner, and by the Senate.

However, as I have stated, it is not my purpose this afternoon to undertake to argue conclusively that proposition. My point is simply that I desire it clearly understood that in voting for the Charter, which I shall do, after receipt of the President's message I shall not be precluded, when agreements under article 43 come up for action, from using my then best judgment in determining whether those agreements are matters necessitating a treaty.

Mr. DOWNEY. Mr. President, I wish only to express my profound and unqualified commitment to the pending Charter and to its noble ideals and objectives and my fervent hope that the Senate of the United States will soon express its approval of the Charter, and thereafter at an appropriate date adequately implements its powers.

Mr. President, I should like to ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks, without reading, a column from one of our great California newspapers, the San Francisco Chronicle, the column be-

ing written by one of our noted political writers, Earl C. Behrens.

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

WASHINGTON, July 23.—The San Francisco Charter of the United Nations will be ratified overwhelmingly by the United States Senate. It should be.

The instrument forged by the hands of men and women of 50 United Nations at San Francisco opens the way for a better world for your sons and mine.

The Charter may not be perfect but neither was the Constitution when it was written in 1787.

It may be improved as the years show its imperfections.

The new World Security Organization presents to peace-loving nations the opportunity for new form of cooperative effort to better the conditions of all peoples, to work for peace on earth and good will toward one's neighbors.

The charter can succeed if men of good will have the courage to make it work.

The 20 to 1 vote whereby the Senate Foreign Relations Committee adopted its report favoring Charter ratification represents about the ratio of sentiment throughout the Nation for American participation in the new International Organization with the fervent hope it will be the beginning of the end of wars.

In marked contrast to consideration of the League of Nations Covenant by the Senate 26 years ago is the present debate over the San Francisco Charter.

The charter was framed in the full spotlight of world publicity. Representatives of the press of the 50 nations at the San Francisco Conference kept the people informed of every phase of the Charter making.

The Senate was kept daily advised of the progress of the delegates at San Francisco.

Two Members of the Senate, TOM CONNALLY, Texas, Democrat, and ARTHUR H. VANDENBERG, Michigan, Republican, were members of the United States delegation.

The League of Nations Covenant was the work of a few men. The charter was the creation of 50 nations working in harmony to reach an accord.

Hearings on the charter by the Foreign Relations Committee gave every person who asked to be heard, either for or against ratification, an opportunity to present his or her arguments. Senator CONNALLY did an admirable job in handling the week-long hearings.

The committee hearings, the wide publicity attendant upon the Conference deliberations, the complete reports given the Senate by CONNALLY and VANDENBERG upon their return from San Francisco laid the ground work for an intelligent, searching, and speedy action upon the charter.

Each important instrumentality under the charter—the General Assembly, the “town meeting of the world”; the Security Council, the agency which will have at its disposal forces to keep the peace; the Economic and Social Council, designed to improve the life standards of men and women; the trusteeship system for presently dependent areas; and finally the World Court—will have its part in making the world a better place in which to live.

That details for working out American participation to the fullest in every function of the new organization will be the subjects of future Senate debates is certain. That, too, is a good thing.

Ultimately, the United Nations Organization will become a smooth operating mechanism. It will take time.

Ratification of the charter by the Senate making the United States the first of the

major powers to place its final stamp of approval on the charter will give a “lift” to a war-weary world.

Americans will be proud of the Senate when the history books record the accomplishments of the Seventy-ninth Congress.

Mr. O'MAHONEY. Mr. President, on the 5th of July I was privileged to make a radio broadcast on the United Nations Charter over Station WOL, at Washington, and it was also carried over certain other stations in the West. I ask unanimous consent that the broadcast may be printed in the body of the RECORD as a part of the debate upon the Charter.

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

AMERICA SHALL SHOW THE WAY

Twenty-six years ago, on July 10, 1919, I stood on the floor of the United States Senate and listened to the address of President Wilson when he laid before the Senate the Treaty of Versailles with the Covenant of the League of Nations. I shall never forget the profound impression he made upon his auditors, nor the prolonged applause which greeted him. True, there were frigid faces in the Chamber and some senatorial hands firmly held in repose, but the great audience which thronged the Chamber was stirred to its depths.

The President stood there on the rostrum urging with matchless eloquence that “The united power of free nations must put a stop to aggression, and the world must be given peace.” As he spoke, it seemed almost as though there emanated from him the light in which he beheld the vision of a world from which war had been forever banished.

On Monday, as I listened to the message of President Truman, laying before the Senate another charter of world peace, I thought of that message so many years ago and of the sufferings and the sacrifices which have been endured by all peoples of the world because the words of Wilson fell upon deaf ears. I thought of the boys whose lives were sacrificed on the fields of France in that conflict of more than a quarter of a century ago. I thought of the boys, the American boys, whose lives have been offered in this war upon every continent and every ocean—and then I thought of the boys not yet born upon whom will fall the sacrifices of the inevitable wars that will follow a repetition of the failure of 1919.

I have never forgotten the address of President Wilson on that July day of 1919. I felt then, as I feel now, that the nations of the world must unite to prevent war or be prepared for succeeding conflicts, growing in horror, and terminating finally in the destruction of civilization.

At the conclusion of President Truman's appeal for the ratification of the United Nations Charter, I turned back in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to read again the address of President Wilson. I want now to read his concluding paragraph, for it is as true today as it was when he uttered it. These were the words with which he laid the Covenant of the League of Nations before the Senate:

“The stage is set; the destiny disclosed. It has come about by no plan of our conceiving but by the hand of God who led us into this way. We cannot turn back. We can only go forward with lifted eyes and freshened spirit to follow the vision. It was of this that we dreamed at our birth. America shall in truth show the way. The light streams upon the path ahead, and nowhere else.”

The message of Wilson did not die. His vision did not perish. And in the course of time America gave another great President

to the world who labored to make it effective. Now a third great American President, standing in the very spot where Wilson stood at the end of the First World War, has called upon America to realize its destiny—to approve the Charter of the United Nations—and thus to point out the path of peace for all the rest of mankind.

No one, it has seemed to me, who has ever taken pride in the fact that here in the United States we have built a people's government can fail to rejoice at the opportunity now given to us to build a world organization for all the peoples of the world. It is not without meaning that President Truman called to the attention of the Senate that the new Charter "has been written in the name of 'We the peoples of the United Nations.'" The Constitution of the United States began with the phrase "We, the people of the United States." Now we have a document for all the inhabitants of the earth written upon the same sound foundation of popular sovereignty.

There are many things that can be said about this Charter, about the powers it creates, and the functions which it calls into being. Each of them will be painstakingly scrutinized and all of them will, in due course, be expounded to the Senate and to the people of the country. For the purposes of this talk, however, I want to call attention to the essential human character of the document. It is a charter for the people. It is designed to conserve human liberty. It is designed to safeguard human rights. Its purpose is to create a world from which war will be banished and in which all mankind shall be able to live without distinction of race, sex, language, or religion.

Thus, the principles which we have proven in the United States to be productive of good for all men are the principles upon which this new structure of the United Nations is to be erected.

In the preamble, the Charter asserts faith in the "equal rights and self-determination of peoples." It proclaims the goal of international cooperation for the promotion of human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The Charter, in article 2, pledges the Organization and all its members to the purposes set forth in the preamble, and all members are enjoined to "fulfill in good faith the obligations assumed by them" under the Charter.

Popular rights constitute the heart and soul of this document and as one reads its various articles over and over again, one hears the theme of humanity and freedom reasserted.

Not only are the members of the United Nations placed under a solemn obligation to seek the pacific settlement of all disputes; not only are the means provided for the avoidance of war through negotiation, mediation, and conciliation, and through the operation of an International Court of Justice; not only is provision made for action to avoid breaches of the peace and to suppress acts of aggression, but the pact provides the means for bringing about international economic and social cooperation for the express purpose of promoting the welfare of people as individuals.

We are not dealing here with states alone. We are not dealing with power alone. We are dealing with people—with their rights, their standards of living, their economic and social development. In chapter IX on "International economic and social cooperation" as in chapter I, the United Nations Charter enjoins "universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all without distinction as to race, sex, language, or religion."

Again the spirit of the Charter, which is the same spirit that brought forth the free political institutions of self-governing Amer-

ica, is reannounced in the declaration regarding those territories of the earth which have not yet achieved self-government. This is chapter XI, and by its terms (art. 73), "Members of the United Nations which have or assume responsibilities for the administration of territories whose peoples have not yet attained a full measure of self-government recognize the principle that the interests of the inhabitants of these territories are paramount and accept as a sacred trust the obligation to promote to the utmost, within the system of international peace and security established by the present Charter, the well-being of the inhabitants of these territories."

Here is a pledge to develop self-government among all peoples. Here is the establishment of an international system of trusteeship which sets a new goal of liberty and progress for all the backward peoples of the world.

The golden thread of liberty and humanity which runs through this charter leads directly to the General Assembly which Senator VAN DEN BERG, in his report to the Senate, called the town meeting of the world. The General Assembly is not only an open forum for all the peoples of the world, but all the provisions of the Charter for the Economic and Social Council and the Trusteeship Council, and the other organs which are designed to protect and advance human rights, are drawn together in the General Assembly. It is the world parliament in which free speech shall reign and in which there may be discussed any question that threatens the peace and security of the world. Here the representatives of the nations may gather to promote the general welfare of all mankind.

In simple words, it is set down (article 10) that "the General Assembly may discuss any questions or any matters within the scope of the present Charter." It may discuss any questions or matters "relating to the powers and functions of any organs provided for in the present Charter." It may "consider the general principles of cooperation in the maintenance of international peace and security, including the principles governing disarmament and the regulation of armaments." It may discuss "any questions relating to the maintenance of international peace and security brought before it by any member of the United Nations, or by the Security Council, or by a state which is not a member." And finally it may "call the attention of the Security Council to situations which are likely to endanger international peace and security."

It seems inevitable that a world organization so dedicated to the preservation of human freedom; an organization framed to foster economic and social improvement among men; to raise the standards of colonial peoples; and to promote self-government, as well as to banish war, will rise superior to any restrictions or impediments that may be deemed to be contained in the provision that the vital decisions of the Security Council shall be made by an affirmative vote of 7 of the 11 members, including the 5 permanent members. When a free assembly is created in which men may speak their minds, an instrument of public opinion is formed. There is no force that can permanently withstand public opinion. The Charter of the United Nations in the General Assembly has forged the instrument of world public opinion from which there can be no appeal.

All the sacrifices that the people of America have endured in two World Wars within the span of a single generation will have been in vain unless this Organization is given to the world. We can justify the miseries, deprivations, casualties, and deaths which have been endured only by a firm de-

termination that the world shall have this agency for peace and progress.

"It was of this," as Wilson said, "that we dreamed" when our Nation was born. "America shall in truth show the way. The light streams upon the path ahead and nowhere else."

Mr. LUCAS. Mr. President, without taking the time of the Senate to indulge in further remarks, I ask unanimous consent that there may be printed at this point in the RECORD a statement which I issued to the press this afternoon, dealing with the subject that has just been discussed by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. DONNELL].

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

Mr. President, the President, with forthright candor and in advance, has sent to the Senate a message in which he advises that supplemental military agreements to the charter will be sent to the Congress for appropriate legislative action.

His message is timely and constructive. First, it definitely eliminates any possibility that these military agreements for troop contingents to be used in the future will be implemented by executive agreement.

Second, it advises the Senate that the agreements will be sent to the Congress for joint action.

Third, it adds tremendous strength to the position that so many Senators have taken, namely, that these supplemental agreements are not treaties.

Fourth, that frank and open declaration of the President will help remove fear and doubt among the United Nations with respect to what is the proper constitutional process.

Fifth, the declaration, along with treaty ratification, will materially strengthen the President's hand in the remaining days of the Potsdam Conference.

Sixth, it assures to the American people that the President believes the San Francisco Charter is one of substance and strength and not one of form and futility.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is, will the Senate advise and consent to the ratification of Executive F, the United Nations Charter?

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, during my service in the Senate in behalf of the common people, I have never sold the truth to serve the hour. I have no quarrel with the vote of any honest Senator upon this floor. Each one took the same oath that I took, namely, to defend and uphold the Constitution of the United States of America.

Practically all Members of this body have indicated that they will vote for the charter. Under my oath, Mr. President, and under my conscience, I cannot so vote. If I did I would feel that I was betraying the hundreds of thousands who have died in this war for the United States, and the hundreds of thousands who have sacrificed their loved ones and their treasure. I would be willing to vote for the appropriation of the last dollar in the United States Treasury, and the last dollar that we could borrow if, by spending that money, we could eliminate war, which we all abhor and hate. I would unhesitatingly vote for the Charter if I felt that it offered even the tiniest hope of a per-

manent peace. But, in spite of that, Mr. President, I feel from the bottom of my heart that the adoption of the Charter—and, make sure, we are going to implement it—will mean perpetuating war. I feel that it will mean the enslavement of millions of people from Poland to India, from Korea to Java, as well as people in many other places on this earth.

Mr. President, I feel that the adoption of the Charter will be one step more toward compulsory and military conscription, and all that which goes with war.

In my opinion, the charter is not at all similar to the Constitution of the United States which was adopted by the Original Colonies. I may say at this point that I agree with what the distinguished Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES] said earlier in the day, when he stated:

Most important of all, the American Constitution went to great length to guarantee genuine equality to States entering into the Union. Neither Ben Franklin nor the other members of the Constitutional Convention would have tolerated a constitution by which two or three or five of the States were given a veto power over all of the rest.

Mr. President, I say to you and to the other Members of the Senate that, in my judgment, if the Charter had been in effect when the American Revolution took place, France and all other countries who came to help us would not have been able to come, and today we would still be a colony under the rule of England.

Mr. President, in my campaign for the senatorship 5 years ago I pledged to the fathers and mothers of North Dakota that I would never vote to send our boys away to be slaughtered upon the battlefields of Europe. I kept that pledge on this floor. I promised in that campaign to vote in the Senate to expend the last dollar, if necessary, in order to defend the Western Hemisphere. Again I say, Mr. President, that I kept that pledge to the people of North Dakota.

Having so pledged myself, and having been elected to my senatorship upon such pledge, and not having been elected to create an organization to which we would give a promise, either express or implied, that it would have authority to send our boys all over the earth, I cannot support the Charter. I believe it is fraught with danger to the American people, and to American institutions. I further believe that when a candidate for office pledges himself by specific promises, those promises should be honored, regardless of the political consequences which may follow to the candidate who made them.

Furthermore, Mr. President, I reiterate that we ought not to vote on this Charter in the absence of our 11,000,000 fighting men and women. They are now away, and we do not know what their attitude will be upon their return, after having been to the four corners of the earth and after having fought upon the seven seas. We sit here, Mr. President, in our fine offices and upon this senatorial floor, blissfully ignorant of what those 11,000,000 veterans may be thinking. After all, they constitute the backbone of the

common people of America. Certainly there is no reason for such a hurry to pass this Charter that some steps could not have been taken to have referred the matter to the people of the country, including the men and women in the armed forces, before the final vote was taken upon it. As their representative here in the Senate, I cannot, I will not, God helping me, vote for a measure which I believe to be unlawful under our Constitution, a measure which, in my opinion, betrays the very people who sent us to the Senate as their representatives.

Mr. BARKLEY. 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	Murdoch	Young
George	Murray	
Gerry	Myers	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Ninety-one Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, I do not rise to make a speech. I do wish, however, to have printed in the RECORD a resolution of October 4, 1943, which was submitted by the senior Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON]. I do not believe that the debate on this historic Charter should close without some mention being made in the RECORD that on October 4, 1943, the Senator from Iowa [Mr. WILSON] submitted a resolution requesting the President to invite friendly nations to enter upon consultations with delegates of the United States with the view to promotion of permanent international peace. I think due credit should be given to the senior Senator from Iowa for being one of the first Members of the Senate during this war to seek the convening of a world conference of friendly nations to charter a course of permanent peace.

I look upon his resolution of October 4, 1943, as really one of the forerunners of the great San Francisco Conference which brought forth the historic document now about to be voted upon. I ask unanimous consent to have the resolution printed in the body of the RECORD.

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

Joint resolution requesting the President to invite friendly nations to enter upon consultations with delegates of the United States with a view of the promotion of permanent international peace

Resolved, etc., That the Congress requests the President of the United States to call upon the nations not engaged in warfare against the United States to enter immediately into deliberations looking toward the promotion of permanent international peace.

There is hereby created to participate in such discussion a committee of six delegates from the United States, two to be appointed by the President, two to be elected by the Senate, and two to be elected by the House of Representatives, which delegates shall take oath as prescribed for public officers.

Upon receipt by the President of notification of the willingness of other nations to enter into such discussions, the committee shall begin consultations with the representatives of such other nations, and shall continue until the delegates are recalled by resolution.

The committee may, or shall, upon written request from the President or from the Congress, or from either branch thereof, report and make recommendations jointly to the President and the Congress.

The President of the United States is requested to do all things necessary to carry into effect the provisions of this resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I dislike very much to find that there is a division in the thinking of the delegation in the Senate from North Dakota. However, I should like to make this statement: Surely the more than 30,000,000 dead and wounded of this war, the suffering, the heartaches, and the sacrifices of millions more, the loss of probably more than a trillion dollars in property, should be an incentive to us to find better means of solving world problems than what we have had in the past.

I not only shall vote for the Charter, but I hope that no vote I cast at any time during the period I am privileged to be a Member of the Senate will in any way hinder our progress under the Charter for peace by negotiation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The resolution of ratification will be read.

The resolution was 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.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the resolution of ratification. The yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. HOEY (when Mr. BAILEY's name was called). My colleague the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. BAILEY] is detained at home because of illness in his family. If he were present he would vote for the ratification of the Charter. If his vote had been essential to ratification he would have been here regardless of the illness in his family.

Mr. CONNALLY (when Mr. GLASS' name was called). The Senator from Virginia [Mr. GLASS] is absent because of personal illness. He has requested that I announce that fact to the Senate, together with the statement that if he were able to be present he would vote for the ratification of the Charter.

Mr. WHERRY (when the name of Mr. JOHNSON of California was called). I announce that the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is paired on this question with the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS]. If present, the Senator from California would vote "nay." If the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] were present they would vote "yea."

I also announce that the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] is necessarily absent, the Senator from Idaho [Mr. THOMAS] is absent because of illness, and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. REED] is absent on official business.

The roll call was concluded.

The result was—yeas 89, nays 2, as follows:

YEAS—89

Alken	Gerry	Myers
Andrews	Green	O'Daniel
Austin	Guffey	O'Mahoney
Ball	Gurney	Overton
Bankhead	Hart	Pepper
Barkley	Hatch	Radcliffe
Bilbo	Hawkes	Revercomb
Brewster	Hayden	Robertson
Bridges	Hickenlooper	Russell
Briggs	Hill	Saltonstall
Brooks	Hoey	Smith
Buck	Johnson, Colo.	Stewart
Burton	Johnston, S. C.	Taft
Bushfield	Kilgore	Taylor
Butler	La Follette	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	Murdoch	Young
George	Murray	

NAYS—2

Langer Shipstead

NOT VOTING—5

Balley	Johnson, Calif.	Thomas, Idaho
Glass	Reed	

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. On this vote the yeas are 89, the nays are 2. Two-thirds of the Senators present concurring therein, the resolution of ratification is agreed to, and the treaty is ratified.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask that the President be immediately notified of the action of the Senate in advising and consenting to the ratification of the treaty.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the President will be so notified.

EIGHTH ANNIVERSARY OF SERVICE OF SENATOR BARKLEY AS MAJORITY LEADER

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that there be entered in the body of the RECORD, in regular type, a letter from the President of the United States, dated July 27, 1945, congratulating and commending the majority leader of the Senate on the eighth anniversary of his service as majority leader.

Mr. President, this letter, I think, should go into the RECORD because it is expressive not only of the commendation and the honor which the President of the United States pays the majority leader of this body, but the Honorable ALBEN W. BARKLEY, senior Senator from Kentucky, has served in the capacity of majority leader for a longer period of time than anyone else in the history of the Senate, so far as I am advised.

Mr. President, I wish to say that the distinguished majority leader has at all times maintained the dignity of his political party in this body, but he likewise has approached the discharge of all his duties, as the President of the United States says, without "semblance of partisanship or desire for party advantage whenever the welfare of our Nation required it."

The distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky has served well not only his party, but he has served well the interest of this Republic through the long period, through the convulsive years that he has been privileged to serve this body. Times have been trying. Problems have been most important. No similar period in the whole history of the country can duplicate the problems and the difficulties and great issues and events which we have been called upon to consider here in the last 8 years.

Mr. President, I know that I speak not only for all the members of the majority party, but I feel certain that I voice the sentiments of the minority party in wishing for the Senator from Kentucky long years of further service in this important post which he has filled with such distinguished ability and credit and profit to the country.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LUCAS in the chair). Without objection, the letter will be placed in the RECORD, as requested by the Senator from Georgia.

The letter is as follows:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, July 27, 1945.

DEAR ALBEN: Today marks the eighth anniversary of your service as majority leader of the Senate. I understand that this is twice as long as any of your predecessors have served. These years have been eventful ones. They have been years of great moment to the United States and to the world.

In all of the recent events which have meant so much in shaping the future of our civilization you have played an important and effective role. Not only have

you helped to fulfill the ideals and principles of our party, but you have been willing and anxious to lay aside all semblance of partisanship or desire for party advantage whenever the welfare of our Nation required it.

I congratulate you on your past service as majority leader, and, also, on your 33 years of service in the Congress. The Nation is grateful to you for your patriotic share in the accomplishments of these years, and I know that the years to come will be equally fruitful.

With all best wishes for your continued health and success from your old friend,

Very sincerely yours,

HARRY TRUMAN.

HON. ALBEN W. BARKLEY,
The United States Senate,
Washington, D. C.

Mr. WHITE. Mr. President, the Senator from Georgia has correctly expressed the sentiments of all those on this side toward the majority leader. I have served in the Congress with the Senator from Kentucky for more than 28 years. I have known of his work through all that span of time. But in late years, since I have been sitting in this seat across the aisle from him, I have come to know him better than ever before. And as I have known him my respect for him has increased and my admiration and affection for him have grown. I have wondered many times how it was possible for him to master the intricacies of the many legislative subjects which come before the Senate; how he could discuss them with such force and such clarity as he has done often and again.

Mr. President, beyond all that he has been kindly and courteous at all times. Persuasive and powerful though he has been in debate, he nevertheless has been considerate of those who may have held divergent views from his.

I especially want to express my deep appreciation and consideration for the kindness he has at all times shown me. He has made me deeply grateful to him.

I rejoice in this service which has been his. It has redounded to his personal credit. It has brought honor to his State. He has been a distinction in the Senate of the United States.

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, I endorse all that the distinguished Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE] and the distinguished Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE] have said about our colleague the senior Senator from Kentucky. He has been a great leader, and we are all proud of him. Let me make it short by saying, May he live long and prosper. That is my earnest wish, and I believe it is the earnest wish of every other Member of this body.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, at this time I wish to express my very profound appreciation and gratitude, first for the letter of the President, with whom I served in this body, as most of us have, for 10 years. The letter was written upon the occasion of the eighth anniversary of my selection to the post which I hold at this desk.

I wish also especially to thank the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], with whom I have served here during all the years in which I have been a Member of the Senate; the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE]; and the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], my neighbor and colleague.

I do not know how the President happened to remember that on yesterday I had served 8 years as majority leader of the Senate. It is only evidence of the fact that he does not lose sight of any details with regard to his friends.

Eight years is a long time in the history of any man. These have been eventful years. They have been tragic years. I am not entitled to any special credit for having been majority leader for 8 years, which, as the records indicate, is twice as long as any other man ever held that position. That was not because there were not many greater majority leaders; but by reason of the change of party, the retirement of the Senator, his death, or for some other reason, it so happens that no one has heretofore served longer than 4 years in that position.

If there has been any measure of success which has accompanied my efforts here, it has been due to the cooperation and work of the Senate itself, and to individual Members of the Senate. During these years in the controversies which have arisen out of our domestic as well as our foreign affairs, there was always bound to be disagreement here and there. That is what makes this, in my judgment, the greatest deliberative body in the world. It is the one forum left among men in which men may express their views without limitation.

During all the differences which have existed over domestic and foreign matters, I think we can say that we have maintained our respect for one another, and our respect for the institution of the United States Senate. I never had greater respect for it than I have at this hour. I feel a sort of exhilaration. I feel that we have justified the processes of democracy, and that we may within our hearts experience a sort of inward invincibility in this body, as a symbol of democracy throughout the world.

I want every Senator present to know how deeply I have appreciated and now appreciate all the courtesies and all the forbearance and patience which Senators have exhibited toward me during these difficult 8 years. There is not a Member of this body, and there has not been a Member of it, for whom I do not entertain the deepest affection and profoundest respect. I now thank all of you for the efforts you have put forth which have made it possible for us, during these 8 years, to record what I believe is an unsurpassed record of legislation on surpassingly important problems in the history of the United States.

Especially do I wish to thank my good friend across the aisle, the Senator from Maine [Mr. WHITE], with whom I served in the House, whom I helped to elect on one occasion by speaking in his district against him [laughter], and who has cooperated with me in the same spirit in

which his predecessor, Senator McNary, of Oregon, cooperated during the days in which he occupied the same position.

We are about to go for a season of rest. We cannot do so until next Wednesday, under the terms of the concurrent resolution which we have already agreed to; but I presume that before next Wednesday many Senators will have taken their leave. I wish for all of you rest and happiness and repose. I wish for each of you that inner feeling and inner consciousness of work well done which will enable you to enjoy this vacation which I am happy to have helped to bring about.

Mr. WHITE. I am not willing that there should be an adjournment or recess tonight without saying a very brief word of appreciation of the labors of the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY] and my colleague from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG]. During all the preliminary stages which led up to the Dumbarton Oaks Conference and the Dumbarton Oaks proposal and the labors at San Francisco and the work which has been done here since their return, and which has its consummation today, both of them brought to their tasks rare abilities, high purpose, and a consecration to the highest of mankind's hopes and causes. I think we always wish to bear in mind that peace is one of the fundamental concepts of every religion, it is the professed desire of every statesman in the world, and I think it is the yearning of every human heart. The Senator from Texas and the Senator from Michigan, by their efforts, more than anyone else, have taken us with giant strides along the road to peace. I think they have pointed out the star of hope to all of us. I wish to express to both of them my respect, my affection, and my admiration for their service.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, of course I join in what the Senator from Maine has said. I tried feebly to express it on Tuesday when I discussed the treaty itself. I feel that it cannot be too often reiterated. I not only appreciate the intelligence with which the Senator from Texas and the Senator from Michigan have approached this subject, but I appreciate the skill with which, not only at San Francisco, but here, they have piloted this great consummation to a successful conclusion in this body. I feel that we all may say, in the words of the Methodist hymn:

This is the hour we long have sought,
And mourned because we found it not.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I find no adequate words with which to express to the distinguished senior Senator from Maine and the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky my appreciation for the kind things they have said. I simply desire to express my gratitude for their generosity.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. MCKELLAR, from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, reported favorably the nominations of sundry postmasters.

NOMINATION OF NATHAN ROSS MARGOLD TO BE ASSOCIATE JUSTICE OF DISTRICT COURT FOR THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—MOTION TO DISCHARGE JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. CHANDLER submitted the following resolution, which was ordered to lie on the table:

Resolved, That the Committee on the Judiciary be, and it is hereby, discharged from the further consideration of the nomination of Hon. Nathan Ross Margold, of the District of Columbia, to be associate justice of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia, vice Hon. Bolitha J. Laws.

CONSIDERATION OF NOMINATIONS ON THE EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the nominations on the calendar be now considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the clerk will state the nominations on the calendar.

THE JUDICIARY

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Enrique Campos del Toro, of Puerto Rico, to be attorney general of Puerto Rico.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

The legislative clerk read the nomination of James E. Manahan, of St. Albans, Vt., to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 2.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nomination is confirmed.

POSTMASTERS

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations of postmasters.

Mr. BARKLEY. I ask unanimous consent that the nominations of postmasters be confirmed en bloc.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the postmaster nominations on the calendar and those which have been reported today are confirmed en bloc.

THE NAVY

The legislative clerk proceeded to read sundry nominations in the Navy.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the nominations in the Navy are confirmed en bloc; and, without objection, the President will be notified of all nominations confirmed today. That completes the calendar.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of legislative business.

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

THE FARM MACHINERY SHORTAGE

Mr. LANGER. Upon various occasions I have spoken about the terrible situation in the Northwest because of the lack of farm machinery and farm machinery repair parts. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the

RECORD a letter received by me from Mr. R. J. Eggert, of Davenport, N. Dak. In his letter he says it is impossible for him to harvest his crop unless he obtains some machinery.

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

DAVENPORT, N. DAK., July 23, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: I thought that after we went through last year with no repairs and all the loss of time in man-hours and all the loss of grain that the people that look after the repairs would see to it, as the Government said they would, that this would not happen again. Well, here we are getting ready to harvest and I got two combines, two tractors, a truck, and a power binder waiting for parts. Oh yes, we got the parts coming on a red order, but when in hell they will get here is more than we know. This is just getting ready to harvest. When we break down in the field we will still have to put it on a red order and keep paying our help \$10 a day to wait with us. That gets to be hell and we're all getting fed up on working and spending our money and then getting nothing to harvest with. This policy of too little and too late has got to be stopped if we want to save our country from destruction. I know, Mr. LANGER, that your heart is with us, and please see what you can do to get the repairs coming to save this crop.

Best regards,

R. J. EGGERT.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I may say that the letter to which I have just referred is only one of several hundred letters which I shall be glad to show to any Senator who wishes to see them. They are all in my office. I do not wish to encumber the RECORD by having them printed at this time.

Mr. President, in this connection I wish to say that at this very time, when thousands of our farmers cannot get farm machinery, it is being exported from the United States. On the second of July, through the little town of Portal, N. Dak., there went to Canada eight McCormick-Deering self-propelled combines, on rubber. I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the postal card I have received relative to that matter.

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

PORTAL, N. DAK., July 2, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been out of town for over a week. The girl here did not count the machinery that was exported, but she says there were many carloads.

Tonight there were eight McCormick-Deering self-propelled combines exported on rubber.

NORMAN G. JENSEN.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on the 3d of July, through Portal, N. Dak., there were exported on flat cars 18 Allis-Chalmers combines on rubber, and 2 self-propelled McCormick-Deering combines on rubber. I ask unanimous consent to have the communication I have received in that connection printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PORTAL, N. DAK., July 4, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR: There were exported on flat cars here July 3, 18 Allis-Chalmers combines

on rubber, 2 self-propelled McCormick-Deering combines on rubber.

Rumor was that there were two carloads in boxcars. I can't see that.

NORMAN G. JENSEN.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on July 7, at the very time when our farmers were despairing of ever getting the farm machinery they needed and were not able to buy it at any place in North Dakota, through the same town of Portal, N. Dak.—and I may add that similar shipments were made through numerous other towns lying near or on the border between North Dakota and Canada—there were exported on flatcars 6 Allis-Chalmers combines on rubber, 4 McCormick-Deering self-propelled combines on rubber, and 6 McCormick-Deering tractors on rubber; and on July 8, 1945, 6 Allis-Chalmers combines on rubber were exported to Canada through the same town.

The gentleman who sent me that information also writes, as follows:

I missed sending you a card for July 4. There were 18 Allis-Chalmers combines on rubber, 2 McCormick-Deering self-propelled combines on rubber, and 1 used caterpillar tractor.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have that communication printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PORTAL, N. DAK., July 9, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR: There were exported at Portal, on flat cars, July 7, 1945, six Allis-Chalmers combines on rubber, four McCormick-Deering self-propelled combines on rubber, six McCormick-Deering tractors on rubber.

July 8, 1945, six Allis-Chalmers combines on rubber.

I missed sending you a card for July 4. There were 18 Allis-Chalmers combines on rubber, two McCormick-Deering self-propelled combines on rubber, one used caterpillar tractor.

NORMAN G. JENSEN.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have also received a postal card dated the 16th of July, and in it the writer states that through the town of Portal, N. Dak., the following McCormick-Deering combines were exported:

On July 9, two combines; on July 10, eight combines; on July 11, six combines; on July 12, four combines; on July 13, 14, and 15, none; and on July 16, six combines. The writer states that all the combines were on rubber.

I ask unanimous consent to have that communication printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PORTAL, N. DAK., July 16, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR: I have been out of town a week, but here's the count.

Only McCormick-Deering combines were exported as follows:

July 9, two combines; July 10, eight combines; July 11, six combines; July 12, four combines; July 13, 14, and 15, none; July 16, six combines; all on rubber.

NORMAN G. JENSEN.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I have also received the following communication, dated at Portal, N. Dak., July 21, 1945:

PORTAL, N. DAK., July 21, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR: I was out of town on July 18 and 19. On July 20 there were six McCormick-Deering self-propelled combines, on rubber, exported at Portal. These were on flatcars—I can't see what is in the boxcars.

NORMAN G. JENSEN.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I received a similar communication dated July 24, just a few days ago, at the very time when our farmers out there were writing to me that they could not harvest their crops because they do not have the machinery they need. I may say that the same situation exists in Montana and South Dakota. The postal card which I hold in my hand states that through the same little town, Portal, N. Dak., there were exported 2 McCormick-Deering self-propelled combines, 4 Oliver combines, and 7 John Deere tractors, all on rubber.

I ask unanimous consent to have the communication printed at this point in the RECORD.

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

PORTAL, N. DAK., July 24, 1945.

DEAR SENATOR: Yesterday evening there were exported on flat cars 2 McCormick-Deering self-propelled combines, 4 Oliver combines, 7 John Deere tractors, all on rubber.

There was another train during the night, but I missed that. There were some on it, but no count was taken.

NORMAN G. JENSEN.

MEAD COMMITTEE INVESTIGATION OF CURTISS-WRIGHT PLANT

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, in connection with the investigation of the Curtiss-Wright plant which took place at Buffalo, N. Y.—a subject which I have discussed in the Senate at various times—it appears that I was unfair or unjust to a gentleman holding office in Washington. His name is T. P. Wright. He formerly was vice president of the Curtiss-Wright Co. I have no desire to be unfair to anyone. I, myself, know what it means to be treated unfairly. Therefore, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter Mr. Wright wrote me on July 12, in which he states he thinks he was unfairly dealt with in my speeches; and I also ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a certified copy of a resignation which Mr. Wright had filed with the Curtiss-Wright Co., and also various other documents which I have in connection with this matter.

There being no objection, the letter, resignation, and accompanying documents were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CIVIL AERONAUTICS ADMINISTRATION,
Washington, July 12, 1945.

[Registered]

The Honorable WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR LANGER: The January 11 CONGRESSIONAL RECORD reported a speech which you had made before the Senate, in

which you stated that during the time I was engaged in the war effort on aircraft production matters as a public servant, I was also vice president of the Curtiss-Wright Corp. Implications of a similar nature in connection with my present post as Administrator of Civil Aeronautics were also made. I decided to ignore that unjustified attack at that time, based as it was on misinformation.

Subsequently you have made other attacks on my character, culminating in one on July 3 (copy attached), which contains statements so grossly at variance with the facts as to lead me to believe that it is appropriate to advise you that you have been misinformed, and that with correct information at hand, you would welcome an opportunity of putting the RECORD straight.

I am therefore forwarding herewith a copy of my resignation from the Curtiss-Wright Corp., dated January 20, 1941, together with a copy of that portion of the minutes of the meeting of the board of directors of Curtiss-Wright, held January 24, 1941, in which my resignation was accepted.

I am sure you will now want to rectify the grave injustice occasioned by your previous speeches by renouncing on the floor of the Senate all of your past untrue statements concerning me, together with all implications that you drew from them. As I do not want the RECORD to stand uncorrected any longer, I shall greatly appreciate your courtesy in making an appropriate statement before the Senate this month.

Kindly be advised that I have not as yet taken any action on this matter other than this letter. I am, however, sending copies to those Government officials who are most vitally concerned with knowing that my position as a public servant in the posts I have held and now hold is unimpeachable from the standpoint of any outside company connections.

Sincerely yours,

T. P. WRIGHT,

Administrator of Civil Aeronautics.

[Enclosures.]

Copies (with copy enclosures) to President Truman, Secretary Wallace, Assistant Secretary Burden, Senator J. W. Bailey, Senator P. McCarran.

[Excerpt from speech of Senator LANGER, CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, p. 7171, July 3, 1945]

MR. LANGER. Mr. President, at the time when Mr. Truman, as a Senator, was criticizing Curtiss-Wright, Theodore P. Wright was vice president of the Curtiss-Wright Corp. He was one of the men in charge. When Government contracts were being let, Theodore P. Wright took over the job of directing the Aircraft Resources Control Office of the War Department.

Mr. President, the vice president of Curtiss-Wright was appointed by President Roosevelt to take over the job of directing the Aircraft Resources Control Office of the War Department. The vice president of Curtiss-Wright also headed the Aircraft Production Board. This meant that Mr. Wright was the dictator of aircraft output in the United States. In this job he had complete control of all raw materials and priorities for the production of aircraft. The Truman committee in its report on July 10, 1943, said that the Curtiss-Wright people obtained more war contracts in the United States than any other corporation with the single exception of General Motors.

Now that the letting of war contracts has reached its peak, this same Mr. Wright—where do Senators suppose he is now? Did Mr. Truman fire him? Well, the President has been so busy cleaning up that one cannot expect him to clean up everything in a few weeks, but the fact of the matter is that Mr. Wright is today the Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration. If the distinguished senior Senator from Connecti-

cut [Mr. McMAHON] has any friend who knows something about aeronautics, I suggest that he go to see President Truman and recommend that his friend take the place of this man, Theodore P. Wright, and I am sure the distinguished senior Senator from Connecticut would make no mistake in recommending such a change.

Mr. President, does it take a Sherlock Holmes to find out why Theodore P. Wright was put in that job? Certainly not. The persons responsible for giving Theodore P. Wright that powerful position as Administrator of the Civil Aeronautics Administration undoubtedly hope to control the postwar aircraft industry, including air transportation, and through the power of a subservient CAA—if they are subservient, which I do not know and do not allege—they may be able to do so. Theodore P. Wright is the man I want to see fired from the Government service, because the CAA will control the postwar aircraft field, and no man who has been vice president of an individual aircraft corporation such as Curtiss-Wright should wield such great power over the industry.

JANUARY 20, 1941.

Mr. G. W. VAUGHAN,

President, Curtiss-Wright Corp.,
New York City, N. Y.

DEAR MR. VAUGHAN: This letter is to tender my resignation as vice president of Curtiss-Wright Corp., effective as of the close of business on January 31, 1941.

I have been asked to serve as Associate Director of Aircraft Production in the aircraft group under the Office of Production Management, and after very careful consideration have come to the conclusion that it is my duty to assist in this undertaking in Washington.

It is, of course, with the greatest regret that I sever the almost 20 years of association which I have had with Curtiss-Wright Corp. and its predecessor companies.

Sincerely yours,

T. P. WRIGHT.

I, J. M. Scanlan, assistant secretary of Curtiss-Wright Corp., hereby certify that the following is a true copy of an extract from the minutes of a meeting of the executive committee of Curtiss-Wright Corp., duly called and held on January 24, 1941, a quorum being present:

"RESIGNATION OF MR. T. P. WRIGHT AS VICE PRESIDENT

"The president presented to the meeting a letter from Mr. William S. Knudsen stating that the services of Mr. T. P. Wright, a vice president of the corporation, were vitally needed in the Aircraft Section of the Office of Production Management, and that because of his unusual background and experience in the aviation industry the services of Mr. Wright in the Office of Production Management were practically indispensable to the national defense program.

"The president then presented to the meeting the resignation of Mr. Wright as a vice president of the corporation.

"After discussion, and upon motion duly made, seconded, and unanimously carried, it was—

"Resolved, That the resignation of Mr. T. P. Wright as a vice president of the corporation be accepted with regret, such resignation to become effective on January 31, 1941."

In witness whereof, I have hereunto subscribed my signature to this certificate and affixed the seal of this company, this 27th day of January 1941.

J. M. SCANLAN.

HISTORY OF AIRCRAFT PRODUCTION

In May 1940 the Secretary of the Treasury called to Washington seven men to discuss the aircraft situation particularly as to the

possibility of producing the British Merlin aircraft engines.

The seven men were: Dr. George Jackson Mead, vice president of Pratt-Whitney; Paul Johnston, of National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics; Dr. Jerome Hunsaker, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dr. Clark B. Milliken, California Technology; Dr. A. E. Lombard, Jr., California Technology; Edward S. Taylor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology; Dr. Theodore Vaughn Karman, California Technology.

When this committee came to no agreement and produced nothing worth while, the Secretary of the Treasury telephoned Eugene Wilson, president of Pratt & Whitney to come to Washington. This was a few days before Dunkerque (May 1940).

President Wilson of Pratt & Whitney asked Secretary Morgenthau if he could bring along Guy Vaughan, president of Curtiss-Wright. Morgenthau said that he would be pleased to have Vaughan in on the conference saying: "Guy and I are great friends."

Both of these men realized that the invitation to come to Washington related to President Roosevelt's startling message to Congress in which he asked for 50,000 planes.

Vaughan, president of Curtiss-Wright, lost no time in helping the Government start mass production of warplanes. According to the Truman committee report of July 11, 1943—Curtiss-Wright received more war contracts than any other manufacturer in the United States with the single exception of General Motors.

During May 1940 President Roosevelt appointed a National Defense Advisory Commission of the following: Knudsen, General Motors; Mead, vice president, Pratt-Whitney; Johnston, National Advisory Committee on Aeronautics; Taylor, Massachusetts Institute of Technology.

In June 1940 the Air Section of the National Defense Advisory Commission was formed as follows: T. P. Wright, Curtiss-Wright; Mead, vice president, Pratt-Whitney; Sam Heron, Ethel Gas Corp.; Robert E. Lees, Maritime Commission; Myron Tracy, Lees' assistant.

In July-August 1940, this Air Section of the National Advisory Commission adopted aircraft production program for the years 1941-42. This Commission was assisted by Admiral Towers, Chief of the Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy; and General Arnold, Chief, Air Forces, War Department.

September 1940: In addition to the National Defense Advisory Commission, a new committee was set up called the Army and Navy and British Purchasing Commission Joint Committee. This was later renamed as Joint Aircraft Committee.

November 1940: Merile Meigs, publisher, Chicago Herald-American replaced Dr. Mead, of Pratt & Whitney, as director of the National Defense Advisory Commission.

January 1941: The Office of Production Management was formed. Meigs then became head of the Aircraft Section of OPM.

January 1942: OPM was renamed War Production Board.

December 1942: The Aircraft Production Board was set up. Members: Charles Wilson, vice chairman, WPB; T. P. Wright, Curtiss-Wright; General Echols, War Department; Admiral Davison, Bureau of Aeronautics, Navy; General Knudsen, General Motors.

March 1943: Aircraft Resources Control Board was formed. T. P. Wright became head of this Board where he remained until he went to the Civil Aeronautics Commission.

In other words, from June 1940 to September 1944, he was actively engaged in Government aircraft production matters.

Information supplied by Lieutenant Nye, War Department, Extension 2154.

DEAR MR. WRIGHT: I acknowledge receipt of your letter of July 12, 1945, dealing with your activities in the war effort and the aircraft production matters.

You will note that in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 17, 1945, page 4695, I corrected what I said previously on the Senate floor, and stated that the present vice president of Curtiss-Wright Corp. was Burdette S. Wright and not yourself. This is what I said:

"Before proceeding further I wish to correct a mistake which I made in one of my former talks in connection with the Curtiss-Wright Corp. In speaking at that time I made a mistake in identifying the Mr. Wright to whom I referred. I stated on the floor at that time, and afterward stated to the Buffalo Evening News correspondent, that I was referring to Burdette S. Wright. The man to whom I intended to refer to was Theodore P. Wright, formerly vice president of the Curtiss-Wright Corp. I do not wish to do any injustice to Mr. Burdette S. Wright, who is now vice president of the Curtiss-Wright Corp. The man to whom I intended to refer to was Theodore P. Wright, formerly vice president, and a man who, until a few days ago, was still in the employ of the United States Government."

Naturally I am most appreciative to obtain a certified copy of your resignation from the Curtiss-Wright Corp. dated June 24, 1941. However, you must agree that you became an important member of the Air Section of the National Defense Advisory Commission in June 1940, approximately 6 months prior to your resignation from the Curtiss-Wright Corp. Furthermore, you must agree that it was this very Committee of which you were a consultant while still vice president of Curtiss-Wright that planned, decided, and adopted the aircraft production program for the United States Government for the years 1941-42, etc.

You will also note that in concluding my reference to you appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of July 3, 1945, page 7171, I specifically said, "No man who has been vice president of an individual aircraft corporation such as Curtiss-Wright should wield such great power over the industry."

This certainly should be clear enough that I did not imply that you were presently a vice president of Curtiss-Wright. You undoubtedly will recall the scandal that emerged from the Black committee investigation which ended in the adoption of a Federal law aimed to separate aircraft manufacturers from the commercial part of the industry. Although I did not mean any personal offense I stoutly contend that this separation must be maintained for the good and future of the aircraft industry.

You must bear in mind that it was the Truman committee and not I who said that the Curtiss-Wright Corp received more war contracts than any other manufacturer with the single exception of General Motors. Also the Truman committee implied that the letting of contracts on such a large scale to a single corporation was a grave error. In con-

necting your name with these contracts I merely desired to show that you were formerly a vice president of the Curtiss-Wright Corp. and that as Director of the Aircraft Resources Control Office of the War Department you played the deciding role indirectly, if not directly, in granting these contracts. If this statement is not correct then I wish that you will so notify me.

In conclusion I desire to call your attention to the Mead committee report, dated July 26, 1945, relative to conditions at the Curtiss-Wright plant at Buffalo, N. Y., which speaks for itself.

I have always tried to be fair in my dealings with everyone I have ever come in contact with or discussed on the Senate floor, and if I have made a mistake I have never hesitated to correct it immediately. If I have not clarified my position to your satisfaction or if I appear in your eyes to have been misinformed please do not hesitate to correct me, and I will be pleased to give your viewpoints every consideration possible.

With many kind thanks, I remain,
WILLIAM LANGER.

STOCK HOLDINGS OF THEODORE P. WRIGHT
JULY 19, 1945.

Set forth below are the stock holdings of Theodore P. Wright in the Curtiss-Wright Corp. The corporation representatives at New York advise that it would be a difficult task to trace Wright's stock holdings and the following information was volunteered by Wright himself.

He was vice president of Curtiss-Wright from 1932 until January 31, 1941, at which time he resigned to take a position with the War Production Board in Washington, D. C. In the latter part of June 1944 he was appointed to the Civil Aeronautics Administration.

His only stock holdings in Curtiss-Wright Corp. after he became vice president, are as follows:

One hundred shares Curtis-Wright. A stock purchased June 2, 1936, sold April 2, 1940, to a New York stockbroker.

One hundred shares Curtiss-Wright common stock purchased September 30, 1937, sold April 2, 1940, to a New York stockbroker.

Ten shares Curtiss-Wright common stock purchased June 21, 1936, sold June 22, 1944, through a Washington, D. C. stockbroker.

Prior to the time Wright became vice president to Curtiss-Wright in 1932, he had some very small holdings in the company which he subsequently disposed of before he became vice president.

Note that T. P. Wright resigned from Curtiss-Wright on January 31, 1941.

But that he was a member of the Air Section of the National Defense Advisory Commission ever since June 1940.

This Board conceived, planned, and adopted the United States Government aircraft production schedule during this period

In other words, T. P. Wright was advising the Government on aircraft production while still a vice president of Curtiss-Wright Corp.

It is of interest also to note that T. P. Wright claims that he sold his last 10 shares of Curtiss-Wright stock on June 22, 1944, which he held while he was still Chairman of the National Defense Advisory Commission.

On October 3, 1942 (New York Times) eight major aircraft companies announced the formation of a nonprofit corporation designed to speed up and increase production of American aircraft by pooling of manufacturing resources and coordinate efforts. This group was called: Aircraft War Production Council, Inc. After a meeting in the Waldorf-Astoria Hotel in New York City, G. W. Vaughn, president of Curtiss-Wright emerged as president of this organization. And of all things J. M. Scanlan, assistant secretary of Curtiss-Wright, became secretary and treasurer of the council.

In this connection attention is called to the scandal that was brought to light when the House Committee on Patents held extensive hearings in 1937-38 and showed how Curtiss-Wright had taken advantage of other companies in the pooling of patents.

RÉSUMÉ OF APPROPRIATIONS, RECEIPTS, EXPENDITURES, ETC., 1939-45

Mr. McKELLAR. Mr. President, before this session ends I desire to place some facts in the RECORD.

First, I wish to place in the RECORD a résumé of our appropriations for each year from 1939 to 1945, inclusive. I think it would be wise to have these figures published for the information of the country. It will be noted that the sum of these appropriations is colossal. No other war ever waged in the world cost so much money.

I also wish to place in the RECORD a statement of the amount of revenue which we have received in taxes from 1940 to 1945, inclusive, aggregating \$138,680,000,000.

I also wish to have placed in the RECORD a statement of our outstanding bonded indebtedness by years from 1940 to 1945, inclusive, showing the increase by years.

I also desire to insert in the RECORD a statement showing our war activities program, and the cost. I think it will be exceedingly interesting and valuable to have these records, and that every Senator may desire to use them.

There being no objection, the matters referred to were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Chronological history of regular annual, supplemental, and deficiency appropriation bills, 76th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 3 to Aug. 5, 1939, both dates inclusive

Title	Reported to House		Passed House		Reported to Senate		Passed Senate		Law, 1939-40		No. of House bill	No. of public act
	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount		
REGULAR ANNUAL ACTS												
Agricultural Department and Farm Credit Administration.....	1939 Mar. 23	\$1,085,633,558.00	1939 Mar. 28	\$835,118,613.00	1939 May 5	\$1,216,528,572.00	1939 May 12	\$1,218,666,572.00	1939 June 30	\$1,194,498,633.00	5269	159
District of Columbia.....	Apr. 6	46,902,707.00	Apr. 6	46,915,207.00	June 3	49,172,985.00	June 5	49,524,985.00	July 15	48,002,347.00	5610	176
Independent offices.....	Feb. 6	1,668,290,340.00	Feb. 8	1,651,087,340.00	Feb. 17	1,668,218,340.00	Feb. 22	1,668,218,340.00	Mar. 16	1,668,218,340.00	3743	8
Interior Department.....	Mar. 8	100,578,905.23	Mar. 20	159,538,815.23	Apr. 15	173,505,288.23	Apr. 17	174,975,288.23	May 10	172,679,765.23	4852	68
Labor Department.....	Mar. 29	30,552,470.00	Mar. 29	30,535,770.00	May 19	30,747,780.00	May 22	30,747,780.00	June 29	30,536,170.00	5427	157
Legislative establishment.....	Feb. 16	21,631,398.00	Feb. 17	21,636,278.00	Mar. 10	21,984,599.00	Mar. 13	21,985,779.00	June 16	21,851,779.00	4218	120
Navy Department.....	May 4	770,473,241.00	May 8	773,420,241.00	May 17	773,049,151.00	May 18	773,049,151.00	May 25	773,049,151.00	6149	90
State, Justice, and Commerce.....	May 18	121,399,120.00	May 19	121,399,120.00	June 7	122,624,410.00	June 12	122,624,410.00	June 29	122,177,220.00	6392	156
State.....	do	18,225,200.00	do	18,225,200.00	do	18,821,890.00	do	18,821,890.00	do	18,518,700.00
Justice.....	do	50,745,320.00	do	50,745,320.00	do	51,010,520.00	do	51,010,520.00	do	50,907,520.00
Commerce.....	do	52,428,600.00	do	52,428,600.00	do	52,792,000.00	do	52,792,000.00	do	52,751,000.00

Chronological history of regular annual, supplemental, and deficiency appropriation bills, 76th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 3 to Aug. 5, 1939, both dates inclusive—Continued

State	Reported to House		Passed House		Reported to Senate		Passed Senate		Law, 1939-40		No. of House bill	No. of public law
	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount		
REGULAR ANNUAL ACTS—continued												
Treasury and Post Office	1939 Feb. 24	1,700,471,354.00	1939 Feb. 28	1,700,591,354.00	1939 Mar. 10	1,668,929,114.00	1939 Mar. 14	1,701,189,114.00	1939 May 6	1,700,615,054.00	4492	65
Treasury	do	668,626,670.00	do	608,731,670.00	do	607,731,610.00	do	609,591,610.00	do	609,627,810.00		
Post Office	do	790,844,684.00	do	780,859,684.00	do	791,197,504.00	do	791,197,504.00	do	790,987,244.00		
War Department:												
Military	Mar. 1	469,857,636.00	Mar. 3	469,857,636.00	Mar. 24	513,188,882.00	Mar. 27	513,188,882.00	Apr. 26	508,789,824.00	4630	44
Civil functions	May 10	255,188,514.00	May 15	305,188,514.00	May 26	255,192,684.00	June 1	305,267,684.00	June 28	205,188,514.00	6260	154
Total, regular annual acts		6,360,979,543.23		6,145,289,188.23		6,523,142,105.23		6,570,438,285.23		6,545,606,797.23		
DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL ACTS												
First deficiency, 1939	Jan. 19	9,979,000.00	Jan. 23	9,679,000.00	Feb. 3	22,682,041.89	Feb. 6	22,682,041.89	Mar. 15	23,765,041.89	2868	7
Second deficiency, 1939	Mar. 22	138,871,028.23	Mar. 22	139,871,028.23	Apr. 7	148,570,364.89	Apr. 17	165,662,864.89	May 2	157,621,031.34	5219	61
Third deficiency, 1939	Aug. 2	53,180,056.28	Aug. 2	54,252,056.28	Aug. 4	189,450,566.38	Aug. 4	191,025,566.38	Aug. 9	185,168,172.75	7462	361
Urgent deficiency and Supplemental, 1939 and 1940	June 23	2,669,377.00	June 23	2,649,377.00	June 28	3,189,377.00	June 29	3,224,377.00	June 30	3,069,377.00	6790	160
Supplemental Military, 1940	June 12	222,198,047.00	June 22	222,198,047.00	do	223,398,047.00	do	223,398,047.00	July 1	223,398,047.00	6791	164
Emergency relief of 1939 (fiscal year 1940)	June 14	\$1,716,000,000.00	June 17	\$1,735,600,000.00	June 27	\$1,735,600,000.00	June 28	\$1,808,900,000.00	June 30	\$1,755,600,000.00	H. J. Res. 326	Pub. Res. 24
Emergency relief deficiency, 1940	Jan. 12	725,000,000.00	Jan. 13	725,000,000.00	Jan. 21	725,000,000.00	Jan. 28	725,000,000.00	Feb. 4	725,000,000.00	H. J. Res. 83	Pub. Res. 1
Do	Mar. 29	100,000,000.00	Mar. 31	100,000,000.00	Apr. 6	100,000,000.00	Apr. 11	100,000,000.00	Apr. 13	100,000,000.00	H. J. Res. 246	Pub. Res. 10
Total, deficiency and supplemental acts		2,968,507,508.51		2,989,549,508.51		3,147,890,397.16		3,239,892,897.16		3,173,651,669.98		
Grand total		9,329,487,051.74		9,134,838,696.74		9,671,032,502.39		9,810,331,182.39		9,719,268,467.21		

¹ Includes \$1,971.45 interest on District of Columbia judgments.
² Includes \$106.37 interest on District of Columbia judgments.
 Sept. 15, 1939.

Chronological history of regular annual, supplemental, and deficiency appropriations bills, 76th Cong., 3d sess., Jan. 3, 1940, to closing of compilation, Nov. 15, 1940, both dates inclusive

Title	Reported to House		Passed House		Reported to Senate		Passed Senate		Law 1940-41		No. of House bill	No. of public act
	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount		
REGULAR ANNUAL ACTS												
Agricultural Department	1940 Jan. 30	\$626,369,256.00	1940 Feb. 2	\$713,896,084.00	1940 Mar. 9	\$922,864,068.00	1940 Mar. 22	\$922,911,213.00	1940 June 25	\$918,603,918.00	8202	658
District of Columbia	Mar. 27	48,291,717.00	Mar. 29	48,291,717.00	do	49,697,340.00	May 15	49,697,890.00	June 12	48,765,080.00	9109	602
Independent Offices	Jan. 16	1,100,212,307.00	Jan. 18	1,100,187,267.00	Jan. 31	1,138,693,528.00	Feb. 8	1,139,783,528.00	Apr. 18	1,120,243,528.00	7922	459
Interior Department	Mar. 4	119,071,187.05	Mar. 7	118,678,187.05	May 1	133,814,834.05	May 2	137,256,834.05	June 18	135,383,303.05	8745	640
Labor-Federal Security	Mar. 21	954,048,700.00	Mar. 28	1,021,639,760.00	Apr. 24	998,054,670.00	Apr. 26	1,025,054,670.00	June 26	1,023,282,690.00	9007	665
Labor		31,980,400.00		31,980,400.00		33,132,370.00		33,132,370.00		32,714,390.00		
Federal Security Agency		788,759,400.00		856,209,400.00		831,244,400.00		858,244,400.00		857,143,400.00		
Related independent agencies		133,308,900.00		133,449,900.00		133,677,900.00		133,677,900.00		133,424,900.00		
Legislative establishment	Mar. 13	23,907,744.00	Mar. 13	23,907,744.00	Apr. 2	23,705,720.00	Apr. 8	23,707,720.00	June 18	23,671,220.00	8913	641
Navy Department	Feb. 13	966,772,878.00	Feb. 16	965,779,438.00	(Apr. 12) May 22	(963,797,478.00) 1,302,014,038.00	(Apr. 18) May 23	(963,797,478.00) 1,302,014,038.00	June 11	1,308,171,138.00	8438	588
State, Justice, and Commerce	Feb. 6	107,379,000.00	Feb. 8	107,225,660.00	Feb. 24	107,241,000.00	Feb. 26	107,079,000.00	May 14	107,149,000.00	8319	608
State		20,162,000.00		20,170,500.00		20,140,500.00		20,140,500.00		20,125,500.00		
Commerce		34,080,500.00		33,918,500.00		34,060,500.00		33,898,500.00		33,908,500.00		
Justice		42,391,000.00		42,391,000.00		41,243,000.00		41,243,000.00		41,323,000.00		
Judiciary		10,745,500.00		10,745,660.00		11,797,000.00		11,797,000.00		11,792,000.00		
Treasury and Post Office	Jan. 23	1,032,154,612.00	Jan. 25	1,032,154,612.00	Feb. 14	1,032,784,115.00	Feb. 15	1,032,784,115.00	Mar. 25	1,032,801,095.00	8068	442
Treasury		218,691,530.00		218,691,530.00		218,652,033.00		218,652,033.00		218,752,033.00		
Post Office		813,463,082.00		813,463,082.00		814,132,082.00		814,132,082.00		814,049,062.00		
War Department:												
Military	Apr. 3	785,999,094.00	Apr. 4	784,999,094.00	May 20	1,497,711,368.00	May 22	1,500,324,988.00	June 13	1,499,323,322.00	9209	611
Civil functions	Feb. 27	203,472,567.00	Feb. 29	203,472,567.00	Apr. 9	223,362,517.00	Apr. 17	223,636,517.00	June 24	222,718,717.00	8668	653
Total, regular annual acts		5,967,679,062.05		6,120,132,070.05		7,429,943,798.05		7,464,250,513.05		7,440,113,038.05		
DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL ACTS												
Emergency supplemental, 1940	Jan. 10	\$267,197,908.00	Jan. 12	\$264,611,252.00	Jan. 23	\$251,822,588.00	Jan. 25	\$251,822,588.00	Feb. 12	\$252,340,776.00	7805	415
Urgent deficiency, 1940	Jan. 23	58,502,600.00	Jan. 25	58,502,600.00	Jan. 29	57,541,300.00	Feb. 1	57,541,300.00	do	57,541,300.00	8067	415
First deficiency, 1940	Feb. 26	90,069,139.11	Feb. 26	90,069,139.11	Mar. 8	92,769,021.52	Mar. 12	92,777,021.52	Apr. 6	92,035,408.52	8641	447

Chronological history of regular annual, supplemental, and deficiency appropriation bills, 76th Cong., 3d sess., Jan. 3, 1940, to closing of compilation, Nov. 15, 1940, both dates inclusive—Continued

Title	Reported to House		Passed House		Reported to Senate		Passed Senate		Law 1940-41		No. of House bill	No. of public act
	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount		
REGULAR ANNUAL ACTS—continued												
Emergency relief, 1941.....	1940 May 15	1,111,754,916.00	1940 May 23	1,111,754,916.10	1940 June 5	1,073,584,916.00	1940 June 15	1,224,791,357.00	1940 June 26	1,157,711,357.00	H. J. Res. 544.	Pub. Res. 88
First supplemental national defense, 1941.....	June 11	1,381,917,147.00	June 12	1,381,917,147.00	June 19	1,488,353,027.00	June 20	1,488,353,027.00	do.....	1,479,777,147.00	10655	667
Second deficiency, 1940.....	June 18	57,917,100.39	June 18	57,909,600.39	June 21	95,146,163.23	June 22	95,176,257.23	June 27	85,891,777.23	10104	668
Second supplemental national defense, 1941.....	July 31	2,234,191,957.00	July 31	2,234,191,957.00	Aug. 19	2,268,659,277.00	Aug. 29	2,374,158,277.00	Sept. 9	2,497,016,392.00	10203	781
First supplemental civil functions, 1941.....	Sept. 23	207,475,727.02	Sept. 23	207,475,727.02	Oct. 2	189,162,298.85	Oct. 3	189,178,663.25	Oct. 9	228,132,013.35	10559	812
Third supplemental national defense, 1941.....	Sept. 26	1,311,493,636.00	Sept. 26	1,311,493,636.00	do.....	1,324,193,636.00	do.....	1,324,193,636.00	Oct. 8	1,324,193,636.00	10572	800
Total, deficiency and supplemental acts.....		6,720,520,130.52		5,717,925,974.52		6,841,277,227.40		7,097,992,127.10		7,174,639,807.10		
Grand total.....		12,688,199,192.57		12,838,058,044.57		14,271,216,025.63		14,562,242,640.15		14,614,752,845.15		

NOTE.—The dates and figures shown in parentheses () for the naval appropriation bill, indicate the first dates and amounts of the bill on report to and passage by the Senate. The bill was subsequently returned to the Senate by the House of Representatives on May 20, 1940, pursuant to S. Con. Res. 47, recommitted to the Senate Committee on Appropriations, rereported to the Senate and passed. The amounts for the bill, not included in parentheses (), are the figures included in the totals of this tabulation. Nov. 5, 1940.

Chronological history of regular annual, supplemental, and deficiency appropriation bills, 77th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 3, 1941, to Jan. 3, 1942, both dates inclusive

Title	Reported to House		Passed House		Reported to Senate		Passed Senate		Law, 1941-42		No. of House bill	No. of public law
	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount		
REGULAR ANNUAL ACTS												
Agricultural Department.....	1941 Mar. 3	\$890,824,637.00	1941 Mar. 6	\$890,824,637.00	1941 Mar. 28	\$1,340,610,744.00	1941 Apr. 3	\$1,340,622,744.00	1941 July 1	\$1,060,500,062.00	3735	144
District of Columbia.....	June 13	52,547,681.60	June 16	52,547,681.60	June 26	54,783,686.00	June 27	54,785,636.00	do.....	54,183,168.00	5049	148
Independent Offices.....	Jan. 29	1,404,576,838.00	Jan. 31	1,404,576,838.00	Feb. 23	1,415,991,838.00	Mar. 19	1,415,991,838.00	Apr. 5	1,414,626,838.00	2788	28
Interior Department.....	Apr. 30	177,019,678.00	May 14	177,027,078.00	June 2	185,119,813.00	June 3	185,119,813.00	June 28	188,325,623.00	4650	136
Labor Department and Federal Security.....	June 2	1,191,776,000.00	June 5	1,191,776,000.00	June 16	1,189,298,500.00	June 19	1,200,511,100.00	July 1	1,195,861,940.00	4626	146
Labor.....	do.....	24,200,200.00	do.....	24,200,200.00	do.....	24,777,520.00	do.....	24,877,520.00	do.....	24,234,700.00	4662	146
Federal Security Agency.....	do.....	1,014,749,200.00	do.....	1,014,749,200.00	do.....	1,011,815,200.00	do.....	1,022,799,200.00	do.....	1,018,799,200.00	4926	146
Related independent agencies.....	do.....	152,826,600.00	do.....	152,826,600.00	do.....	152,705,780.00	do.....	152,834,380.00	do.....	152,828,040.00	4626	146
Legislative Establishment.....	May 15	24,846,047.00	May 15	24,846,047.00	June 11	25,087,486.00	June 12	25,087,486.00	July 1	25,062,226.00	4756	145
Navy Department.....	Mar. 13	3,415,457,250.00	Mar. 14	3,415,457,250.00	Mar. 19	3,415,521,750.00	Mar. 20	3,415,521,750.00	May 6	3,415,521,750.00	3861	48
State, Commerce, Justice, and the Judiciary.....	Apr. 2	212,687,200.00	Apr. 3	212,687,200.00	May 16	278,652,587.00	May 19	279,416,547.00	June 28	279,142,477.00	4276	135
State.....	do.....	21,287,300.00	do.....	21,287,300.00	do.....	21,587,640.00	do.....	21,587,640.00	do.....	21,499,240.00	4276	135
Commerce.....	do.....	112,228,000.00	do.....	112,228,000.00	do.....	179,168,586.00	do.....	179,182,546.00	do.....	179,000,100.00	4276	135
Justice.....	do.....	66,257,500.00	do.....	66,257,500.00	do.....	66,563,300.00	do.....	66,313,300.00	do.....	66,307,500.00	4276	135
The Judiciary.....	do.....	12,314,400.00	do.....	12,314,400.00	do.....	12,333,661.00	do.....	12,333,661.00	do.....	12,323,637.00	4276	135
Treasury and Post Office.....	Feb. 10	1,146,394,496.00	Feb. 13	1,146,394,496.00	Mar. 26	1,152,572,632.00	May 7	1,151,156,632.00	May 31	1,147,624,384.00	3285	88
Treasury.....	do.....	304,330,185.00	do.....	304,330,185.00	do.....	307,330,185.00	do.....	307,330,185.00	do.....	304,330,185.00	3205	88
Post Office.....	do.....	842,064,311.00	do.....	842,064,311.00	do.....	845,242,447.00	do.....	843,826,447.00	do.....	843,294,199.00	3205	88
War Department:												
Military.....	June 5	9,826,509,402.00	June 9	9,826,509,402.00	June 23	10,384,821,624.00	June 27	10,384,821,624.00	June 20	10,384,821,624.00	4965	139
Civil functions.....	Mar. 26	221,272,228.00	Mar. 27	221,272,228.00	Apr. 25	228,251,828.00	Apr. 29	234,805,663.00	May 23	228,601,828.00	4183	71
Total, regular annual acts.....		18,563,309,747.00		18,563,317,747.00		19,670,511,888.00		19,687,841,083.00		19,394,212,189.00		
DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL ACTS												
Urgent deficiency, 1941.....	Feb. 10	\$388,140,000.00	Feb. 12	\$388,140,000.00	Feb. 19	\$395,357,775.00	Feb. 20	\$395,357,775.00	Mar. 1	\$393,687,775.00	3204	9
Fourth supplemental national defense, 1941.....	Feb. 26	1,376,337,202.00	Feb. 27	1,376,277,202.00	Mar. 6	1,376,464,602.00	Mar. 10	1,376,464,602.00	Mar. 17	1,376,464,602.00	3617	13
First deficiency, 1941.....	Mar. 6	188,863,693.68	Mar. 7	188,863,693.68	Mar. 19	191,753,544.88	Mar. 20	191,803,544.88	Apr. 1	191,478,544.88	3836	25
Defense aid supplemental, 1941.....	Mar. 18	7,000,000,000.00	Mar. 19	7,000,000,000.00	Mar. 22	7,000,000,000.00	Mar. 24	7,000,000,000.00	Mar. 27	7,000,000,000.00	4050	23
Fifth supplemental national defense, 1941.....	Mar. 21	1,980,356,820.00	Mar. 21	1,980,356,820.00	Mar. 28	2,295,830,920.00	Apr. 1	2,295,667,920.00	Apr. 5	2,299,767,920.00	4124	29
Additional urgent deficiency, 1941.....	May 7	173,749,630.00	May 7	173,749,630.00	May 16	174,409,630.00	May 19	174,409,630.00	May 24	174,409,630.00	4609	73
Emergency relief, 1942.....	June 9	885,905,000.00	June 13	885,905,000.00	June 18	935,905,000.00	June 20	926,395,000.00	July 1	910,905,000.00	H. J. Res. 193.	143
Second Deficiency, 1941.....	June 25	882,183,825.29	June 25	879,321,270.80	June 28	1,042,239,652.75	June 30	1,042,565,565.03	July 3	1,041,444,529.75	5106	150
First Supplemental National Defense, 1942.....	July 24	7,063,238,478.00	July 28	7,063,238,478.00	Aug. 12	5,828,326,948.00	Aug. 14	5,838,436,948.00	Aug. 25	6,586,896,948.00	5412	247
Second Supplemental National Defense, 1942.....	Oct. 8	6,159,416,229.39	Oct. 10	6,159,562,769.39	Oct. 21	6,161,605,969.39	Oct. 23	6,161,615,669.39	Oct. 28	6,161,467,229.39	5788	282
Third Supplemental National Defense, 1942.....	Dec. 3	7,649,789,031.00	Dec. 5	7,650,601,531.00	Dec. 11	9,617,810,765.00	Dec. 12	9,478,310,750.00	Dec. 17	9,233,637,065.00	6159	353
Additional Appropriations, National Defense, 1942.....	Dec. 19	512,000,000.00	Dec. 19	512,000,000.00	Dec. 19	512,000,000.00	Dec. 19	512,000,000.00	Dec. 23	512,000,000.00	H. J. Res. 258.	371
Total deficiency and supplemental acts.....		34,259,580,509.36		34,257,406,424.87		34,631,704,747.02		35,403,327,659.30		35,931,559,184.02		
Grand total.....		52,823,299,656.36		52,820,724,171.87		54,662,216,635.02		55,691,168,742.30		55,625,771,373.02		

Chronological history of regular annual, supplemental, and deficiency appropriation bills, 77th Cong., 2d sess., Jan. 5 to Oct. 31, 1942, both dates inclusive

Title	Reported to House		Passed House		Reported to Senate		Passed Senate		Law—1942-43		No. of House bill or joint resolution	Public Law No.
	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount		
REGULAR ANNUAL ACTS												
Agriculture.....	1942 Mar. 2	\$676,681,239.00	1942 Mar. 13	\$648,170,517.00	1942 May 13	\$680,383,695.00	1942 May 20	\$680,395,695.00	1942 July 22	\$665,742,646.00	6709	674
District of Columbia.....	May 5	56,118,311.00	May 5	56,129,351.00	June 5	56,314,461.00	June 8	56,329,161.00	June 27	56,306,031.00	7041	632
Independent offices.....	Jan. 22	2,096,138,875.00	Jan. 22	2,096,048,875.00	Apr. 23	2,125,985,890.66	May 6	2,126,042,890.66do.....	2,090,885,128.66	6430	630
Interior Department.....	Mar. 24	162,634,845.00	Mar. 27	162,117,965.00	May 25	185,752,998.00	May 28	186,924,998.00	July 2	178,099,712.00	6845	645
Labor Department and Federal Security Agency.....	June 3	1,058,451,660.00	June 5	1,058,951,660.00	June 24	1,073,572,626.00	June 26	1,157,598,426.00do.....	1,071,574,318.00	7181	647
Labor Federal Security Agency.....do.....	23,715,930.00do.....	23,715,930.00do.....	24,107,830.00do.....	24,107,830.00do.....	23,935,080.00
Related independent agencies.....do.....	803,298,140.00do.....	803,798,140.00do.....	817,966,206.00do.....	901,992,006.00do.....	816,194,148.00
.....do.....	231,437,590.00do.....	231,437,590.00do.....	231,498,590.00do.....	231,498,590.00do.....	231,445,090.00
Legislative branch.....	Mar. 17	27,581,866.00	Mar. 18	27,463,866.00	(Apr. 2) Apr. 30	1 (27,696,048.00) 27,547,628.00	May 11	27,884,588.00	June 8	27,570,708.00	6802	600
Military.....	June 23	42,820,003,067.00	June 23	42,820,003,067.00	June 27	42,820,003,067.00	June 30	42,820,003,067.00	July 2	42,820,003,067.00	7280	649
Navy Department.....	Jan. 26	17,722,565,474.00	Jan. 27	17,722,565,474.00	Jan. 31	23,738,865,474.00	Feb. 2	23,738,865,474.00	Feb. 7	23,738,865,474.00	6460	441
State, Justice, Commerce, and Judiciary.....	Feb. 16	221,068,700.00	Feb. 18	221,078,100.00	May 18	425,703,235.00	May 21	425,703,235.00	July 2	426,281,885.00	6599	644
State.....do.....	26,993,400.00do.....	26,993,400.00do.....	26,995,140.00do.....	26,995,140.00do.....	27,056,700.00
Justice.....do.....	84,338,600.00do.....	84,338,600.00do.....	84,111,600.00do.....	84,111,600.00do.....	84,255,100.00
Commerce.....do.....	97,307,000.00do.....	97,307,000.00do.....	302,152,845.00do.....	302,152,845.00do.....	302,526,435.00
The Judiciary.....do.....	12,429,700.00do.....	12,439,100.00do.....	12,443,650.00do.....	12,443,650.00do.....	12,443,650.00
Treasury and Post Office.....	Feb. 2	1,112,926,899.00	Feb. 3	1,112,626,899.00	Mar. 4	1,113,321,439.00	Mar. 5	1,113,321,439.00	Mar. 10	1,113,321,439.00	6511	495
Treasury.....do.....	209,956,976.00do.....	209,956,976.00do.....	210,351,516.00do.....	210,351,516.00do.....	210,351,516.00
Post Office.....do.....	902,969,923.00do.....	902,969,923.00do.....	902,969,923.00do.....	902,969,923.00do.....	902,969,923.00
War Department civil functions.....	Mar. 6	350,650,826.00	Mar. 11	333,950,826.00	Mar. 24	367,039,826.00	Mar. 25	367,039,826.00	Apr. 28	343,938,826.00	6736	527
Total, regular annual acts.....	66,304,821,762.00	66,259,446,600.00	72,614,490,339.66	72,700,108,799.66	72,532,589,234.66
DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL ACTS												
Fourth Supplemental National Defense, 1942.....	Jan. 23	12,555,872,474.00	Jan. 23	12,556,672,474.00	Jan. 27	12,556,672,474.00	Jan. 28	12,556,672,474.00	Jan. 30	12,556,672,474.00	6448	422
First Deficiency, 1942.....	Feb. 6	160,590,611.43	Feb. 9	160,412,611.43	Feb. 13	163,794,819.77	Feb. 17	163,806,854.77	Feb. 21	163,780,819.77	6548	463
Fifth Supplemental National Defense, 1942.....	Feb. 17	29,720,901,900.00	Feb. 17	29,720,901,900.00	Feb. 23	30,412,737,900.00	Mar. 2	30,412,737,900.00	Mar. 5	30,412,737,900.00	6611	474
Sixth Supplemental National Defense, 1942.....	Mar. 27	18,156,947,148.00	Mar. 28	18,156,961,345.00	Apr. 4	19,062,373,260.18	Apr. 7	19,062,373,260.18	Apr. 28	19,001,197,010.18	6868	528
Seventh Supplemental National Defense, 1942.....	June 3	654,999,740.00	June 3	654,999,740.00	June 8	654,999,740.00	June 11	655,074,740.00	June 23	655,074,740.00	7182	623
Emergency Relief, 1943.....	June 9	282,584,000.00	June 11	282,584,000.00	June 23	282,584,000.00	June 25	282,584,000.00	July 2	282,584,000.00	H. J. Res. 324	651
Second Deficiency, 1942.....	June 16	53,513,999.84	June 16	53,513,999.84do.....	53,715,999.74do.....	53,721,999.74do.....	53,721,999.74	7232	648
First Supplemental National Defense, 1943.....	June 29	1,810,487,615.47	June 30	1,808,669,615.47	July 10	1,856,801,710.90	July 16	1,863,961,710.90	July 25	1,858,939,210.90	7319	678
Second Supplemental National Defense, 1943.....	Oct. 8	6,236,956,621.00	Oct. 8	6,236,956,621.00	Oct. 14	6,341,196,887.66	Oct. 20	6,352,234,137.66	Oct. 26	6,351,184,137.66	7672	763
Total, deficiency and supplemental acts.....	69,632,853,299.74	69,631,671,406.74	71,384,876,792.25	71,403,167,077.25	71,335,892,292.25
Grand total.....	135,937,674,971.74	135,891,118,006.74	143,999,367,132.21	144,103,275,876.91	143,868,481,526.91

¹ Recommitted to the Senate Committee on Appropriations on Apr. 13, 1942.

Chronological history of regular, annual, supplemental, and deficiency appropriation bills, 78th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 6 to Dec. 21, 1943, both dates inclusive

Title	Reported to House		Passed House		Reported to Senate		Passed Senate		Law, 1943-44		Number of House bill	Public Law No.
	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount		
REGULAR ANNUAL ACTS												
Agriculture	1943 Apr. 13	\$707,040,844.00	1943 Apr. 20	\$715,099,662.00	1943 June 5	\$820,680,709.00	1943 June 11	\$875,680,709.00	1943 July 12	\$848,295,883.00	2481	129
District of Columbia	Apr. 16	54,789,434.00	do	54,789,434.00	June 22	55,493,210.00	June 22	55,568,210.00	July 1	55,466,565.00	2513	107
Independent Offices	Feb. 9	2,621,104,379.00	Feb. 17	2,620,824,379.00	May 19	2,621,539,379.00	May 27	2,621,539,379.00	June 26	2,621,366,879.00	1762	90
Interior Department	May 17	72,861,316.00	May 20	72,861,316.00	June 17	127,889,141.00	June 18	127,989,991.00	July 12	104,608,921.00	2719	133
Labor Department and Federal Security Agency	June 14	1,086,562,499.00	June 16	1,086,059,499.00	June 24	1,139,022,810.00	June 29	1,186,367,512.00	do	1,137,167,010.00	2935	135
Labor	do	27,325,050.00	do	27,325,050.00	do	28,906,050.00	do	28,940,050.00	do	27,794,050.00		
Federal Security Agency	do	672,842,380.00	do	672,839,380.00	do	718,423,960.00	do	721,752,462.00	do	719,749,460.00		
Related independent agencies	do	386,395,069.00	do	385,895,069.00	do	391,692,800.00	do	435,675,000.00	do	389,623,500.00		
Legislative and judiciary	Apr. 6	40,659,273.00	Apr. 8	40,659,273.00	May 12	40,943,778.00	May 17	40,943,778.00	June 28	40,894,478.00	2469	96
Legislative	do	28,257,863.00	do	28,257,863.00	do	28,363,988.00	do	28,363,988.00	do	28,363,988.00		
Judiciary	do	12,401,410.00	do	12,401,410.00	do	12,579,790.00	do	12,579,790.00	do	12,530,490.00		
Military	June 18	59,037,599,673.00	June 21	59,034,839,673.00	June 25	59,034,839,673.00	June 29	59,034,839,673.00	July 1	59,034,839,673.00	2096	108
Navy Department	May 14	27,463,687,198.00	May 20	27,463,687,198.00	June 5	24,850,427,198.00	June 7	24,850,427,198.00	June 26	27,637,226,198.00	2713	92
State, Justice, and Commerce	Apr. 5	189,729,400.00	Apr. 7	189,629,400.00	June 14	226,105,758.00	June 15	226,105,758.00	July 1	221,405,400.00	2307	105
State	do	33,358,100.00	do	33,358,100.00	do	33,528,100.00	do	33,528,100.00	do	33,523,100.00		
Justice	do	102,657,300.00	do	102,657,300.00	do	102,657,300.00	do	102,657,300.00	do	102,657,300.00		
Commerce	do	53,714,000.00	do	53,614,000.00	do	89,920,358.00	do	89,920,358.00	do	85,225,000.00		
Treasury and Post Office	Feb. 2	1,102,007,320.00	Feb. 9	1,098,840,960.00	Mar. 19	1,102,381,425.00	Mar. 25	1,102,381,425.00	June 30	1,100,691,275.00	1648	102
Treasury	do	202,724,465.00	do	199,724,465.00	do	202,628,340.00	do	202,628,340.00	do	201,222,740.00		
Post Office	do	899,282,855.00	do	899,116,495.00	do	899,753,085.00	do	899,753,085.00	do	899,468,535.00		
War Department civil functions	Mar. 31	63,032,683.00	Apr. 1	63,032,683.00	May 5	63,657,098.00	May 6	63,657,098.00	June 2	63,657,098.00	2346	64
Total, regular annual acts		92,439,074,019.00		92,440,323,477.00		90,082,980,179.00		90,185,500,731.00		92,865,610,380.00		
DEFICIENCY AND SUPPLEMENTAL ACTS												
Urgent Deficiency, 1943 (H. J. Res. 82)	Feb. 18	22,410,000.00	Feb. 18	22,410,000.00	Feb. 22	22,410,000.00	Feb. 25	22,410,676.17	Mar. 2	22,410,676.17	H. J. Res. 82	3
First Deficiency, 1943	Feb. 24	4,102,810,890.87	Feb. 26	4,102,569,890.87	Mar. 9	4,107,286,166.01	Mar. 12	4,108,485,949.96	Mar. 18	4,106,261,194.96	1975	11
Naval Supplemental, 1943	Mar. 3	3,816,206,583.00	Mar. 5	3,816,206,583.00	Mar. 16	3,851,176,119.00	Mar. 17	3,851,176,119.00	Mar. 31	3,836,176,119.00	2068	20
Farm Labor Supply, 1943-44	Mar. 12	26,100,000.00	Mar. 17	26,100,000.00	Apr. 6	40,000,000.00	Apr. 8	40,000,000.00	Apr. 29	26,100,000.00	H. J. Res. 96	45
Urgent Deficiency, 1943 (H. J. Res. 115)	Apr. 13	2,911,700.00	Apr. 14	2,911,700.00	Apr. 22	3,746,700.00	Apr. 26	7,246,700.00	May 7	7,246,700.00	H. J. Res. 115	50
Urgent Deficiency, 1943 (H. R. 2714)	May 14	134,141,279.86	May 18	134,096,279.86	May 26	143,630,591.56	May 28	143,630,591.56	July 12	143,430,591.56	2714	132
Defense Aid Supplemental, 1943-44	May 21	6,273,629,000.00	May 21	6,273,629,000.00	do	6,273,629,000.00	June 3	6,273,629,000.00	June 14	6,273,629,000.00	2753	70
National War Agencies, 1944	June 16	2,921,441,504.00	June 18	2,880,941,504.00	June 30	2,936,215,033.00	June 30	2,931,215,033.00	July 12	2,911,697,224.00	2968	139
Second Deficiency, 1943	June 23	36,245,360.60	June 24	36,158,760.60	July 3	343,660,359.72	July 5	363,059,927.72	do	253,256,179.72	3030	140
First Supplemental National Defense, 1944	Nov. 4	167,268,444.32	Nov. 5	166,754,124.32	Dec. 4	307,995,019.23	Dec. 8	308,340,019.23	Dec. 23	188,833,720.23	3598	216
Farm Labor Supply, 1944-45	Dec. 17	27,000,000.00	Dec. 17	27,000,000.00		(1)		(1)		(1)	H. J. Res. 208	
Total, deficiency and supplemental acts		17,530,164,762.65		17,488,777,842.65		18,029,748,988.52		18,049,194,016.64		17,769,041,405.64		
Grand total		109,969,238,781.65		109,929,101,319.65		108,112,729,167.52		108,234,694,747.64		110,634,660,785.64		

¹ Consideration not completed during first session. Carries over to the second session.

Chronological history of regular annual, supplemental, and deficiency appropriation bills, 79th Cong., 1st sess., Jan. 3, 1945, to July 27, 1945, both dates inclusive—Continued

Title	Reported to House		Passed House		Reported to Senate		Passed Senate		Law 1945-46		Number of House bill	Number of public act
	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount	Date	Amount		
REGULAR ANNUAL ACTS—continued												
Treasury and Post Office.	1945 Feb. 19	1,342,813,090.00	1945 Feb. 21	1,342,813,090.00	1945 Mar. 29	1,343,694,670.00	1945 Mar. 30	1,343,694,670.00	1945 Apr. 24	1,342,958,105.00	2252	38
Treasury		285,763,800.00		285,763,800.00		285,775,800.00		285,775,800.00		285,771,300.00		
Post Office		1,057,049,290.00		1,057,049,290.00		1,057,318,870.00		1,057,318,870.00		1,057,186,805.00		
War Department civil functions	Feb. 12	99,165,940.00	Feb. 13	99,165,940.00	Mar. 10	112,450,940.00	Mar. 11	112,450,940.00	Mar. 31	112,450,940.00	2126	24
Total, regular annual acts		51,577,880,217.66		51,573,110,932.66		51,945,913,795.66		51,955,970,933.66		51,874,738,244.66		
DEFICIENCY, SUPPLEMENTAL, AND MISCELLANEOUS ACTS												
First deficiency, 1945	Feb. 27	2,338,877,125.62	Mar. 2	2,338,877,125.62	Mar. 24	2,612,715,078.31	Mar. 26	2,375,332,528.31	Apr. 25	2,373,837,128.31	2374	40
National war agencies, 1946	June 1	769,764,850.00	June 8	752,764,850.00	June 20	771,538,765.00	June 30	774,005,765.00	July 17	769,364,850.00	3368	156
Second supplemental, 1945	May 8	18,433,000.00									3146	
Second deficiency, 1945	June 25	3,134,031,456.78	June 28	3,634,044,236.78	June 30	3,675,508,776.79	June 30	3,675,508,776.79	July 5	3,636,203,476.79	3579	132
National war agencies, 1946 ¹	July 3	752,544,850.00	July 5	134,280,400.00							3679	
Miscellaneous resolutions		267,278,530.00		267,278,530.00		267,278,530.00		267,278,530.00		267,278,530.00		
Total, deficiency, supplemental, and miscellaneous acts		7,280,929,812.40		7,127,245,142.40		7,327,041,150.10		7,092,125,600.10		7,046,683,985.10		
Grand total		58,858,810,030.06		58,700,356,075.06		59,272,954,945.76		59,048,096,533.76		58,921,422,229.76		

¹ Reported and passed House in lieu of H. R. 3368, which was the original national war agencies appropriation bill for 1946, and which was finally enacted into law.

Total receipts, excluding net receipts appropriated to Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund:

Fiscal year:	Amount
1940	\$5,387,124,670
1941	7,607,211,852
1942	12,799,061,621
1943	22,281,642,709
1944	44,148,926,968
1945	46,456,554,580
Total	138,680,522,400

Public debt

	Outstanding public debt	Guaranteed obligations ¹
June 30:		
1940	\$42,967,531,038	\$5,528,815,655
1941	48,961,443,536	6,370,252,580
1942	72,422,445,116	4,568,250,630
1943	136,696,090,330	4,099,943,046
1944	201,003,387,221	1,623,069,301
1945	258,682,187,410	433,158,392

¹ Not owned by the Treasury.

War activities program

1. APPROPRIATIONS, CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS, AND EXPENDITURES, JULY 1, 1940, THROUGH JUNE 30, 1945¹

	Total appropriations and contract authorizations (approved and pending)	Appropriations ²					Contract authorizations (net) ³	
		Total	Fiscal year 1946	Fiscal year 1945	Fiscal year 1944	Fiscal years 1941-43	Total	Fiscal year 1946
War Department	\$228,267,466,712.10	\$206,770,260,432.05	\$1,886,540	\$15,323,160,352.14	\$58,825,663,391.72	\$132,619,550,148.19		
Navy Department	139,968,295,180.91	131,467,766,126.25	\$23,421,136,064	29,401,119,732.33	29,305,438,163.42	49,340,072,166.50	\$7,659,803,907	\$1,399,008,413
Agriculture Department	8,045,520,453.00	8,047,520,453.00	14,986,472	1,483,197,665.82	2,164,547,577.44	4,384,788,337.74		
Federal Security Agency:								
Office of Education	504,115,537.17	508,730,637.17		15,541,737.17	130,724,900.00	362,464,060.00		
Other	254,397,135.69	176,573,135.69		76,837,071.01	66,726,354.00	33,009,710.68		
Federal Works Agency:								
Public Roads Administration	367,500,000.00	345,100,000.00	48,000,000	77,000,000.00	88,000,000.00	132,100,000.00	22,400,000	
Public works (community facilities)	534,500,000.00	514,500,000.00		32,000,000.00	165,000,000.00	317,500,000.00		
Other	34,679,604.92	41,079,604.92		10,914,547.29	12,731,756.85	44,725,909.06		
National Housing Agency	1,834,717,404.51	1,834,717,404.51		158,771,944.72	157,452,123.79	1,518,493,336.00		
Selective Service (administrative expenses)	302,995,747.36	250,955,611.12		62,501,368.35	70,494,104.77	118,000,108.00		
Treasury Department	6,183,219,978.59	6,183,219,978.59		1,231,003,540.25	889,008,533.76	4,062,307,904.58		
U. S. Maritime Commission	13,430,776,962.33	13,387,608,388.33		3,657,000,000.00	1,288,093,187.00	8,442,515,201.33	43,108,574	
War Shipping Administration	8,342,971,229.09	7,905,638,902.23		1,445,913,147.72	3,362,335,920.85	3,097,389,833.66		
Aid to China	500,000,000.00	500,000,000.00				500,000,000.00		
United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration	450,000,000.00	450,000,000.00		450,000,000.00				
Other:								
Commerce Department	605,200,525.38	605,200,525.38	75,000	1,455,946.93	32,432,056.73	571,237,521.72		
Executive Office:								
Office for Emergency Management	2,591,914,516.32	1,748,410,768.82		417,851,010.39	482,864,985.24	847,694,773.19	616,500,000	
Other	3,858,955,005.72	1,192,643,790.72	445,300	215,041,942.25	4,362,206,543.42	5,769,446,976.39		
Justice Department	173,142,515.54	179,627,515.54	28,219,000	42,384,006.90	46,320,194.67	62,704,313.97		
Office of War Mobilization and Reconversion	45,218,474.18	1,263,074.18		1,263,074.18				
Panama Canal	107,569,400.00	107,569,400.00	810,600			106,758,800.00		
Smaller War Plants Corporation—capital stock	200,000,000.00	200,000,000.00		50,000,000.00		150,000,000.00		

Footnotes at end of table.

War activities program—Continued

	Total appropriations and contract authorizations (approved and pending)	Appropriations ²					Contract authorizations (net) ³	
		Total	Fiscal year 1946	Fiscal year 1945	Fiscal year 1944	Fiscal years 1941-43	Total	Fiscal year 1946
Other—Continued.								
Other.....	519,348,320.13	442,222,029.13	15,148,500	140,738,247.90	110,140,829.53	176,194,451.70		
Total, war activities program, including appropriations for liquidation of 1940 and prior contract authorizations.....	417,122,504,702.94	382,860,647,777.63	23,530,707,476	53,851,782,386.27	92,821,204,022.65	212,656,953,892.71	8,341,872,481	1,399,008,413
Liquidation of 1940 and prior contract authorizations.....	-467,872,846.00	-467,872,846.00				-467,872,846.00		
Total, war activities program, exclusive of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its affiliates.....	416,654,631,856.94	382,392,774,931.63	23,530,707,476	53,851,782,386.27	92,821,204,022.65	212,189,081,046.71	8,341,872,481	1,399,008,413

	Contract authorizations (net) ³		In pending appropriations ⁴		Expenditures			
	Fiscal year 1945	Fiscal years 1942-44	Appropriations	Liquidations	Total	Fiscal year 1945	Fiscal year 1944	Fiscal years 1941-43
War Department.....			\$21,497,206,280.05		\$159,591,836,310.96	\$50,336,795,063.28	\$49,242,377,389.76	\$60,012,663,837.92
Navy Department.....	\$3,540,000,000	\$2,720,785,494	840,725,147.66		88,365,781,969.80	30,047,152,135.15	26,537,633,877.26	31,780,995,957.45
Agriculture Department.....			-2,000,000.00		6,051,385,715.47	1,198,129,249.57	2,143,403,788.69	2,709,852,677.21
Federal Security Agency:								
Office of Education.....			-4,615,100.00		427,625,368.76	45,847,277.72	74,672,068.74	307,106,022.30
Other.....			77,824,000.00		153,275,639.58	76,488,870.32	58,105,155.41	18,681,613.85
Unclassified expenditures.....					142.63	124.68	20,359.87	20,342.02
Federal Works Agency:								
Public Roads Administration.....		22,400,000			267,591,102.25	53,657,859.62	102,158,113.64	111,775,128.99
Public works (community facilities).....			20,000,000.00		405,061,881.26	123,226,849.19	133,356,739.61	148,478,292.46
Other.....			-6,400,000.00		16,989,448.30	8,328,589.71	7,802,356.01	16,463,214.60
Unclassified expenditures.....					44,342.12	43,959.40	18,792.13	19,174.85
National Housing Agency.....					1,558,613,640.52	69,873,179.11	538,768,704.05	949,971,757.36
Selective Service (administrative expenses).....			52,000,136.24		224,936,392.60	62,613,382.02	59,430,108.62	102,892,841.96
Treasury Department.....					4,638,328,890.83	1,462,335,266.63	1,432,044,410.45	1,743,949,213.75
U. S. Maritime Commission.....	¹² 43,168,574				10,794,700,599.97	3,226,539,725.48	3,811,704,050.35	3,756,456,824.14
War Shipping Administration.....			437,832,326.86		5,201,188,166.50	2,041,899,324.96	1,922,137,130.98	1,237,151,710.56
Aid to China.....					380,406,156.61	140,355,437.46		240,050,719.15
United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration.....					113,638,156.12	113,638,156.12		
Other:								
Commerce Department.....					509,162,149.52	86,881,831.63	132,791,192.87	259,489,125.02
Executive Office:								
Office for Emergency Management.....	2,500,000	¹¹ 614,000,000	230,848,460.50	-\$3,844,713	1,327,973,071.22	336,657,964.84	420,830,035.54	¹³ 570,485,050.94
Other.....			¹⁴ 2,666,311,215.00		651,383,636.12	251,585,055.23	243,120,018.35	¹⁵ 156,678,562.54
Justice Department.....			-6,485,000.00		136,600,099.02	36,080,272.21	42,698,791.15	57,821,035.66
Office War Mobilization and Reconversion.....			43,955,400.00		474,482.90	474,482.90		
Panama Canal.....					75,262,652.46	2,577,486.08	6,425,829.40	66,269,336.98
Smaller War Plants Corporation—capital stock.....					190,672,469.59	120,078,551.47	57,382,991.11	13,211,827.01
Other.....			77,126,291.00		407,934,445.94	187,139,715.06	82,430,813.23	138,366,917.65
Unclassified expenditures.....					1,990,051.75	636,831.16	5,005,492.40	7,832,375.81
Total, war activities program, including appropriations for liquidation of 1940 and prior contract authorizations.....	3,585,668,574	3,357,195,494	25,923,829,157.31	-3,844,713	281,488,787,910.06	90,029,145,512.84	87,038,671,937.86	104,420,970,459.36
Total, war activities program, exclusive of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its affiliates.....	3,585,668,574	3,357,195,494	25,923,829,157.31	-3,844,713	281,488,787,910.06	90,029,145,512.84	87,038,671,937.86	²¹ 104,420,970,459.36

NOTE.—This statement includes appropriations and net contract authorizations provided for in the 76th Cong. (3d sess.), 77th, 78th, and 79th Congs.

¹ Exclusive of Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its affiliates shown in Statement II.

² In many instances, funds appropriated during any fiscal year are also available for the succeeding fiscal year. Immediately available funds are shown in the fiscal year for which the appropriation was made. This statement excludes unexpended balances of appropriations on June 30, 1940 (except immediately available funds in fiscal year 1941 appropriations), which were available for expenditure in the fiscal year 1941. Allocations from appropriations made to the President (lend-lease and emergency funds for the President) are shown under the departments or agencies to which allocated.

³ Contract authorizations have been reduced by later appropriations which were earmarked in authorizing acts for this purpose.

⁴ Pending appropriations, as used herein, represent appropriation bills reported from the Committee on Appropriations to the House or in subsequent stages of Congressional action before Presidential approval. Credit figures represent existing appropriations to be repealed in pending bills.

⁵ Excludes expenditures for Selective Service (administrative expenses) reflected separately below.

⁶ Revised to adjust classification.

⁷ Reduced by \$7,500,000 representing amounts repealed by Congress on June 22, 1944 (Public Law No. 347).

⁸ Includes \$340,795,494 for tonnage provided in Public Law No. 204, approved Dec. 17, 1943; and \$1,825,000,000 for tonnage provided in Public Law No. 375, approved June 28, 1944.

⁹ Excess of credit, deduct.

¹⁰ Deduct. Reflects reductions during the fiscal years 1944 and 1945 of allocations made in previous years.

¹¹ Includes expenditures for Public Roads Administration and public works (community facilities) from allocations of the President's emergency funds.

¹² Reduced by \$2,100,000,000 in appropriations and \$4,265,000,000 in contract authorizations representing amounts repealed by Congress on May 29, 1945 (Public Law No. 68).

¹³ Allotments have been made to the following agencies: Agriculture Department, \$123,000,000; Federal Security Agency, \$848,689; Foreign Economic Administration, \$55,565,000; Treasury Department, \$226,000,000; and War Shipping Administration, \$20,500,000.

¹⁴ Includes \$600,000,000 representing the net amount of contractual authority that the President may authorize in accordance with Public Law No. 282, approved Oct. 28, 1941.

¹⁵ Expenditures relating to "Emergency funds for the President" and "Lend-lease funds" for the fiscal years 1941 and 1942 are reflected under "Other: Executive Office: Other."

¹⁶ Includes unallocated balances of the President's emergency funds amounting to \$63,941,052.94 and lend-lease balances amounting to \$320,687,856.42.

¹⁷ Deduct. Reflects allocations to various agencies in the fiscal years 1944 and 1945 of amounts appropriated in previous years.

¹⁸ Includes \$2,475,000,000 for lend-lease.

¹⁹ Includes expenditures of the Office for Emergency Management from "Emergency funds for the President" and "Lend-lease funds."

²⁰ For details by fiscal years, see the daily Treasury statement of Feb. 15, 1945, p. 19.

²¹ For details by fiscal years, see the daily Treasury statement of Jan. 15, 1944, p. 15.

War activities program—Continued

II. RECONSTRUCTION FINANCE CORPORATION (DIRECT AND THROUGH ITS AFFILIATES), JULY 1, 1940, THROUGH JUNE 30, 1945

[Compiled from latest reports received by the Treasury]

	Commitments	Cancellations	Charges	Credits ¹ (repayments, sales, rentals, etc.)
Defense Plant Corporation.....	\$11,570,278,607.40	\$2,256,694,477.32	\$8,015,301,848.47	\$2,901,350,410.55
Defense Supplies Corporation.....	11,319,320,872.45	921,103,995.70	6,955,350,361.91	5,230,932,810.98
Metals Reserve Company.....	5,647,768,609.96	2,341,499,849.13	2,359,225,141.11	1,632,171,557.64
Rubber Development Corporation.....	557,269,937.00	40,687,251.99	269,321,519.67	202,284,114.69
Rubber Reserve Company.....	3,257,774,929.83	686,303,290.73	2,243,050,975.41	1,334,648,077.10
U. S. Commercial Company.....	2,834,756,833.84	162,450,460.61	1,252,128,227.58	768,689,344.45
The RFC Mortgage Company.....	144,775,122.19	22,343,123.75	112,757,358.05	78,602,826.54
RFC direct:				
Loan to Great Britain and Northern Ireland.....	425,000,000.00	-----	390,000,000.00	118,112,529.84
Loan—Defense Homes Corporation.....	65,750,000.00	-----	65,392,000.00	8,458,301.26
Loan—Petroleum Reserves Corporation.....	31,000,000.00	30,900,000.00	100,000.00	-----
Stock—War Damage Corporation.....	100,000,000.00	-----	1,000,000.00	-----
Automobile financing loans.....	132,143,106.38	132,143,106.38	-----	-----
All other loans.....	1,986,615,765.49	737,750,384.43	946,963,666.62	638,233,175.65
	38,072,453,784.54	7,331,875,940.04	22,610,591,098.82	12,913,483,148.70
Less intercompany eliminations.....	3,411,992,378.85	441,033,190.67	1,873,670,978.95	1,104,885,029.30
Total.....	34,660,461,405.69	6,890,842,749.37	20,736,920,119.87	11,808,598,119.40

¹ Includes total sales proceeds.

III. APPROPRIATIONS AND NET CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS THROUGH JUNE 30, 1945 ¹

Date approved	Public Law No.	Title of act	Appropriations	Net contract authorizations ²
77TH CONG., 1ST SESS.				
Feb. 6, 1941	5	Joint Resolution (emergency ship construction).....	\$313,500,000.00	
Feb. 13, 1941	6	Joint Resolution (clothing and equipage—War Department).....	175,000,000.00	
Mar. 1, 1941	9	Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941.....	6,047,775.00	
Mar. 17, 1941	13	Fourth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941.....	1,376,464,602.00	
Mar. 27, 1941	23	Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1941.....	7,000,000,000.00	
Apr. 1, 1941	25	First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941.....	114,458,468.00	
Apr. 5, 1941	28	Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1942.....	399,360,000.00	
Do.....	29	Fifth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1941.....	2,293,227,920.00	
May 6, 1941	48	Navy Department Appropriation Act, 1942.....	3,415,521,750.00	
May 23, 1941	71	War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1942.....	37,920,370.00	
May 24, 1941	73	Additional Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941.....	168,556,000.00	
May 31, 1941	88	Treasury Department Appropriation Act, 1942.....	62,193,150.00	
June 28, 1941	135	Justice, State, and Commerce Departments Appropriation Act, 1942.....	129,227,750.00	
Do.....	136	Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1942.....	2,035,000.00	
June 30, 1941	139	Military Appropriation Act, 1942.....	10,384,821,624.00	
July 1, 1941	146	Labor—Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1942.....	173,168,500.00	
July 3, 1941	150	Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1941.....	998,894,561.00	
Aug. 25, 1941	247	First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942.....	6,580,012,448.00	
Oct. 28, 1941	282	Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942: (Title I).....	5,985,000,000.00	³ \$600,000,000.00
		(Title II).....	159,005,585.00	
Nov. 19, 1941	295	Defense Highway Act of 1941.....		12,000,000.00
Dec. 17, 1941	353	Third Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942.....	9,112,021,947.00	50,000,000.00
Dec. 23, 1941	371	Joint Resolution (War, Philippine relief, and defense housing).....	510,000,000.00	
		Total, 77th Cong., 1st sess.....	49,396,437,450.00	662,000,000.00
77TH CONG., 2D SESS.				
Jan. 30, 1942	422	Fourth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942.....	12,525,872,474.00	
Feb. 7, 1942	441	Naval Appropriation Act, 1943.....	⁴ 23,738,865,474.00	² 2,171,000,000.00
Feb. 12, 1942	452	Joint Resolution (financial aid to China).....	500,000,000.00	
Feb. 21, 1942	463	First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1942.....	135,203,320.69	
Mar. 5, 1942	474	Fifth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942.....	30,412,737,900.00	
Apr. 28, 1942	527	War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1943.....	57,886,985.00	
Do.....	528	Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942.....	18,932,124,093.00	
June 5, 1942	572	Joint Resolution (War Risk Insurance Fund).....	210,000,000.00	
June 19, 1942	616	Joint Resolution (education and training).....	9,500,000.00	
June 23, 1942	626	Seventh Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1942.....	⁴ 655,074,740.00	150,000,000.00
June 27, 1942	630	Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1943.....	1,052,812,003.66	
July 2, 1942	644	Justice, State, and Commerce Departments Appropriation Act, 1943.....	261,908,180.00	
Do.....	645	Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1943.....	8,977,370.00	
Do.....	647	Labor—Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1943.....	227,726,864.00	
Do.....	648	Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1942.....	10,415,077.72	
Do.....	649	Military Appropriation Act, 1943.....	42,820,003,067.00	
Do.....	650	War Housing and Public Works Appropriation Act, 1942.....	32,500,000.00	
July 25, 1942	678	First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943.....	1,845,234,990.47	
Oct. 26, 1942	763	Second Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1943.....	⁴ 6,299,361,448.40	
		Total, 77th Cong., 2d sess.....	139,736,203,987.94	2,321,000,000.00
78TH CONG., 1ST SESS.				
Mar. 2, 1943	3	Joint Resolution (Selective Service System).....	21,160,000.00	
Mar. 18, 1943	11	First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943.....	4,063,948,984.28	
Mar. 31, 1943	20	Supplemental Naval Appropriation Act, 1943.....	3,836,176,119.00	
Apr. 29, 1943	45	Joint Resolution (farm labor program).....	26,100,000.00	
May 7, 1943	50	Joint Resolution (Commerce Department—war training program).....	3,500,000.00	
June 2, 1943	64	War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1944.....	1,457,898.00	
June 14, 1943	70	Defense Aid Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1943.....	6,273,623,000.00	
June 26, 1943	90	Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1944.....	1,395,013,569.00	
Do.....	92	Naval Appropriation Act, 1944.....	⁴ 27,637,226,198.00	9,000,000.00
July 1, 1943	105	Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce Appropriation Act, 1944.....	67,035,000.00	
Do.....	108	Military Appropriation Act, 1944.....	59,034,839,673.00	
July 12, 1943	129	Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1944.....	38,048,000.00	
Do.....	132	Urgent Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943.....	31,979,000.00	
Do.....	133	Interior Department Appropriation Act, 1944.....	14,884,000.00	
Do.....	135	Labor—Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1944.....	307,953,500.00	

Footnotes at end of table.

War activities program—Continued

Date approved	Public Law No.	Title of act	Appropriations	Net contract authorizations
78TH CONG. 1ST SESS.—continued				
July 12, 1943	139	National War Agencies Appropriation Act, 1944	\$2,911,697,224.00	\$14,000,000.00
Do	140	Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1943	151,340,087.67	
Oct. 1, 1943	156	Joint Resolution (Labor Department)	18,620,000.00	
Dec. 17, 1943	204	Public Law (naval expansion program)		\$340,795,494.00
Dec. 23, 1943	216	First Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act, 1944	81,283,467.87	
Total, 78th Cong., 1st sess.			105,916,492,320.82	363,795,494.00
78TH CONG., 2D SESS.				
Feb. 14, 1944	229	Joint Resolution (farm labor and migration of workers)	31,359,200.00	
Apr. 1, 1944	279	First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944	170,221,080.07	
Apr. 4, 1944	298	Public Law (Federal Works Agency—public roads)		10,400,000.00
May 12, 1944	303	Joint Resolution (Labor Department—maternity and infant care)	6,700,000.00	
June 22, 1944	347	Naval Appropriation Act, 1945	\$27,562,298,301.00	1,600,000,000.00
June 26, 1944	352	War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1945	1,431,840.00	
June 27, 1944	353	Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1945	6,836,008,043.00	43,168,574.00
June 28, 1944	365	Departments of State, Justice, and Commerce Appropriation Act, 1945	47,885,000.00	
Do	367	Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1945	30,700,000.00	
Do	372	National War Agency Appropriation Act, 1945	1,030,937,242.00	2,500,000.00
Do	373	Labor—Federal Security Appropriation Act, 1945	218,611,829.00	
Do	374	Military Appropriation Act, 1945	15,434,814,795.00	
Do	375	Second Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1944	\$186,266,524.40	\$1,880,000,000.00
Do	382	Defense Aid Appropriation Act, 1945	3,450,570,000.00	
Do	382	United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration Participation Appropriation Act, 1945	450,000,000.00	
Do	382	Foreign Economic Administration Appropriation Act, 1945	19,750,000.00	
Dec. 22, 1944	529	First Supplemental Appropriation Act, 1945	\$410,291,029.06	\$60,000,000.00
Total, 78th Cong., 2d sess.			\$55,905,679,983.53	3,596,068,574.00
79TH CONG., 1ST SESS.				
Mar. 31, 1945	24	War Department Civil Appropriation Act, 1946	2,697,140.00	
Apr. 30, 1945	40	First Deficiency Appropriation Act, 1945	\$2,015,384,142.91	
May 3, 1945	49	Independent Offices Appropriation Act, 1946	57,288,300.00	
May 5, 1945	52	Department of Agriculture Appropriation Act, 1946	14,986,472.00	
May 26, 1945	61	Departments of State, Justice and Commerce Appropriation Act, 1946	34,599,500.00	
May 29, 1945	62	Naval Appropriation Act, 1946	\$23,601,136,064.00	1,399,008,413.00
Do	68	Joint resolution (U. S. Maritime Commission)	\$3,100,000,000.00	(*)
June 12, 1945	83	Joint resolution (Labor Department—maternity and infant care)	2,200,000.00	
Total, 79th Cong., 1st sess.			22,628,291,618.91	1,399,008,413.00
IN PENDING APPROPRIATIONS ¹				
Interior Department appropriation bill, 1946			10,625,000.00	
Joint resolution (reducing certain appropriations)			—82,054,000.00	
Labor-Federal Security appropriation bill, 1946			197,011,554.00	
Military appropriation bill, 1946			21,490,902,030.00	
National war agencies appropriation bill, 1946			774,008,765.00	—3,844,713.00
Second deficiency appropriation bill, 1945			\$3,527,335,808.31	
Total pending			25,923,829,157.31	—3,844,713.00
SUMMARY				
Total, 76th Cong., 3d sess. ¹¹			8,994,015,828.00	
Total, 77th Cong., 1st sess.			49,396,437,450.00	662,000,000.00
Total, 77th Cong., 2d sess.			139,730,263,887.14	2,321,000,000.00
Total, 78th Cong., 1st sess.			105,916,492,320.82	363,795,494.00
Total, 78th Cong., 2d sess.			55,905,679,983.53	3,596,068,574.00
Total, 79th Cong., 1st sess.			22,628,291,618.91	1,399,008,413.00
Permanent appropriations and net transfers from other than war activities appropriations ¹²			283,526,588.43	
Total approved			382,860,647,777.63	8,341,872,481.00
Total pending, 79th Cong., 1st sess.			25,923,829,157.31	—3,844,713.00
Liquidations of 1940 and prior contract authorizations			—467,872,846.00	
Total approved and pending appropriations and net contract authorizations, exclusive of Reconstruction Finance Corporation			408,316,604,088.94	8,338,027,768.00

¹ Consists of appropriations and net contract authorizations available on and after July 1, 1940. Excludes: (1) authorizations of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation and its affiliates for war purposes, and (2) unexpended balances of appropriations on June 30, 1940 (except immediately available funds from fiscal year 1941 appropriations), available for expenditure in the fiscal year 1941.

² Contract authorizations have been reduced by later appropriations which were earmarked in authorizing acts for this purpose.

³ Represents the net amount of contractual authority that the President may authorize in accordance with provisions of this act.

⁴ Includes appropriations made available for prior years. For amounts, see appropriate footnotes in Treasury daily statement dated June 15, 1945, p. 16.

⁵ Unappropriated contract authorizations for the naval expansion program are as follows:

Public Law No. 441	\$2,171,000,000
Public Law No. 204 (estimated by Navy Department)	340,795,494
Public Law No. 375	55,000,000
Public Law No. 375 (estimated by Navy Department)	1,825,000,000
Public Law No. 529	60,000,000

⁶ Revised. Public Law No. 347 has been reduced by \$7,500,000, representing the amount repealed by Congress and carried to the surplus fund in accordance with provisions of this act.

⁷ Includes \$180,000,000 for the fiscal year 1945.

⁸ Represents amount of prior appropriations repealed by Congress. The repeal of contractual authority has been applied to prior acts.

⁹ Pending appropriations, as used herein, represent appropriation bills reported from the Committee on Appropriations to the House, or in subsequent stages of Congressional action before Presidential approval.

¹⁰ Includes \$2,742,548,420 for the fiscal year 1946, of which \$2,475,000,000 represents lend-lease.

¹¹ For details of appropriations made by 76th Cong., 3d sess., see daily Treasury statement for Feb. 15, 1945, p. 20.

¹² Includes actual transfer of balances of the Bureau of Marine Inspection and Navigation from the Department of Commerce to Coast Guard, Navy, in the amount of \$1,153,802 in accordance with Executive Order 9063, dated Feb. 28, 1942. Also includes \$6,017,975.32 received as war contributions under authority of the Second War Powers Act and deposits of advance payments made by foreign governments to the Defense Aid Special Fund for the procurement of defense articles amounting to \$102,815,053.77.

COOPERATION BETWEEN THE ARMY AND NAVY IN THE PURCHASE OF TEXTILES AND CLOTHING

Mr. GURNEY. Mr. President, I had hoped that I might have time during the day without disturbing the debate on the United Nations Charter to make a short brief statement in the nature of a pat on the back for the Navy and the Army be-

cause of their cooperative program which is of much benefit, not only to the military but also to the civilian population, the people at home. It has to do with purchases by the Army and Navy of textiles and clothing. It has to do with the record they have made in cooperative buying, so that the shirts, tenting, clothing materials, and similar materials

manufactured by the textile mills can be more efficiently purchased for the military, thereby leaving more of the facilities of the mills available for the production of goods for the civilian population. I understand that the program has been instituted by Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson and Secretary of the Navy James Forrestal.

Rather than burden the Senate with an 8-minute or 10-minute talk on the subject at this time, in the course of which I would mention some examples of what they actually have done, I ask unanimous consent that the statement I have prepared be printed at this point in the RECORD, for the information of the Senate.

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

Mr. President, a source of annoyance to the Members of Congress is the oft repeated complaint that two or more Government bureaus or departments cannot seem to get together and work in unison toward a common goal. Consequently, when I have a concrete example showing that it is not only practical but possible, it is a personal pleasure as well as a duty to bring it to the attention of the Members of this body. And when the two agencies furnishing the example are the two largest wartime operators, the example is all the more striking.

I refer to the Army and Navy. As you know, each is a large buyer of textiles and clothing, each using the same goods to a large extent, and each making its procurements through its own long-established channels. Now, when private industry is straining its capacity to the utmost to produce wartime needs for a global war, it is of paramount importance that procurements should be coordinated and made, in the manner most compatible with necessity and ever mindful of hewing to the line of speed and economy.

It seems that this was also in the minds of the War and the Navy Departments, for they have been particularly active along these lines. Last year, the Under Secretary of War Robert P. Patterson and the Secretary of the Navy James V. Forrestal, then Under Secretary, got together on this matter and directed that a study be made in regard to the procurement of standard stock items, particularly in the field of clothing and textiles, with a view to coordinating purchases.

A sweeping survey was conducted by their staffs looking to the practicability of establishing purchasing offices for common items used jointly by Army and Navy procurement officers in strategic areas for the purpose of standardizing and coordinating procedures and purchase plans for the respective services.

As a result, in April of this year such a purchasing office for textile and clothing items was established in New York City. More than three months have passed since this action was taken, not long enough perhaps to gain a comprehensive view but certainly long enough to determine the feasibility of the operation. I have requested from the War and Navy Departments a preliminary report and I find that the move has been working out even better than anticipated for such a short time. I shall outline a few specific examples of how such coordination is working to eliminate red tape, paper work, and most important of all, the elimination of delay in acquiring items in which one service may be short at the time and the other is long.

First of all, most of us recognize the importance of paper work, a necessary evil and nonetheless vital, although it can be carried to excess, especially when different agencies are making use of different forms to accomplish the same result. The Army-Navy Purchasing Office quickly put into effect a common cost and price analysis form and now is drafting a common purchase order instrument form. Within the past two or three weeks when it was necessary to use the Office of Price Administration escalator clause, the Army and Navy got together and

worked out a way by which industry receives but one type of form from both services.

As a more concrete example, recently the Army was in critical need of additional production in chambray shirts and the outlook was poor since the manufacturers had tendered to the Navy bids on more than 5,000,000 of this item. The Navy, however, was then in the process of making large reductions in its current monthly requirements and through coordination of effort, by each knowing what the other was doing, the Army was able to go to certain of these manufacturers and say, in effect: "The Navy doesn't need all of your production at the present time and we can take over 1,500,000 units of your output."

Blankets have been an important, and sometimes critical, item with all services. Recently the Army's current requirements were more than could be provided by the factories; however, the Navy was in the process of replacing a half million o. d. blankets with white shipboard blankets. The items being replaced were turned over to the Army, helping it out of a tight situation.

As a final example of how this is working out, I want to cite the following instance. Navy manufacturers recently were unable to meet that service's current requirements in the matter of sheets, while the Army was in good position and getting ready to place orders for its third quarter requirements; in view of Navy's immediate need for this item, the Army is making available a portion of its future requirements to the extent of nearly 1,000,000 sheets which had been offered but for which orders had not been placed. The Navy will reciprocate at the proper time.

Information has been placed in my hands showing how the same procedure of coordinating requirements and procurements is being effected in such items as twills, duck, wool, webbing, socks, shoes, and other standard items, together with specific instances. But the foregoing examples will suffice to illustrate what is being done.

I feel that it is only just that public attention should be directed to this fine example of cooperation on the part of these two great military services. Secretary Forrestal and Undersecretary Patterson are indeed to be complimented on the speed and efficiency with which they have effected this program. It is a tribute, too, to their ability and foresight that they have under them an able staff, ready and willing to carry out their directions.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, several days ago I indicated—I believe with general approval—that there would be no general program of legislation taken up following the vote on the Charter. Were it not for the terms of the resolution adopted by the House of Representatives and concurred in by the Senate, namely, that the Senate take a recess during August or September, I would be prompted to move tonight that we adjourn until the 8th of October. But we cannot do that until next Wednesday, which is the 1st of August.

It is my purpose, when we conclude the business of today, to move that the Senate adjourn until next Wednesday, because I know of no reason why the Senate should be in session Monday or Tuesday. There may be one or two little matters which should be disposed of on Wednesday, and regarding which there is no controversy. If there is any controversy regarding any of them, I shall not ask that they be taken up. One of them is a bill reported from the Finance Commit-

tee, providing that veterans of World War II who have lost limbs or their eyesight or have otherwise been injured be placed on the same basis as injured veterans of World War I. The measure is a House bill. While the Senate committee has proposed an amendment to it in one particular, and that amendment cannot be acted upon by the House of Representatives until the 8th of October, it was made clear to the committee that if the Senate passes the bill, so that these veterans will know now that they will have that legislation when Congress returns in October, it will be a great stimulus to their morale. I do not think anyone will object to the bill, and it may be possible for us to take it up on Wednesday.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, in connection with the important piece of legislation which the Senator from Kentucky mentioned, namely, a bill providing for increases in the rates of compensation paid to veterans in amputation and other types of cases, I should like to call the attention of the Senator from Kentucky to a bill of much lesser importance, but one which has passed the House of Representatives, has come out of the Senate Finance Committee with a unanimous report, is not opposed by the Treasury, or the Joint Committee staff, and which, if passed on Monday or Wednesday, could go to the President for his signature, since no amendment has been proposed by the Senate committee. The measure to which I refer is House bill 3239, Calendar No. 518. If the Senator from Kentucky finds it possible to have the bill considered on Wednesday, I hope he will have it brought up.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, I appreciate the Senator's bringing the bill to my attention. I anticipate that there will be no difficulty in doing what he has suggested.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, there is another simple bill, Calendar No. 519, House bill 122, which is in the same position. I think the Senator from Georgia will agree that those two bills might well be passed, because no amendments have been proposed to them by the committee. They are House bills, and they have the unanimous report of the Finance Committee.

Mr. GEORGE. Mr. President, the Senator is correct, and I hope the majority leader will bring them up.

ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, if there is nothing further which any Senator wishes to bring before the Senate, I move that the Senate adjourn until next Wednesday at 12 o'clock noon.

The motion was agreed to; and at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, August 1, 1945, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate July 28 (legislative day of July 9), 1945:

THE JUDICIARY

ATTORNEY GENERAL OF PUERTO RICO

Enrique Campos del Toro to be attorney general of Puerto Rico.

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS

James E. Manahan to be collector of customs for customs collection district No. 2, with headquarters at St. Albans, Vt.

IN THE NAVY

APPOINTMENTS IN THE NAVY FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

David W. Bagley to be a vice admiral, to continue until his detachment from duty as a member of the Joint United States-Mexican Defense Committee, to rank from February 1, 1944.

Adolf V. S. Pickhardt to be a commodore, to continue while serving as chief of staff to commander, United States Naval Forces, northwest African waters, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

Roger E. Nelson to be a commodore, to continue while serving as commandant, United States naval operating base, Guam, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

James W. Boundy to be a pay director with the rank of commodore, to continue while serving as a fleet or force supply officer, United States Pacific Fleet, and until reporting for other permanent duty.

POSTMASTERS

ALABAMA

William O. Smith, Glen Allen.

CALIFORNIA

Irene Beckley, Grimes.
Otto J. Hanzlik, Nuevo.
George Christian, South Dos Palos.

COLORADO

Henry Joseph Kick, East Portal.
Rose E. Stocks, Evans.
Charles W. Knoll, Gardner.
Hazel H. Brown, Green Mountain Falls.
Esther Anna Holtz, Laporte.
Evelyn Myers, Palmer Lake.

CONNECTICUT

Carl J. Lauretti, Farmington.
Albert T. Babcock, Oakdale.
Kenneth R. Williams, Old Mystic.
George G. Emerson, South Lyme.
Benjamin Phelps, Staffordville.
Bertha M. Place, Tolland.
P. Stanley Barber, West Mystic.

DELAWARE

Mary A. Butler, Christiana.

FLORIDA

Ruth Akins, Bell.
Herman B. Wiggins, Hampton.
W. Wallace Waters, McIntosh.
James G. Pulliam, Minneola.
Joseph Frank Potts, Uleta.

IDAHO

Lillian H. Gibson, Arimo.
Seralda E. Hudson, Castleford.
Ethel W. Hatcher, Clark Fork.
Edward E. Schau, Gibbs.
Linus E. Small, Notus.
Nettie T. McClain, Pinehurst.
Alec L. Bull, Princeton.
John H. Clay, Riggins.

IOWA

Bert E. Fry, Adel.
William F. Dunn, Bernard.
Lee W. Lugar, Derby.
Anna E. St. Clair, Floris.
Nettie Evelyn Mack, Hardy.
Carmelita B. Collins, Imogene.
James Burnham Silsby, Lamoni.
Cora G. Bigelow, Lester.
Edith O. Jacobson, Ottosen.
Olive S. Squires, Palo.
Celestine M. Mischo, Panama.
Ervey Engelhardt, St. Olaf.
Emmett E. Butler, Treynor.
Lillie Grace Snakenberg, Webster.
Vera L. Coleman, Westgate.
Ruby E. Stegemann, Williamson.
Letha Doughten, Woolstock.

KENTUCKY

James S. Trosper, Allais.
Herman M. Hall, Allock.
Thomas C. Morton, Bandana.
Tina Mae Kirtley, Browder.
Lear Bates, Bypro.
Mary G. McGuire, Clay City.
Maxie Lee Wright, Cromona.
James B. Rone, Crummies.
Russell Harman, David.
Mack T. Tarry, Dexter.
Less Sarver, Falls of Rough.
Mollie Baker, Flat Lick.
Nancy Clark, Flatwoods.
Hugh P. Stanford, Glomawr.
Lela M. Wilson, Gracey.
May Z. Todd, Hillsboro.
Ora Potter, Jackhorn.
Norman Combs, Jeff.
Fannie M. Kniffey, Kniffey.
Albert L. Canter, Lynnville.
Golda P. Griffith, McVeigh.
Minnie E. Webb, Mayking.
Wilfred B. Haigis, Melbourne.
Lula P. Holbrook, Millstone.
Sallie B. Gilbert, Oneida.
Nelle A. Miller, Olmstead.
Edgar C. Harper, Quality.
Walter G. Revlett, Rumsey.
Mabel M. Day, Soldier.
Blanche Sanders, South Portsmouth.
Haleen Brooks Nunn, Sullivan.
Alexander White, Trappist.
Norma R. Huey, Union.
Rosy Mae McCloud, West Van Lear.
Jessie H. Blue, Wooton.
Lizzie Mary Oney, Worthington.

MICHIGAN

Cynthia K. Nelsey, Davisburg.
Blanche C. Papineau, Ensign.
Eldon S. G. Huber, Montrose.
Virginia Novacek, Union Pier.

MISSOURI

Albert P. Carr, California.
Charles A. Boyd, Camden Point.
Laura L. Procter, Centertown.
Vern Rozell, Chadwick.
Earle F. Stewart, Coffey.
Carlisle M. Randall, Craig.
Lawrence Ruckman, Denver.
Napoleon A. King, Des Arc.
William L. Shelton, Edgar Springs.
Lila B. Coull, Greenwood.
Edith B. Sympton, Gullford.
Ross N. Glasscock, Hartsburg.
William V. Mullies, Hume.
John E. White, Hunnewell.
Ethel M. Vaughan, Lanagan.
Roxie M. Shook, Larussell.
Prudy T. Keith, Leonard.
Marie E. Triplett, Long Lane.
Mora Tracy, Mayview.
Ruby M. Laurie, Osage Beach.
J. Ralph Brown, Patton.
Ethel McCurry, Pleasant Hope.
Virgil Reinhard, Pollock.
Mildred E. Vassar, Rothville.
Glen H. Rozell, Sparta.
Albert George Layton, Vanduser.

MASSACHUSETTS

Alice A. Hammond, Westport.

MINNESOTA

Clarence E. Scheibe, Cloquet.
Louis B. Matsch, Hastings.
Gerald B. Davis, Magnolia.
Everett H. Albers, Ottertail.
Datus M. Arnold, Redby.
Robert E. Lee, Redlake.
Walter B. Nelson, Wrenshall.

NEW HAMPSHIRE

Alvan E. Kallman, Dixville Notch.
Harold W. Henderson, East Barrington.
Carroll F. Clark, Frankestown.
Charles M. Belyea, Glendcliff.
Roland L. Alexander, Harrisville.
Theodore W. Drew, Intervale.
Ida K. Samson, Jefferson.

Vernon H. Hall, Pittsburg.
Hazel D. Brown, Salem.
Clifford W. Tuttle, Spofford.
John E. Guard, Westville.
James F. Magee, Wolfeboro Falls.

NEW JERSEY

Laurance G. Wygant, Creamridge.
William Schmidt, Cologne.
Clara R. Andersen, Dorothy.
Lillian E. Nelson, Gillette.
Mary E. Vanderhoef, Lake Como.
Edeva M. Crater, Lake Hopatcong.
Elmer T. Smith, Middlebush.
Herbert W. Polhemus, Mantoloking.
Dorothy De Marino, Port Morris.
Virgil B. Zellars, Port Murray.
Linda H. Huntley, Port Republic.
Matthew Travalgio, Richland.
Jules S. Thebaud, Surf City.
Edward W. Johnson, West Creek.

NEW YORK

Howard Vadney, Feura Bush.

NORTH DAKOTA

Bridget E. Knudson, Amidon.
Charles E. Fleck, Arnegard.
Leo Rolle, Brinsmade.
Clara J. Graff, Erie.
Sara Gillies, Hensel.
Edwin H. Naumann, Kramer.
Lena R. Storvestre, Landa.
William J. Hanson, Luverne.
Benno G. J. Schimansky, Solen.
Hattie D. Heffernan, Ypsilanti.

OHIO

Charles W. Blake, Arcadia.
John Beymer, Belle Valley.
Lee A. Andrews, Birmingham.
Logan W. Watts, Briggsdale.
Lucille E. Gregg, Cable.
Oscar B. Morris, Cairo.
Ethel Van Derveer, Carlisle.
Nannie M. Radcliffe, Carpenter.
Angela McGaharan, Cecil.
Ruth Benton, East Orwell.
Vinnie Zaugg, East Rochester.
Frank I. Kepner, Everett.
Edith I. Retterer, Harpster.
Mabel Hobaugh, Harrisville.
Faye E. Kelley, Harveysburg.
Emma Grace Miller, New Burlington.
Don V. S. Biddinger, Nova.
Gertrude Ray, Ray.
Rhodabelle Campbell, Springboro.
Homer I. Crandall, Thompson.
Andrew F. Sautter, Tontogany.
Ray H. Davis, Unionport.
Fla Victoria Dipert, Vanlue.
Mary L. Bluhm, Vickery.
Russel D. Stewart, Wren.

OKLAHOMA

Norma Mitchell, Arkoma.
Grady B. Watson, Bessie.
Newport W. Sanford, Bethany.
Bently A. Cox, Bowlegs.
Hugh H. Swadley, Council Hill.
Mattie Graham, Eagletown.
Chester C. Cunningham, Fox.
Rose Reeder, Hardesty.
Arthur Duck, Keystone.
Claire S. Elliott, Lenapah.
Tommie L. Payne, Lone Grove.
Viola E. Mitchell, Longdale.
Harry B. Becker, Meno.
James M. Hardesty, Strang.
Leonard H. Roberts, Sweetwater.
Montye K. Richardson, Union.

OREGON

Anna May Conklin, Metzger.

PENNSYLVANIA

Wade S. Hoke, Acme.
Chester O. Weaver, Amity.
Henry O. Heisey, Avon.
Dyson F. Kennedy, Bendersville.
Essie B. Spangler, Blanchard.
Henry R. Shadlinger, Blooming Glen.
Celeste Ganassi Uram, Blythedale.

James R. Kern, Bowmansville.
 Florence Ferrere, Boyers.
 Catherine Radanovich, Bressler.
 Agatha Mullany, Brockport.
 Martin L. Serfass, Brodheads ville.
 Ida P. Sandine, Buena Vista.
 Katharine H. Vall, Chester Springs.
 Le Roy K. Lennon, Churchville.
 Harry W. McArthur, Conneaut Lake Park.
 Jason W. Shaffer, Creekside.
 Jennie Eagono, Dresher.
 Mary Jane Fay, East Smethport.
 George E. Straub, Espy.
 Anna M. Young, Fairview Village.
 Bessie M. Durland, Falls.
 Irene J. Brahosky, Forbes Road.
 Jacob E. Haidle, Greenock.
 Delilah Tormey, Harrison Valley.
 Benjamin E. Hummel, Hummels Wharf.
 J. Clifford Hillman, Lemont.
 Paul T. Kline, Limerick.
 Tennie S. Walter, Loyalhanna.
 William E. Shelley, Mammoth.
 Edward R. Eisenhauer, Mifflinville.
 John K. Zullinger, Orrstown.
 Henry G. Stauffer, Palm.
 Archie F. Stewart, Penn Run.
 William Paxson Bishop, Plumsteadville.
 Palmer C. Bierly, Rebersburg.
 Kathryn B. Borges, Royalton.
 Mary K. Minich, Salunga.
 Earle F. Hausmann, Sanatoga.
 Minnie M. Ritter, Shamokin Dam.
 Agnes Marie Songer, Sigel.
 Herman Gerts lauer, Silverdale.
 J. Harold Stoneback, Springtown.
 Thomas R. McGuire, Swiftwater.
 William E. Kresge, Tannersville.
 Hazel C. Haylett, Utica.
 Chester Erwin Mayer, Warrington.
 Don F. Reed, West Lelsenring.
 J. Franklin Beach, Woodbury.

RHODE ISLAND

Laura Pellett, Alton.
 Phebe P. Bentley, Coventry.

SOUTH DAKOTA

Gwyneath Field, Alexandria.
 Catherine Kazmerzak, Erwin.
 Theresia M. Benson, Hartford.
 Martha L. Williams, Oelrichs.
 Dagmer Eastman, Trent.
 Percy G. Houghton, Willow Lake.
 Edd A. Sinkler, Wood.
 John W. Woods, Worthing.

TEXAS

Elma Martin, Apple Springs.
 Ruth Hale Clary, Atascosa.
 Mary F. Bluhm, Austwell.
 Mary B. Bloodworth, Axtell.
 Lucy F. Cowart, Banquete.
 Claude O. Williams, Barry.
 Mima Fessler, Bigwells.
 Jennie H. Whitney, Brookston.
 Leona D. Allen, Campbellton.
 Lizzie Potts, Choice.
 Anna M. Dunn, Clute.
 Thomas O. Walton, College Station.
 Rufus H. Chapman, Crowley.
 Sidney L. Hooper, Donna.
 Mary L. Spaw, Dripping Springs.
 Ethel Barker, Duncanville.
 Ella L. Martin, Eola.
 Dena Butts, Farmers Branch.
 Jessie M. Sims, Fluvanna.
 Elvira E. Bush, Fort Hancock.
 Ivah Smith, Glenflora.
 Lora H. Hudgins, Hungerford.
 Thomas C. Stell, Irene.
 Douglas A. Bigony, Klondike.
 Jessie Robinson, London.
 Mary B. Rowley, Loving.
 Caroline B. Fisher, Markham.
 Arthur I. Tolleson, McLeod.
 LaVerne G. Files, Monroe City.
 Edith S. Cocek, Penelope.
 Lora Mae Brashear, Petersburg.
 Arthur E. Robison, Prosper.
 Lela R. Maxwell, Quail.
 Ina C. McClellan, Rivivista.
 John L. Guinn, Sagerton.

A. Delta Sanders, Scurry.
 Ethel Miller, Stowell.
 Joseph W. Caldwell, Sumner.
 Plevna C. Garren, Turnersville.
 Ella Hutchinson, View.
 Helen I. Burks, Webster.
 Lula G. Thornton, Westpoint.
 Rena Doble, Wimberley.
 Andrew B. Cody, Winfield.
 John F. Leigh, Yantis.

UTAH

Ephia E. Foster, Columbia.

WASHINGTON

Mabel M. Gavin, Malott.
 Elsie J. Trana, Maple Valley.

WEST VIRGINIA

Aaron E. Altizer, Accoville.
 Ezra R. Patterson, Besoco.
 Dorothy M. Ferguson, Braeholm.
 Mearl C. Freeland, Burton.
 Thomas W. Alkire, Carolina.
 Ina Knapp, Cedar Grove.
 Claudia F. Halstead, Colcord.
 Strauss B. Herold, Craigsville.
 Ruth Corns, Davin.
 Maude Price, Dott.
 Fannie C. Fleener, Eunice.
 A. Wirt Berry, Flat Woods.
 Lula Griffin, Friendly.
 Harry Lowe, Gallagher.
 John Sevcik, Jr., Galloway.
 Flossie M. Powell, Glen Morgan.
 Albert H. Taylor, Hugheston.
 Harriet W. Stephenson, Jolo.
 Lula Tharpe, La Frank.
 William W. McFann, Lesage.
 J. Finley Cottrell, Mahan.
 Lorena D. Lewis, Malden.
 Ruth B. Daugherty, Mineralwells.
 Claud M. Mick, Orlando.
 Forest N. Walkup, Pax.
 Noretta M. Lucado, Pemberton.
 Mabel Galeota, Pursglove.
 Kenna J. Parsons, Putney.
 Holly R. Young, Quincey.
 Pearl B. Savage, Rosemont.
 Alice Nemith, Short Creek.
 Mary Thelma Garrett, Simpson.
 George Lee, Slagle.
 George E. Harvey, Sprague.
 Catherine Hill Glass, Talcott.
 Ansel C. Lambert, Volga.
 Hazen S. De Vaughn, Walker.
 Ruby M. Lehew, Waverly.
 Harry M. Wright, Wiley Ford.
 Jean Dalton, Worth.

WISCONSIN

Sam Johnson, Chaseburg.
 Dorothy B. Mills, Jim Falls.
 Robert G. Winkler, Rochester.
 Emil R. Kolash, Yuba.

SENATE

WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 1, 1945

Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., pastor of the Gunton Temple Memorial Presbyterian Church, Washington, D. C., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we thank Thee that daily Thou art authenticating our faith with new assurances of Thy loving kindness and gracious purpose for all mankind.

We pray that we may never yield to that paralyzing type of fatalism which blatantly declares that our faith is vain and that all our efforts to build a social order upon justice and good will are futile.

We rejoice that Thy servants have responded with faith and courage to their high calling of statesmanship by ratify-

ing a charter which we confidently believe will release the hidden splendor of humanity and open the way to the more abundant life.

Grant that men and nations everywhere may now earnestly strive to implement its principles and purposes with a will to have peace, a will to live together happily, and a will to seek one another's welfare.

May the Lord bless us and keep us; the Lord make His face to shine upon us and be gracious unto us; the Lord lift upon us the light of His countenance and give us peace.

In the name of the Christ our Saviour. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Saturday, July 28, 1945, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

THE UNITED NATIONS CHARTER—STATEMENT BY SENATOR WHEELER

Mr. WHEELER. Mr. President, a few days ago, in the course of the debate on the United Nations Charter, a question arose with reference to a statement which appeared in the Democratic platform, and I insisted on having the words "in case of attack" included in the platform.

What I insisted on having in the Democratic platform was a statement that American troops should not be sent out of the Western Hemisphere. I inadvertently made a misstatement during the debate the other day when I said that I insisted upon the insertion of the words "in case of an attack." I assumed, and I assume today, that at any time any nation is attacked it has a right to send its troops anywhere it wishes, because that is part of the sovereign power of the Government itself.

As I recall, what actually took place was that Secretary Byrnes, then Senator Byrnes, came to me and stated that there were some who wanted to have in the platform a modification of the suggested plank containing the words "in case of attack." I agreed with that, because, as I stated at that time, I assumed that any sovereign power which was attacked, of course, had the right to send its troops any place it desired.

I merely wished to make this statement in order to clarify the record.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT—APPROVAL OF BILLS

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries, and he announced that on July 28, 1945, the President had approved and signed the following acts:

S. 592. An act for the relief of the estate of James Arthur Wilson, deceased; and

S. 714. An act to amend the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," as amended.

TREATY OF GREENE VILLE CELEBRATION

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair announces that in accordance with the provisions of section 1, Public Law 159 (H. J. Res. 195), approved July 21, 1945, the Chair appoints the Senator