

to help in every way we can to win the war. Senate Resolution 192, amended as proposed by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] in the name of himself and 13 other Senators, would tend both to unite our Nation and to unite our allies. Our great obligation, next to winning the war, is to make sure that when the war is won it will stay won. This amended resolution would help to that end. We must do everything in our power to make sure that we shall establish, following the war, internal stability in this Nation for the benefit of its people. The opportunity to do so will have been won jointly by all who have fought this war to victory. Full success, however, will depend upon the establishment of peace with a reasonable assurance of stability for many years to come. It is only thus that we shall have a peace worthy of the infinite price paid for it. It is through such a determination to establish and to maintain peace as is expressed in the resolution as proposed to be amended that we can establish a national policy worthy of those who are fighting this war and worthy of those who established this Nation.

We shall live up to the destiny of this Nation if, but only if, we have that deep faith in God and in man which makes us willing to maintain in peace as well as in war that high devotion to this Nation that has won and preserved its freedom. To paraphrase General MacArthur's noble statement: "We are engaged in the great crusade of personal liberty as opposed to perpetual slavery. There can be no compromise. We shall win or we shall die and to this end we pledge the full resources of all the mighty power of our country and all the blood of our countrymen."

This is too deep a dedication for us to falter in carrying out our share in it. It is for us, through our efforts to establish and maintain the peace of the world, to see to it that our young men and women who shall come back from the war shall find here the America of lasting peace, assured stability, high ideals, and high opportunity of which they think, of which they dream, and for which they fight.

STATEMENT BY SENATOR RUSSELL ON HIS VISIT TO WAR FRONTS

Mr. RUSSELL obtained the floor.

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

Mr. RUSSELL. I yield.

Mr. HILL. I happen to know that many Members of the Senate on both sides of the aisle are very much interested in hearing the address which the Senator from Georgia is about to begin, and I hope he will yield to me in order that I may make the point of no quorum.

Mr. RUSSELL. In view of the statement of the Senator from Alabama, I will yield, but I may say that my remarks will largely be a repetition of my statement in the Senate on October 7 last.

Mr. HILL. I can assure the Senator that many Senators are anxious to hear his address. I make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

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

Alken	George	Radcliffe
Andrews	Gerry	Reed
Austin	Gillette	Revercomb
Bailey	Green	Reynolds
Ball	Guffey	Robertson
Bankhead	Hatch	Russell
Bilbo	Hayden	Scruggam
Brewster	Hill	Shipstead
Bridges	Holman	Smith
Brooks	Johnson, Calif.	Stewart
Burton	Johnson, Colo.	Thomas, Idaho
Bushfield	Kilgore	Thomas, Okla.
Butler	Langer	Tobey
Byrd	Lodge	Truman
Capper	Lucas	Tunnell
Caraway	McClellan	Tydings
Chavez	McFarland	Vandenberg
Clark, Idaho	McKellar	Van Nuys
Clark, Mo.	McNary	Wagner
Connally	Maybank	Wallgren
Danaher	Millikin	Walsh
Davis	Murdock	Wheeler
Downey	Murray	Wherry
Eastland	Nye	White
Ellender	Overton	Wiley
Ferguson	Pepper	Wilson

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Seventy-eight Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, published reports of statements purporting to have been made in secret sessions of the Senate by individual members of the Senate committee which recently visited the war theaters overseas have been the subject of much criticism and comment in recent weeks.

The summary of the findings of the committee as a body, outlining opinions on which all of the Senators who participated in the trip were in complete agreement, was given to the press and printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. Very little has been said or published about those conclusions. Perhaps they were not spectacular enough.

The fragmentary handling by the press of the reporting by some Senator or Senators who saw fit to disregard the rules of the Senate applying secrecy to executive sessions caused a great deal of confusion and distortion in the accounts of what transpired appearing in the press and given over the radio. There seems to be a natural tendency on the part of most human beings to emphasize critical statements and gloss over those which are commendatory in character.

The widespread publicity given the deliberations of a secret session reflects no credit on the Senate. It will probably be a long time before another executive session is held. It does seem that a Member or Members of this body who cannot resist the impulse to report secret proceedings to newsmen would at least make an attempt to present a more complete picture. It may well be that it was unwise to arrange an executive session in the first instance. I personally had no objection to making a general statement of my views and observations in public, but it was felt that an executive session would enable the members of the committee to speak more freely on such matters as the number of troops and amount of equipment in each area, and other plans and details of the war which

it would be against the public interest to make available to our enemies.

I believed that if the expedition were to prove of any value to the Senate and thereby to the country in dealing with war legislation or post-war problems, I should be perfectly frank in making my report. Nothing was further from my purpose than to engender any bitterness, either at home or between us and our allies, which would in the slightest degree adversely affect our united effort in the great struggle for life and freedom in which we are all engaged, and I have no apologies for any statement that I made.

In view of the fragmentary and somewhat garbled reports which have been circulated and discussed, I have decided, in order to clear the atmosphere and make plain my own views, to make in open session of the Senate the same report, insofar as possible, I made in the executive session. I have omitted only facts which might be valuable to our enemies. During the course of the sessions a number of questions were asked, and I, of course, cannot remember all of them or repeat my answers verbatim. I am, however, using the same notes and manuscript to which I referred in the executive session held October 7. I do not expect my colleagues to welcome the opportunity to hear the same statement twice, but I feel that in justice to myself I should repeat it. If any Member of the Senate desires to repeat the questions asked in the executive sessions I shall endeavor to answer them just as I did in the first place, if my memory will permit.

Let me make it perfectly clear that I am not undertaking to speak for the committee. This is not a committee report in any sense of the word. It is a statement of my own individual views. As is natural in such a case, each individual Senator who went on the trip returned with some ideas and opinions that differed from those held by his colleagues. All of us did not see and hear the same things, and there were instances of different constructions being placed upon what we did see and hear. Despite the fact that practically every statement made by any member of the committee is attributed to "the five Senators," there are a number of matters on which we are not in agreement.

I now pass, Mr. President, to the manuscript which I used on October 7.

It may facilitate an understanding of the reports of the members of the committee designated to visit the American war operations overseas to preface the discussion with a brief outline of the route traveled by the committee in the course of its investigation.

Leaving Washington on July 25, we flew via Presque Isle, Maine, to an air base in Newfoundland, and from there we proceeded to another airfield in Labrador.

Mr. McNARY. Mr. President, will not the Senator bring the map to which he is now referring from the corner of the Chamber to the front, so that we all may

understand him better, as we would like to do?

Mr. RUSSELL. I was only prepared to use the map to describe the course of the trip of the committee, and that will occupy only a short time. I shall be happy to have the map moved, however, if the Senator desires, but it is a rather large map.

Mr. McKELLAR. I suggest that it be moved down to the front.

Mr. RUSSELL. Very well.

[The map was moved to the Well of the Senate in front of the desk.]

Mr. RUSSELL. I repeat, leaving Washington on July 25, we flew to Presque Isle, Maine, and from there to a large air base in Newfoundland. From this field in Newfoundland [indicating on map] we proceeded to another large base in Labrador used by planes flying across the Atlantic for delivery to England. From this field in Labrador [indicating] we flew across the awesome ice cap, and peaks and glaciers of Greenland, following the Great Circle route to a field in Iceland [indicating]. From Iceland we went to the United Kingdom, where we spent a number of days, practically half the time with our Eighth Air Force. From a gigantic airport in southwest England we took off at midnight one night for Marrakech, in north Africa [indicating].

We spent more than a week in the north African theater of operations, and visited all the important cities along the Mediterranean, as well as Casablanca on the Atlantic, and all the troop concentrations that are scattered along the entire rim of north Africa, as well as the scene of the fighting there last spring. Leaving Cairo, we traveled across Arabia to Basra and Abadan [indicating] on the Persian Gulf. There, in a climate so hot that the actual temperature recorded by thermometer defies belief, our men are assembling and delivering to the Russians vast quantities of war matériel under lend-lease.

From this theater we proceeded to Karachi, in India [indicating], and thence across India by New Delhi and Assam Province and over the Burma Hump into China, visiting Kunming and Chungking. Coming back out of China we proceeded to Calcutta, and from Calcutta across the Bay of Bengal to Ceylon. From Ceylon we crossed the Indian Ocean to Carnarvon on the west coast of Australia. We were told that ours was the first land plane ever to make this flight across the Indian Ocean. We visited Port Darwin and Townsville, from which place we flew across the Coral Sea to General MacArthur's headquarters in New Guinea. Returning to Australia we landed at Brisbane, from which city, after a visit to Sydney and Melbourne, we took off for New Caledonia. We came home across the Pacific, stopping at Fiji Islands, Samoa, Christmas Island, and Hawaii on our way to Los Angeles, whence we took the last long jump across the entire United States to Washington.

This represents the route taken by the four-motored Liberator transport in which we left Washington. The party did not stay together throughout the en-

tire trip, but went to different places with in each area visited in other planes. The large plane in which we left Washington flew nearly 37,000 miles, and members of the committee traveled several thousand miles in other planes when visiting points where a four-motored plane could not land. About one-eighth of the total time of the trip was consumed in travel through the air. Most of the remaining seven-eighths was spent in an earnest effort to gather information.

Upon my appointment as chairman of the committee I announced that we were in no sense a committee on the conduct of the war, and that I did not consider it within our province to undertake to advise or interfere with Allied military and naval leaders in their direction of the strategy of the war. I did feel that the committee could perform a very useful function for the Senate by securing first-hand information from the various theaters of operations as to the provisions being made for the health and well-being of our troops, as well as finding out what the men were thinking and talking about, the condition of their morale, the suitability of the tools of war being produced at such great effort and expense, and the general effectiveness with which the war is being prosecuted. I also believed that the things heard and observed by such a Senate committee would be helpful in dealing with the questions arising from our relations with the other Allied powers, and in preparing for the many trying and complex issues whose solution must have final approval by the Senate after the war is over.

No one would claim that any person could become conversant with all phases of our far-flung activities in a trip of little more than two months' duration. All that one could hope to do was to get a fair idea of the general atmosphere prevailing in each of the theaters visited. This we endeavored to do by personal contact and observation. We slept in palaces and in pup tents. We ate with those who are directing the destinies of nations, and with enlisted men at their mess. We conferred with high officials of every government visited, as well as with the commanding officers in every theater of operations. We had explanations of strategy, tactics, and objectives, illustrated by maps and in some cases by moving pictures. We talked to wounded men in hospitals who had just been brought in from the front, as well as with men of all ranks belonging to every branch of the service.

We spent days with the Fifth Army as they were undergoing the final phases of intensive training in amphibious operations preparatory to the invasion of Italy, as well as with Commando units and Marines training for jungle fighting in the South Pacific. We saw bomber and fighter squadrons briefed for attack take off in their planes, both from England and in the Pacific theater. We visited men in their barracks, and chatted with them as they relaxed in Red Cross canteens. We attended the moving-picture and the U. S. O. shows, to which the men in the more remote places look forward so avidly.

The men who are actually fighting this war are thinking about post-war problems, as well as things at home and the conduct of the war. I wish that every Member of the Senate could have been with me to share my discomfort during a two-hour grilling by several hundred Servicemen in a Red Cross canteen in New Delhi, which they have named "Duration Den." It would have required not only all the powers of prophecy of the entire Senate, but full and frank replies from the heads of all the Allied powers to answer some of the questions propounded. Any idea that the men are only thinking about the end of the war and getting home would be disabused by a visit to any overseas station.

What I have seen and heard does not make me an expert on all things pertaining to the war, but I have a much clearer picture than I could possibly have gained by zealous attendance on committee hearings for 12 months. Not only is this war the greatest undertaking the American people have ever embarked upon, but even after having visited all the theaters of operations it is difficult to grasp the magnitude of the job to which the power and might of the United States and our allies have been harnessed all around the globe. It was a great experience to see first-hand the difficulties and obstacles which are requiring such a tremendous expenditure of human energy and material resources, and which demand ingenuity, heroism, and a spirit of sacrifice on the part of millions of our boys and girls.

The over-all problem of transportation involved in this war is so great as to stagger the imagination. It taxes to the limit the resources of our Nation and the human endurance of our people engaged in it. The most striking single difficulty is that involved in the effort to supply our forces in China and our Chinese allies. After having been brought thousands of miles by steamship into the harbor of Calcutta, every pound of supplies going to General Chennault's gallant air forces in China must now be loaded or unloaded nine different times, as well as being flown over the towering peaks of the Burma "hump" before they can be utilized against the enemy.

The job of maintenance and repair in this mechanized war is an onerous one. Veritable factories must follow each army. American engineers and mechanics have built great machine shops at various places across the vast reaches of north Africa, on the scorching rim of the Persian Gulf, in Australia, and on the islands of the South Pacific, where planes, tanks, trucks, and ships are either assembled or repaired. I never ceased to marvel at their efficiency. We saw production lines at these remote stations receive airplane engines that seemed to be completely wrecked. A few hours later they emerged wrapped in cellophane, and as precisely tooled and efficient as a new engine coming from a plant in the United States.

One benefit we will derive from the enormous expenditures of this awful war lies in the training of large numbers of the finest craftsmen and mechanics in

the world. Both the Army and the Navy have accomplished wonders in this respect. Boys who 12 months ago were either unemployed or doing work requiring no skill are today repairing the most delicate instruments, such as radar and radio equipment, telephone exchanges, submarine periscopes, and are working with the countless finely balanced machines which are necessary in the operation of airplanes, submarines, and other complicated mechanisms of war.

Every American may well be proud of the manner in which our armed forces have met the problem of maintenance and supply. Our difficulties have been so far solved that our troops are now unquestionably the best fed, best equipped, and best provided armed forces the world has ever seen. In some of the remote areas the ration is not as tasty and varied as one would like, but all of our men have plenty of nourishing food and clothes adapted to the climate in which they serve and fight.

The completeness of the hospital facilities both in the field and at permanent stations, and the speed with which the sick and wounded receive treatment are almost unbelievable. I do not think we failed to visit a hospital at a single place we stopped, and I talked with doctors, nurses, and patients. Men are recovering from wounds in a few weeks in this war which would have proved fatal heretofore, and the use of the sulfa drug, blood plasma, and new methods of treatment are accomplishing miracles. Most of these hospital units moved to the front completely staffed with doctors and nurses from our leading hospitals in the States. The quality of medical treatment received by the sick and wounded in our armed forces is incomparably superior to the average treatment received by the civilian population at home.

All Senators have talked to eyewitnesses who have vividly portrayed some of the difficulties and obstacles with which our fighting men must contend in the course of operations, as well as the indomitable courage and resourcefulness of our boys who are engaged in actual combat. I shall not repeat them. All of us heard sagas of individual heroism and accomplishment which make the stories of the Knights of the Round Table pale in comparison. It was hard to believe that the quiet and modest chap you met in a hospital cheerfully bearing three or four gaping wounds was a hero who had either killed 11 Japs single-handed or had flown through the hell of fire which greeted the men who struck the Floesti oil refineries. I shall never forget the emotions I experienced as I sat with 50 fighter pilots of the Eighth Air Force in England and heard a handsome blond squadron leader about 25 years old instruct his men on a mission across the Channel. He sounded as casual as if he were discussing the proper play to run in a football game. Nor can I forget the fine-looking boy, a veteran of 6 months' jungle fighting at 19, who 12 hours before had received a bullet in his leg while fighting the Japs in the Solomons. It so happened that I knew

his family quite well. He was more interested in talking about conditions in Georgia than in New Georgia. After telling me that he hoped to be back in action within 3 weeks, he wound up by expressing concern about the people back home, saying: "Look after the folks at home, Senator, and we will take care of these Japs out here."

The fighting in Europe is against a determined, well-equipped, and resourceful enemy. It does more or less follow the orthodox conception of war. The war in the Pacific is a battle to the death. Tales of incredible and shocking brutality by the Japanese in the treatment of our men, including the wounded, make it easy to understand why no quarter is now being asked or given. The Jap. had the early advantage of training in jungle fighting. They are patient and cunning. A Japanese sniper will tie himself in a tree and remain there for 3 or 4 days. Another will spend several hours crawling as short a distance as a hundred yards for a shot at an American soldier or marine. They have a great trick of slipping behind our lines and feigning death along a path on which reinforcements must travel and throwing a grenade into a detachment of our men. They had mastered all the arts of camouflage in jungle fighting. The best illustration I can use to describe the jungle fighting in the islands of the South Pacific is to compare it with Indian warfare in early colonial days, with the jungle more fearsome and difficult to penetrate than any primeval forest.

Our men have had to learn jungle fighting the hard way, but they have finally mastered it, and today they are beating the Jap at his own game.

NAVAL OPERATIONS

As a member of the Naval Affairs Committee I undertook to observe as many of the activities of our Navy in the areas visited as possible. I am frank to say that I believe the Navy is doing a disservice to many American heroes by overstressing its policy of remaining the "silent service." Sailors handled every one of the landing barges which took the troops and Marines ashore in the South Pacific, as they did in north Africa, in Sicily, and in Italy. They kept the noses of their ships, which are easy targets for bomb and shell, against the sands of the beaches until the last soldier and the last piece of equipment was ashore. Ofttimes the guns of destroyers and cruisers blazed the path for our infantry and tanks. Due to the constant vigilance required to fend off attacks by airplanes and submarines, the men manning these ships often do not get more than 2 or 3 hours' sleep a day for as long as a week. In Sicily one of our light cruisers broke up a tank attack by a regiment of the Hermann Goering Division just before it was apparently about to result in disaster to one of our divisions which had not had time to set up its heavy defense equipment. In my judgment the American people are entitled to know more about what the Navy has been doing in order that they may properly appreciate the sacrifices of

the men who go down to the sea in ships.

It is inspiring to observe that in both the Army and the Navy morale seems to be higher where the hazard is greatest. This is particularly true of the men who man our "pigboats," or submarines. I had an opportunity to talk to the officers and men of many of our underwater craft who are carrying the war to the very shores of Japan. I asked a lad who was a member of the crew of a submarine in drydock at Pearl Harbor, where a huge dent caused by a depth charge was being ironed out, whether he would prefer service on a surface ship. His reply was, "Hell, no. It's safer down there than up above when those airplanes come in with their torpedoes and bombs."

CHINA'S DIFFICULTIES

Due to the great importance of China to the Allied cause, I regretted that our visit there was not long enough to enable us to have time to go more fully into the details of the situation there. We did, however, have ample opportunity to confer with Generals Stilwell and Chennault and to visit with the generalissimo and the leading figures of his government at Chungking.

Some of the conditions noted in China were most disturbing. Such industries as the country possessed were largely in the area occupied by the Japanese. The country has been in an exhausting war for a number of years, and they have suffered great losses. Chinese troops are poorly equipped, and in their present state of affairs are confined to defensive and guerrilla action. To apply the word "army" to the forces of China is not to use that word in the sense usually understood when referring to the armed forces of other leading Allied Powers. Their form of government lacks many of the elements of a democracy, as the term is generally accepted in our country. The generalissimo, Chiang Kai-shek, is a great patriot. In him rests China's last best hope of salvation as a free and unified democratic state. If any one man in China can accomplish this, he will do it. He is confronted with great difficulties, the details of which I shall not relate.

Notwithstanding all his handicaps, the generalissimo refuses even to discuss peace overtures with the Japs, and the fact that China is still in the war as our ally requires the attention of 15 or more Japanese divisions.

In my opinion, General Chennault is one of the most brilliant soldiers this war has produced. With an incredibly small number of effective airplanes, he is contributing greatly to keeping China a factor in the war. Certainly no man has ever done more with so little. Considering the limitations upon him, General Stilwell is also rendering a great service to his country and the Allied cause.

It is requiring a superhuman effort to furnish General Chennault's air forces, but the maintenance of air bases in China is of such importance that we should attack the problem of supplying him with redoubled vigor.

On account of her proximity to Japan and her knowledge of the Japanese people, China has the most effective intelligence service on Japanese activities of any of the Allied Powers.

We received information from the most reliable sources in China to the effect that we were still continuing to underestimate the strength of Japan, particularly in the field of production. We were advised that instead of the 500 planes generally estimated here, the Japs were making more than a thousand planes a month, and were producing twice as much shipping as they were before Pearl Harbor. This may be the answer to the amazement of our commanding officers in the South Pacific as to where the Japs get the planes to replace the large numbers that are shot down so rapidly there.

In addition to the ocean shipping, the Japanese are manufacturing large numbers of lightweight shallow-draft wooden ships powered by Diesel engines. They are using them for interisland transportation, and in some cases over considerable distances. Much timber is being taken from occupied China for the purpose of constructing these ships, and we were also told that they had even used some of the trees from the Emperor's sacred forest in Japan for this construction. I asked some of our submarine commanders about this, and they confirmed the reports that we had received in China. These ships constitute quite a problem to our submarines. Ofttimes submarine commanders do not feel justified in expending a long way from home priceless torpedoes in sinking such small craft. They surface, and sink them with gunfire. Practically all of these wooden ships are armed, and we have undoubtedly sustained some losses of submarines in these actions.

One unit of the Chinese Army is fully trained and equipped. Our transport planes which are flying equipment in to General Chennault returned with cargoes of Chinese soldiers. Many thousands of these men who could not be armed and equipped in China have been flown out to a point where equipment could be provided, and are now fully armed, completely furnished with motorized transport, and have been thoroughly trained in all of the latest methods of warfare. Our officers are confident that they are first-class fighting men and will give a good account of themselves when they come to grips with the enemy.

LEAVE AFTER LONG SERVICE OVERSEAS

The first question asked by every enlisted man and junior officer who has been overseas any considerable length of time is, "When are we going to get some leave to go home?" All of the veterans realize the value of the experience they have acquired in actual combat, and practically none of them expect to be released from service until the job is done, but there is an overwhelming feeling on the part of those who have been overseas for many long months that arrangements should be made to give them a respite from their trials and dangers, and a chance to see their families.

Every member of the committee is agreed that the War Department should immediately adopt some policy of returning troops home for a leave or rest after certain services have been performed. This has worked well in the case of the crews of our airplanes, who are allowed a fixed period of rest after a certain number of sorties, which varies in different theaters of operations. I believe it would be a great incentive to the men and would still further reinforce the fine morale that is now displayed if all of them had definite prospect of a visit home after the performance of a certain task or period of service for which they are assigned. For obvious reasons this is a difficult matter on which to legislate, but the committee has made strong recommendations to the War Department and the Navy Department that a fair policy of leaves be promulgated.

The one bright spot in many of the isolated places where our men are serving has been the American Red Cross and the U. S. O. troupes. There is no way to compute what these touches of home life have meant to boys who are working and fighting under almost impossible conditions. The girls in the Red Cross canteens have been worth their weight in gold, and the resourcefulness they have displayed in all conceivable circumstances has been amazing. We met several of the U. S. O. troupes. Some of them were tired and worn, but they were still carrying on, and I am sure that none of them have ever played to more appreciative audiences. A report to the headquarters of our forces in the Middle East on the trials of a group of these entertainers whose stage was the burning sands of the deserts enabled us to have a better appreciation of what these stage people are doing. The report read:

Attitude of troupe so far is very good. Tonight will play Basra and depart for Khorramshahr tomorrow. Accordion now useless as heat melted wax.

Men who live close to death think on the spiritual side of life. We attended church services at several places, and were much impressed by the manner in which the chaplains are carrying out their multifold duties. We likewise visited several cemeteries where rest those heroes who have made the supreme sacrifice. Even in the haste and confusion of war our honored dead have not been neglected. Those who have loved ones or friends who have fallen in battle would be comforted if they could see the well-kept cemeteries where they sleep, and the solicitude of the chaplains in charge to have every grave properly marked amidst surroundings of appropriate dignity.

SEABEES AND ENGINEERS

Any account of our observations without a word of praise to the Navy Seabees and the Army Engineers would be incomplete as well as unjust to some of the heroes of this war. From the frozen lava beds of Iceland to the blistering sands of the deserts, these men work as high as 20 hours some days constructing facilities that are essential to modern war. When the history of this war is

written, their unselfish sacrifices and tireless labor should adorn one of its brightest pages. To date they have received far too little credit.

EXPECTATIONS OF RELIEF

I was very much concerned to note that for some reason many of the most recent of our allies and our late enemies have great expectations as to what they are to receive from the United States in the way of relief and rehabilitation. It is very unfortunate that their expectations are so high. The widespread idea that we are preparing to look after all of the needs of the world and to restore the destruction wrought by this war has caused me seriously to question the wisdom of delegating to a civilian agency the responsibility of handling relief and rehabilitation abroad. The establishment of a large civilian agency with widespread activities is likely either to generate unnecessary bitterness by failing to fulfill hopes that are excessive or else prove to be a more expensive undertaking than the American people should be compelled to finance. I believe it would be much better for all concerned if the people of north Africa and Italy, particularly, were frankly given to understand now that, while willing to assist to a reasonable extent, we do not consider it the responsibility of the United States to rebuild destroyed cities or embark upon any long-time program of relief.

Mr. BREWSTER. Mr. President, does the Senator desire to yield at all?

Mr. RUSSELL. I have no objection to yielding. I was endeavoring to present the statement.

Mr. BREWSTER. At that point would not the Senator also confirm that some of the most responsible men we saw, from some of the other countries, felt that was very wise?

Mr. RUSSELL. One man who occupies a very responsible position with a nation, a man who should be familiar with the circumstances in that area, confirmed my ideas about that, and told the entire group that he thought it would be much better to put it on a temporary basis.

Mr. BREWSTER. And that within 3 or 4 months they would be able to get on a self-sustaining basis.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Mr. BREWSTER. And not become mendicants of this country.

Mr. RUSSELL. That is correct.

Let them know that in the last analysis they will be compelled to work out their own destiny and restore the destruction of war by their own efforts.

Such necessary relief can be handled by the Army, even if a unit has to be established for that purpose. The Army can supply rations in the areas that have suffered most severely, and thereby prevent actual starvation. In no case should relief or rehabilitation assume such proportions that the recipients will have reason to expect or depend on American bounty for any long period of time. I hope that I do not sound callous when I say that in my opinion this relief should be on a tem-

porary basis, and so far as adults are concerned should be confined to the very minimum, a sufficiency for a short period to maintain life, but kept so small that it will not stifle a desire to supplement the ration received from us through other efforts. We should be very careful not to publicize or embark upon a policy which will either lead to greater misunderstanding or result in stupendous charges against the Treasury that our people should not be called upon to meet.

OUR BRITISH ALLIES

Wherever we went we were most courteously received by the officials of the British Empire. I was much impressed by their frankness in discussing not only the conduct of the war but post-war problems. The people of England have made great sacrifices in this war and have displayed a fortitude, in the face of constant danger, which we might well emulate. Many of their cities have been heavily bombed. The food in England was poorer than in any other place we visited. All clothing is strictly rationed. Civilians have practically no gasoline and are converting their cars and trucks to charcoal burners.

The British people have hospitably received the American soldiers who are stationed in their midst. From a military standpoint, they have displayed every quality that one could ask in an ally. The British Tommy is a first-class soldier. Wherever I had an opportunity to visit with our Navy both enlisted men and officers spoke in glowing terms of the skill and seamanship and the courage of the British tar. The Royal Navy is still living up to its finest traditions. The heroic exploits of the Royal Air Force already belong to the legends of this war. As fighting men they are good partners to have in a scrap.

We had some opportunity to observe the operation of the British Government not only at home but throughout the Empire. I came home with a healthy respect bordering on envy for the efficiency of the British in administration, and in the handling of their relations with other nations, and in their own vast dominion. The British have a definite foreign policy with respect to every corner of the globe. Every civil servant and every officer of any rank is apparently fully acquainted with Empire policy as it applies either militarily, diplomatically, or commercially. Every action of the responsible officials of government is designed to promote that policy.

If our Nation has a definite policy which extends longer than 6 months after the conclusion of the war in any of the far-flung lands in which American troops are fighting and American dollars are being spent, I was unable to find anyone among our officers abroad who could define it.

We cannot afford to rely upon even so splendid an ally as the United Kingdom to protect all our interests, or there will be inevitable conflict and confusion after the war. Our civil agencies abroad are numerous, but too often they are either

working in cross purposes or, worse to relate, in some cases have no apparent purpose. Our post-war interests are being neglected, and we stand to get very little or no return from our immense expenditures.

In places our representation abroad was apparently weak. Too many of our representatives still appear to rely upon ancient protocol and the easy ways and flowery terms which have been in vogue in the past. This is a day of realism, as might be expected when great peoples are fighting for their very lives. Realists are directing this war in the field as well as in places of power, not only in enemy lands but among our allies. We would do well to assume a more realistic attitude. In my opinion all of our civilian agencies operating outside the United States should be coordinated in the hands of some two-fisted American who has an understanding of American interests in all international matters. The old type of kid-glove diplomacy, including high-flown but vague phraseology, does not have any place in today's international dealings. Everyone can understand men like Admiral Standley, who bluntly speak their minds; and whatever may have been his other qualifications I believe that representatives of his type will create more respect and genuine good will for the United States throughout the world than many of the men and most of the methods we are now employing.

We should keep closer check on the expensive tools of war that we are dealing out on such a gigantic scale under lend-lease arrangements. In the Mediterranean area and the Middle East our British allies have stressed the fact that they have given large quantities of war supplies to Turkey as very effective propaganda to gain the good will of the 250,000,000 Mohammedans of the world. Much of this military equipment transferred by England to Turkey is American-made and American-financed equipment, and was transferred to England under lend-lease. Every sensible person realizes that we will not be paid in full for all of the material of war which we have advanced to our allies under lend-lease. No one really expects it. In my judgment, it is a very poor policy to permit lend-lease equipment, paid for by the people of the United States, to be used to buy good will even for our closest friend when good will is such an important commodity. If it is good business for England to get credit with Turkey and the friends of Turkey for helping that nation in time of danger, it would seem to me to be worth something to the United States.

In like manner some of the equipment which is included in the British transfers to Russia is American-made or American-bought. American food handled on a lend-lease basis has likewise been used by the British Food Commission to feed refugees and other hungry peoples of the earth, and I doubt that the recipient is always aware of the fact that the United States was the true benefactor.

I would be the last to do or say anything which would cause any breach between our country and our British allies. I believe that the future peace of the world largely depends upon a complete understanding between us. However, matters of this kind can surely be adjusted without disturbing good relations. No people are perfect, including our own; and I feel that there will be a better understanding and more mutual respect between us and less possibility of feeling which might prevent or postpone a complete accord after the war if such matters are worked out as we go along.

One source of irritation to our men who are serving in that large portion of the world which is under the aegis of that great news agency, Reuter's, is the paucity of news as to the American war effort. After having traveled for practically a month in that area I can understand how they feel. On some days it would have been difficult from reading the papers to know that the United States was participating in the war at all. National pride, of course, colors our own news, and we are not slow to boast about the accomplishments of our armed forces.

However, it seems to me that, on the whole, our press has been much fairer with our allies in reporting the war than they have been with us. I could give many illustrations, but this excerpt from a leading paper in Australia illustrates what I am talking about. The article was written on the day that Italy surrendered. Despite the kindness with which our troops have been received in Australia, it is disturbing to an American soldier there to read:

There is great joy in Britain that Italy's downfall should so largely be a British Empire affair. Empire forces were responsible for 90 percent of the battles from the first battle in East Africa right to the final landing on the Italian mainland.

THE INDIA-BURMA THEATER

All in all, the morale of our troops in India appeared to be lower than in any other theater. India is in many respects a very depressing place for troops to be stationed. This great country of 350,000,000 souls is a land of contrasts, of great wealth of the few and indescribable poverty and filth of the many. A great famine is sweeping some of the provinces, causing unspeakable suffering and many deaths from starvation. Any investigation of the complex problem posed by the conflicts between castes and creeds, Indian Nationalists and British Government, ancient ingrained habit and today's civilization, was not within the scope of our duties. The days that I spent in India, however, did confirm me in the belief that it would require unremitting investigation over many years to even faintly understand the so-called Indian problem, and that those who have never been there, but have a 5-minute solution, are extremely foolhardy. There was much comment on the part of our troops on the very apparent lethargy of the British war effort in that area. This lethargy has undoubtedly

affected morale. I have no knowledge of what should be implied from the appointment of Lord Mountbatten to command the large forces assembled in this theater, but I have reason to hope that it means that the period of inactivity is about to be ended. I met Lord Mountbatten in London. Any opinion formed on such a brief meeting may easily be erroneous, but I am strongly impressed that Mountbatten is not the type of man who will permit the Japs to continue to occupy Burma and to strengthen their hold on Malaya and the Indies, without annoyance. He struck me as being a man of action, who will not be content with a moribund strategy of defense.

PETROLEUM

This war of mechanized transport, involving millions of vehicles from huge ocean liners to the innumerable jeeps which have become so indispensable, is consuming petroleum products in staggering amounts. Up to now we have been depleting our petroleum stocks at a ruinous rate, supplying not only our own forces but those of our allies. It is high time to utilize the petroleum deposits of other parts of the world. Otherwise, the end of the war will find our own deposits practically exhausted.

The President's statement this week that plans are being made to accomplish this is highly gratifying. There may have been sound reasons heretofore for not more widely employing the huge deposits of the Persian Gulf. These reasons were based upon difficulties of transportation. With the opening of the Mediterranean and the great increase in construction of shipping, there is no longer any valid reason for not giving our oil deposits a rest, and tapping those of other areas.

At one time we were shipping high octane gasoline to Russia, which has great petroleum reserves, but lacked refineries. Refineries have now been supplied Russia. We should no longer be compelled to draw on our dwindling petroleum reserves for use in most of the foreign theaters of operation.

POST-WAR AIR RIGHTS

All of us are concerned about American rights in air bases and air facilities which have been constructed at our expense all over the world. There should be no delay in having some definite understanding and agreement as to the post-war rights of our commercial aviation. Certainly we occupy a better position to negotiate such understandings now than we will after the war is over. We cannot expect to have sovereignty over all bases that we have constructed for military purposes, but we should be able to assure to American enterprise an equal chance with others in these bases we have paid for, and the right to operate in all parts of the world.

Air power is the decisive factor in this war. With the great developments being made daily in aviation, the peace of the world and the outcome of any future wars will depend directly upon air power. Planes must have bases from which to operate. We should begin now to plan for the post-war period, both to assure

the future defense of the United States and to assist in maintaining world peace on a basis of justice and equality.

Many of our close offshore bases are built on lands under foreign flags. I have never been satisfied with the 99-year lease given the United States in the destroyer deal negotiated by this country before we entered the war. This is not any 99-year country! Where would we be today if Jefferson had handled the Louisiana Purchase on any such basis, or if our rights in Florida, or if even the Alaska Purchase, had been subjected to any such limitation? If we can be trusted for 99 years to occupy and develop defenses on the lands belonging to our allies, but essential to our defense, there is no reason why future generations, who will still be paying for this war, should be denied the protection these bases afford.

Time can bring remarkable changes. War will move much faster in the future than it has even in this day of blitz. With the tide of lend-lease running high from our shores, future generations of Americans should not be subjected to the danger of having these bases, built and maintained by Americans, used against them 100 years from now. It should be possible to work out some arrangements which will give us permanently such protection as these bases may afford.

There are many other important spots on the globe which have been fortified and developed with American money and sweat, which will become increasingly important to the defense of the United States with the rapid improvement of air and sea transportation. The smaller the world becomes, the closer are these bases to our shores.

I invite the attention of the Senate to the importance of some arrangement with the Government of Iceland in the post-war period which will permit us to use the very expensive facilities we have constructed on that island. A glance at the map will show that heavy bombers and submarines based on Iceland can close all of the shipping lanes of the north Atlantic. In any future war, control of Iceland means control of the north Atlantic Ocean.

We are now in Iceland at the invitation of the Icelandic Government issued before Pearl Harbor. Our British allies, appreciating the significance and importance of Iceland, had moved in some time before. It was a very fortunate thing that they did, because if Germany had beaten the British to Iceland it could have prolonged this war by years, and undoubtedly would have enormously increased the losses of the Allied Nations. Iceland, with 120,000 people, occupying an area of 40,000 square miles, manifestly cannot defend itself against aggression. A strong enemy in Iceland would ever be a great menace to the security of the United States. We should endeavor to protect the millions of dollars and the tremendous effort that we have spent to secure our northern flank and sea lanes in this war by building fields and bases in Iceland. If in the future we should have another war it would cost the lives of

many American boys and the expenditure of even greater sums to restore our present position.

Dakar, on the West Coast of Africa, occupies the same position in relation to the South Atlantic that Iceland does to the North Atlantic. As a matter of self-defense we should see to it either that we have some rights in Dakar or that it does not fall into unfriendly hands, or is not committed to the custody of those who are unable to defend this vital base which can dominate the South Atlantic and threaten all South America.

In the Pacific our boys are already fighting and dying over and around the islands that were mandated to Japan after the last World War. Much more precious blood will be shed before the Japs are finally rooted out. Certainly as a result of the sacrifices of these men, and to prevent the further killing of the boys of the second or third generation moving back into these islands in some future war, we should have some definite policy with respect to the future status of these islands that will assure the defense of the United States, as well as contribute to the peace of the world. We have rights in these islands that are being purchased today with the blood of American boys.

I spent several days on the island of New Caledonia, one of the westernmost of the Pacific islands. This is a French possession. In order to assure an open sea route to Australia and the bases of operations against the Japs in the islands of the Pacific, we have spent many million dollars fortifying this island. It has a fine, natural, land-locked harbor. We have built wharves and docks, seaplane bases, airfields, and roads, barracks, and hospitals, and placed heavy defense artillery to beat off the strongest Japanese attack. We have in operation at our bases there some of the finest repair and machine shops that I saw anywhere in the world. In brief, New Caledonia has been transformed by American dollars and American sweat and sacrifice into an all but impregnable fortress. So long as it is in friendly hands and we have any considerable naval and air power, no enemy from the west can with safety attack either North or South America without first reducing it.

In the past we have heard a great deal about the fortification of Guam. I do not know what future plans or program for the fortification of Guam the American Congress will be compelled to pass upon; but I believe that if we could obtain rights in New Caledonia and utilize the fortifications and facilities already existing, it would save much of the expense of fortifying Guam. It seems to me that negotiations should be entered into at the earliest possible date looking to the acquisition, by fair and just arrangements, either of title to all of New Caledonia or perpetual rights in and to the bases and facilities we have constructed. I know that there are those who will hurl the charge of imperialism at such suggestions and claim that they are in derogation to the terms of the Atlantic Charter. I do not think that there is anything imperialistic about it.

Call it what you will, it is a realistic step to prevent another generation of Americans, who will undoubtedly still be paying for the present war, from being compelled to pay again in blood and treasure in taking these islands back from the same enemy who may obtain them if we follow the policy of take and abandon after this war is over.

American boys will soon be dying to free the soil of France from a foreign invader. We are now equipping many French divisions in north Africa with American arms in order that they may join in the fight for the liberation of France. We are supplying the French people in north Africa with petroleum, clothing, and many other articles through lend-lease. When the motherland of France is freed from the German invader we will undoubtedly spend huge sums for relief and rehabilitation in France. It is not too much to ask that for the sake of the future defense of America we be given some rights in an island which means nothing to the defense of France but may be vital to our own defense.

OVERCONFIDENCE A GREAT DANGER

Nothing that I saw in the course of my travels would justify any confidence that the war is nearly over. Indeed, I believe that overoptimism is one of the enemies which the American people must constantly fight, day and night. The German Army, though extended to the limit, is still a most formidable military organization. Their first-line troops are still the equal of any in skill and fanatical bravery.

While in north Africa we were told of an incident in Sicily involving a company of German parachute troops who were posted in an olive grove with orders to delay at any cost the American advance for 12 hours. When the grove was finally stormed and captured, over 200 of the 250 men stationed there were dead, and the remainder, with 4 or 5 exceptions, were wounded. One of the unwounded leaped at his American captor and bit him entirely through the hand. The Germans are giving ground in Russia and in Italy, but discipline is still strong, and their retreats are still orderly. They are falling back to ever stronger defenses, and it is always well to bear in mind that up to the time of the armistice in 1918 the German Army was carrying out orders and was still a strong and organized fighting force.

Any hope for an early defeat of Germany must depend upon the collapse of the Army due to shortage of fighting equipment, or to a break-down of civilian morale and revolution within. They are taking a terrific pounding by day and by night from our gallant airmen and the R. A. F. We will soon be in a position to increase substantially the bombing of Germany from bases in Italy as well as from England, and the number of German factories destroyed and families driven from their homes will greatly increase.

But all of this is not done without losses to us. The Germans have turned from the production of bombers to fighter

planes in the effort to stop the destruction of their homeland from the air. They are devising new methods such as the rocket guns and small parachute bombs dropped from the air in the effort to destroy our air forces. While our military authorities say the price we are paying is not excessive in comparison with the destruction our air forces are causing, we must frankly face the fact that the increasing tempo of bombing likewise brings about increasingly severe losses of our own in men and equipment.

In the Pacific we have only whipped the Japanese in the outposts of their ill-gotten empire. The bulk of their Army and the major units of their Navy have not yet been brought into action. We have a long, hard, bloody job before us, and I fear that the sacrifices, shocks, and losses we must yet endure are much greater than the average American citizen anticipates.

In summation of my observations, I would say:

First. American production has justified our proudest boasts by turning out tools of war of high quality in huge quantities. The men in the field are satisfied with the weapons issued them. We are making great strides in assembling the facilities of transportation necessary to fight a war on every continent and every sea of the globe. This stupendous effort constitutes a great drain upon our natural resources. We should pay more attention to the utilization of raw materials of other lands, lest the end of the war find those resources virtually untapped and our own exhausted. We should be more careful in the distribution of the products of American industry financed by American taxpayers.

Second. Our lack of a post-war policy and stronger representation abroad in some key positions is likely to cost us dearly in the post-war period. All agencies having to do with any phase of the war effort abroad should be coordinated.

Third. We must constantly combat any tendency to underestimate our enemies or to delude ourselves with optimism. The slightest relaxation in the national war effort at home will be paid in the blood of American boys fighting overseas.

Fourth. The American Army, Navy, and Marine Corps are well fed, well equipped, and every reasonable provision has been made for their health, comfort, and welfare. No armed force in history has ever been so well supplied. Command and staff work have been of the highest caliber. Our leaders have to date accomplished all that the American people could have reasonably expected of them.

Fifth. The general conduct of our troops in action has been good. Their discipline is satisfactory and they are daily becoming more efficient in the grim business of war. Combat experience is forging our Army, Navy, and Marine Corps into the toughest and most efficient fighting machine the world has ever seen. No one who has ever had any contact with troops would contend that every man is a fearless hero, who craves contact with the enemy, but as organiza-

tions our men have displayed courage and a willingness to fight and sacrifice which measures up to or surpasses the finest traditions of our armed services. The number of individuals who have performed remarkable feats of heroism, requiring resourcefulness and great personal bravery, is unusually high. The men in uniform have made up their minds to see this thing through to victory, whatever it may take. If our civilian population gives them unstinted support, they will win the total victory over our enemies perhaps sooner than we have any right to expect.

Mr. President, what I have said is the record, as complete as I can make it, of my remarks in the executive session of the Senate on October 7. It has not been altered materially in either form or substance. I tried to be factual, and to speak as objectively as possible.

We are told that what was said here has caused a great deal of bitterness and resentment in the United Kingdom. If this be true as to my own case, my high opinion of the British people would cause me to believe that the accounts they received must have been distorted even worse than by our own press. Not a word of my statement was intended as an attack on Great Britain. If any official of the British Empire, or if the British press or people, be offended, it is regrettable, for no offense is intended. But I would not have this statement construed anywhere as an apology for my position. If offense be found, I must say in all candor that our British allies have become unduly sensitive if an American citizen and Senator cannot discuss the operations and policies of his own government, of which I am a part, without raising a storm of furor and resentment throughout the United Kingdom and the Empire.

My admiration for the British people is almost extravagant, but it must be remembered that I think and speak as a citizen and a Senator of the United States. What I saw was through American eyes. I observed, weighed, and reported as an American who properly holds the future welfare of these United States above any other consideration. I would regret if any word of mine should cause dissension or ill feeling between the United States and any of our allies, but if that word be necessary to protect a legitimate vital interest, either during this war or in the post-war world, I would still feel duty-bound to speak.

The chain which binds the United Nations together is frail indeed if there are links which cannot stand the strain of expression of opinion made in good faith in the parliamentary bodies of a democracy. There are a few who have expressed the opinion that it is sheer impertinence for a Member of the American Congress to discuss our relations with the British or the part being played by them in the war. Such people would do well to observe the fine restraint and poise shown by the American people when officials of the British Empire tell us what is expected of us, and adopt it as a model of future behavior. Only a

few days ago that pillar of empire and great world figure, General Smuts, in a speech which was widely publicized throughout the world as an expression of official British opinion, told the people of the United States very frankly that we were expected to furnish in large measure the men who will make the bloody assault to breach Hitler's fortress of Europe. Few Americans failed to grasp all the implications of General Smuts' statement. The lives of American boys are infinitely more precious to us than all the material which will ever be handled under lend-lease. Nevertheless, General Smuts' statement did not evoke any great public resentment and outcry in the United States. The President did not send a message to Congress commenting with thinly veiled sarcasm on advice from abroad. I have not seen in the American press caricatures of General Smuts, ridiculing him for making a public statement as to what he considered the obligation of America in the performance of its duty to the common effort. I have not heard of any Member of Congress becoming unduly excited.

Every patriotic American expects our country to do its full part in this war, but I do not believe that doing our part requires us so to keep our light under a bushel that, where permitted to think, we are expected to speak in whispers of the contribution of our own country to the cause of Allied victory.

I therefore am not greatly disturbed by that portion of the American press or officialdom which sees ghosts every time any person in American public life has the temerity to suggest that it is proper for our allies to appreciate the extent of our efforts and sacrifices in this war as we appreciate their efforts and sacrifices. We have come to a pretty pass if a citizen of the United States cannot support with wholehearted devotion the cause of his own country without subjecting himself to the charge that he is anti-British or anti-Russian.

Recently a man who has spent his life in the service of the United States was pilloried in some quarters because he publicly stated that the people of Russia were not fully aware of the assistance given them by this country. Russian Armies and Russian people have won the undying gratitude of the American people for the heroism and spirit of sacrifice with which they have met the onslaught of the brutal hordes of Nazi Germany. Too much praise cannot be given their heroism, and with rare exceptions that praise has been spread with lavish hand in every public forum in the United States and through press and pulpit. It does not detract one jot or tittle from the valor of the Russian Armies or the sacrifices of the Russian people to mention in public the fact that the United States, and, for that matter, Great Britain, as well, have made a stupendous effort to furnish equipment to those armies, and that the equipment given must have contributed in some measure to the victories won.

The American people have before them each day the achievements of the Russian Armies. The Russian Government has not hesitated to complain fre-

quently and publicly of our failure to open a second front when and where Russia wants it instead of when and where our own military experts think advisable. The American people have expressed no resentment of this criticism, and it is inexplicable to me that a suggestion that the masses of the Russian people should have knowledge of our efforts to aid them is likely to cause disunity between comrades in a fight involving the fate and freedom of both the people of the United States and of Russia.

I yield to no one in the fervor of my desire for the closest unity between the Allied Nations to achieve the victory over our common enemies. I am as anxious as any man for the United States to cooperate with Russia, England, China, and the other Allied Powers in maintaining peace in the years to follow that victory. I believe any lasting world peace must have as its keystone a complete understanding between the United States and the British Empire. But, Mr. President, this cooperation and understanding cannot be had except upon a basis of equality and frank and fair dealings. If such matters as I have touched upon in this report cannot be publicly discussed by a Senator of the United States even in time of war, it certainly does not augur well for the harmonious relations the American people so earnestly desire in the post-war period, because victory over our enemies will far from settle all world problems.

For my own part, I have too great a faith in the common sense and inherent fairness of the average citizen of all the United Nations, wherever he may live, to believe that harm can result from fully publicizing the true facts as to the contribution of every nation engaged in this great common enterprise, whether it be military operations on land and sea or in the operations of lend-lease, either direct or reverse. Frank discussion will always dissipate the clouds of suspicion. It will promote a better understanding between all the Allied Nations in the trying days ahead of us after the victory is won. It will pave the way for the necessary sense of appreciation of sacrifices in a common cause which begets good will between peoples. On such good will and understanding any permanent peace for this stricken world must depend.

COLLABORATION FOR POST-WAR PEACE

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 192) declaratory of war and peace aims of the United States.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. DANAHY] to insert after line 9 a new section.

Mr. CAPPER. Mr. President, I intend to support the committee measure, Senate Resolution 192, largely because I believe the third paragraph of the resolution goes as far as the Senate should go at this time toward commitments by the United States as to what foreign policies it shall pursue in a post-war world of which we do not, and cannot, see the pattern at this time.

I cannot support the amendment offered by the Senator from Florida [Mr. PEPPER] on behalf of himself and other Senators, which has been so ably espoused by himself, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], and the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BURTON]. My reason for opposing the substitute I shall state later in these brief remarks.

Mr. President, there is no doubt in my mind, nor, I believe, in yours, that 90 percent of all the peoples in all the nations of the world want peace, an enduring and, if possible, a perpetual peace, when this cruel war is over. We and they are willing to make considerable sacrifices in the hope of attaining that goal. From a reading of history, I think that has been true in every major world conflict. Always there has been held out to the people by their leaders that once the war is won, the leaders will so arrange the world that there will be no more wars. The "war to end war" has been a very potent slogan. I, myself, would like to believe that is the kind of war we are fighting today.

This high ambition, this most laudable ideal, inspired Woodrow Wilson's League of Nations in 1919, though its high purpose was somewhat warped by those who wrote the Treaty of Versailles.

There are those who believe that if the United States Senate had approved the League covenant following World War No. 1, and guaranteed the boundary lines therein established, there would not have been a World War No. 2. I shall not go into that argument. Those who make it follow a very simple line of reasoning. The Senate did not ratify the League covenant. We are in the midst of World War No. 2. Whether these two incontrovertible facts prove that if the Senate had approved the League covenant we would not have had World War No. 2 I leave for others to argue, and to reach their own decisions.

At any rate, it is up to the United States—and I would stress that it also is up to the British Government, and to Premier Josef Stalin of the Soviet Union, and General Chiang Kai-shek of China—to work out some basis for a program for the post-war world which will at least minimize the chances for another world war in the near future.

The pending resolution realizes, accepts, and would implement by action, that we, and other nations of the world, particularly the leading nations of the world, must cooperate and organize for peace, for a just peace, and the maintenance of that peace to the maximum degree possible.

The pending resolution also realizes, and accepts and proclaims to the world as well as to our own people, that such post-war cooperation should and will have to be brought about without impairing the essential independence and sovereignty of our own United States of America. It is neither desirable nor necessary, thank God, that the United States become a dominion in a super-state or a satellite nation to some other nation or group of nations, in order to obtain cooperation, collaboration, or participation in the interest of world peace.