



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 78th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Declaratory of War and Peace Aims of the United States

REMARKS

OF

HON. TOM CONNALLY

OF TEXAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

*Monday, October 25, through Friday,
November 5, 1943*

Monday, October 25, 1943

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, the Committee on Foreign Relations has recommended to the Senate the passage of the following 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 honorable peace.

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.

Though brief in its words, it is the result of many weeks of the most careful and deliberate consideration of a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations and of the full committee. The subcommittee consisted of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], the Senator from Utah [Mr. THOMAS], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. BARKLEY], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. GILLETTE], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. VANDENBERG], the Senator from Maine [Mr.

WHITE], and the Senator from Texas [Mr. CONNALLY], chairman. I desire to express my deep personal gratitude to members of the subcommittee for their patience, for their industry, and for the able manner in which they performed their duty as members of the subcommittee.

Before the committee for its consideration were resolutions as follows:

1. Senate Resolution 22, by Mr. WILEY: Inviting the President to join with the Senate in creation of a Foreign Relations Advisory Council.

2. Senate Resolution 76, by Mr. PEPPER: Authorizing the appointment of a subcommittee of the Committee on Foreign Relations to be known as the Committee on Reoccupation and Reconstruction.

3. Senate Resolution 91, by Mr. GILLETTE: Approving the basic principles of the Atlantic Charter.

4. Senate Resolution 99, by Mr. THOMAS of Utah: Favoring the calling of a conference to formulate a program of international economic cooperation.

5. Senate Resolution 114, by Mr. BALL, Mr. HILL, Mr. BURTON, and Mr. HATCH: Favoring organization of the United Nations to maintain peace.

6. Senate Concurrent Resolution 10, by Mr. KILGORE: Requesting the President to invite foreign governments to participate in an international constitutional convention to draft a constitution providing for an international government.

7. Senate Resolution 135, by Mr. PEPPER: Relating to membership of the United States in the United Nations in order to implement the Atlantic Charter.

8. Senate Joint Resolution 56, by Mr. THOMAS of Utah: Relating to the participation of the United States in the establishment of a just and lasting peace.

9. Senate Joint Resolution 60, by Mr. LA FOLLETTE: Establishing a committee to provide for the formation of a Pan-American Legislative Union.

10. Senate Concurrent Resolution 16, by Mr. VANDENBERG and Mr. WHITE: Relating to America's post-war plan.

11. House Concurrent Resolution 25, by Mr. FULBRIGHT: Declaring the sense of the Congress with respect to participation by the United States in prevention of future aggression and the maintenance of peace.

12. Joint Resolution 84, by Mr. WILSON: Requesting the President to invite friendly nations to enter upon consultations with delegates of the United States with a view to the promotion of permanent international peace.

These various resolutions presented many approaches to the outstanding objective of world peace. The Committee on Foreign Relations, after long and careful study, concluded that the pending resolution most nearly interprets the sentiments of the people of the United States and that of the United States Senate than any other proposal submitted. It therefore recommends that the Senate pass the resolution without amendment or modification.

The ideal of international peace has long attracted the dreams and efforts of statesmen and thinkers. It has thrilled the imagination of men for more than a century. A great French scholar, Abbé

de Saint-Pierre (1713) proposed a plan for universal peace. The great German philosopher, Immanuel Kant (1795) advanced a plan for the same objective. The distinguished Englishman, Jeremy Bentham (1786-89) proposed his conception of a workable plan for international peace. None of these proposals met with any concrete adoption. They did, however, leave an impress on the intellect and thought of public men and scholars through succeeding generations. The League to Enforce Peace sponsored by ex-President Taft was another example. There were others.

The attainment of international peace is the logical culmination of the development of governmental and judicial processes. The primary step toward peace was begun in the establishment of agencies to settle disputes between individuals respecting personal property or personal rights within a political unit. The next step was the assumption of authority over feudal barons by the crown, or national authority, in the matter of differences between feudal lords, therefore settled by wars between their private armies.

Possibly the most significant step in the evolution of peace was crystallized in the Constitution of the United States. Conflicts between States had rendered continuance under the Articles of Confederation intolerable. The Constitution federated the States into a Union and established the Congress to legislate for the control of the States in their relation to each other and provided a Supreme Court with authority to adjudicate disputes between the States.

In 1914 the First World War broke upon Europe in all its fury and savagery. For almost 3 years the United States was able to maintain its neutrality. However, because of repeated aggressions against American rights and the lives of American citizens, our country was reluctantly compelled to draw the sword in defense of its own safety and dignity. It is unnecessary here to catalog the sacrifices, the misery, and the tragedies that the war brought upon the humanity of the world. Millions of lives were sacrificed. Oceans of blood were loosed

upon fair lands. Billions of dollars of wealth were poured into rivers of ruin and waste. The gallant and the brave were mutilated and wounded and killed in this cruel and barbaric conflict. The people of the United States and of the world suffering the horrors and miseries of that war began to fashion in their minds and hearts a desire for the establishment by international action of some agency or machinery for the settlement of the causes of war through peaceful and amicable means and therefore to prevent the recurrence of another world tragedy. The League of Nations was established by the Treaty of Versailles. The United States did not become a party to that treaty because the United States Senate failed to ratify the compact.

It is frequently said that the League of Nations was a failure. That is an unjust charge. It is granted that it was not a complete success. However, it did serve a useful purpose. Even its weaknesses and its failures have contributed to the public thought and the attitude of nations and of political leaders. It has served an additional purpose. It has demonstrated where the pitfalls may lie, and where any international organization for peace must be strengthened or buttressed. It was a new departure in international life. It was an experiment in a virgin field. It could not be expected to attain perfection. It did not spring full-panoplied with wisdom, with courage and with instrumentalities for achieving all of the ends which many hoped for and expected. The history of the League ought to lighten the pathway along which nations may travel in the years to come. Great civilized nations are now engulfed in another world war, more far-flung and involving the expenditure of greater resources and calling for more momentous sacrifices than any struggle that has ever shaken the foundations of the earth. Twice within a quarter of a century, the United States, without being guilty of aggression, without any ambitions for the lands of our neighbors, and innocent of any violation of international law, has been dragged into two world struggles that have

sorrowed thousands of homes, have orphaned many thousands of children, and have wasted the national wealth, have injured our commerce and internal economy and have forced staggering sacrifices upon all of our people.

Again the people of the United States hunger for peace. Again they dream of the establishment of international authority to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world.

That ambition cannot be achieved by the United States alone. It requires the cooperation of other strong and powerful nations. The United States cannot write a pattern of its own and expect all other nations to accept it in detail. The Senate of the United States cannot blueprint in advance the action of the nations whose influence, power, and arms must secure the desired results. The most that the Senate may accomplish at this time is to express to the peoples of the world and to lay before the people of the United States the attitude of the Senate with respect to this commanding problem. The Constitution of the United States provides:

He (the President) shall have power, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, to make treaties, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

This solemn injunction places upon the Senate the high responsibility of advising the President, who must initiate treaties with respect thereto. Of course, the Senate may not ratify treaties not yet made. The present Senate may not bind the action of a future Senate. The present Senate, however, under its solemn duty may advise the President as to its sentiments and intentions with respect to any treaty which may be negotiated.

It is under this constitutional sanction that the Senate is asked by the passage of this resolution to express to the President the attitude of the Senate of the United States.

The resolution has been attacked as being general in its terms. It is broad in its terms for the reason that it is advanced as a framework within which the makers of the treaty may provide the detailed structure and the particular de-

limitations and affirmative provisions that may be necessary to accomplish the desired ends.

The primary condition upon which the peace of the future may be based is the necessity that the present war shall end in victory. It is therefore provided, "Resolved that the war against all our enemies be waged until complete victory is achieved." After victory shall be achieved, the next logical step is the securing of an honorable peace. Therefore it is provided, "That the United States cooperate with its comrades-in-arms in securing a just and honorable peace." When these pressing and imperative achievements shall have been accomplished the resolution then looks to the establishment and maintenance of international authority to prevent aggression and preserve the peace of the world. It is therefore provided, "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." The last paragraph just quoted has been assailed because of its employment of the word "sovereign" nation. Certainly a nation would have to possess the elements of sovereignty and ability to perform its obligations and commitments under an international treaty. To the extent of the commitment assumed, the nation would, of course, be deprived of its liberty of action. It would not have, however, to surrender anything of its sovereignty. Sovereignty implies the right and the power in a nation to make its own choices and decisions. But when it assumes a treaty obligation voluntarily, it must fulfill its obligation. This is not an impairment of its sovereignty but is rather a demonstration of its sovereignty. The resolution is not suggestive of any alliance. It provides, "Join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority."

It thus gives the widest latitude to nations that may become initially, or later, members of any organization or authority which may be created.

It has been suggested that instead of the words "international authority," the words "international organization" should be used. The word "authority" was chosen because of its breadth and comprehensiveness. It includes the employment of all existing international agencies, such as the Court at the Hague, or any other existing international organizations, as well as the creation of any new organizations.

We should not abandon what may be useful in arbitration, conciliation, the Pan American Union, the deliberations of the World Court, or the Kellogg Pact.

I was glad to see in this morning's press a statement by the distinguished Senator from Ohio [Mr. TAFT] in which he suggested the utilization of the League of Nations. It indicates agreement with the general belief that the maintenance of international authority comprehends the employment of any useful agencies already in existence, and authorizes the organization and creation of any further agency or organization which might be employed, and that to confine the language to the creation of a new organization would not comprehend those very laudable purposes.

It has been suggested that the words, "with power to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world" should designate the particular kind of power with which international authority may be invested. The word "power"—meaning a grant of authority—was chosen with the deliberate intent to include all forms of power necessary to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world. "Power" is a term clear in its implications and any designation of particular forms of power would exclude those forms not named.

When World War No. 1 ended in victory, we hoped thereafter to live in peace with the powers of the earth. We had hoped that our heroes had not died in vain. Our great leader and Commander-in-Chief, Woodrow Wilson, with an exalted dream of peace and a noble conception of freedom from the misery of war, undertook to lead the world into the pathways of peace. We had hoped that the constructive initiative and the

intelligent energies of the modern world would be devoted to the creation of useful things for the enjoyment of the peoples of the earth. We had hoped that the genius of scientists would no longer be devoted to the manufacture of arms and murderous weapons of warfare. The United States, during the score of years following World War No. 1, made generous exertions toward peace and disarmament and arbitration. These hopes and dreams came crashing about us in ruins in 1939. The dastardly designs of megalomaniacal conquerors and the flame of the cannon's mouth shriveled them into ashes.

Today, our Nation is involved in a war that belts the globe. For 10 years Hitler was secretly arming and marching and drilling a mighty army. He planned the conquest of Europe. He hoped to master the Mediterranean and the lands which it washed. With his fantastic ambition to surpass Napoleon, he planned to subjugate Russia and extend his realm into Asia. He was to combine Napoleon and Alexander the Great and Caesar and Genghis Khan into the world's greatest military master. His ultimate ambition was to leap across the South Atlantic from Africa and challenge the independence of South America and the Monroe Doctrine.

Six thousand miles westward the crafty and treacherous Japanese for 20 years had been preparing for the hour they could strike the United States. For 5 long bloody years Japan had harried with torch and sword the territories of unoffending China. Savage and destructive war had been waged against that peaceful people. The world will long remember the dastardly and treacherous attack upon Pearl Harbor. Our soldiers and sailors were murdered without a hint of warning. While their diplomatic emissaries were standing at the door of the White House pretending to be messengers of peace, they drove the dagger of the assassin into our armed forces. With Oriental beguilement, they sought to becalm and then betray us while they planned with fiendish deviltry the barbaric attack on Pearl Harbor. We promptly declared war on Japan.

Germany and Italy quickly declared war upon us, and we declared war upon them.

In this heroic struggle to save the life of free government and to preserve the liberties of the world, we fight with the United Nations as comrades-in-arms. We are fighting side by side in the cause of "collective security." If in war, concert of action is necessary, why should not we together with the United Nations and other free nations act in concert in time of peace to provide collective security to avert the horrors and miseries of brutal and unjustified aggression? Tyrants and dictators may easily make war. Their edict alone is required to declare and make war. In democratic nations constitutional requirements demand something more—the action of the people through their representatives. There is no adequate curb against the ambitions and aggressions of despots and conquerors except the joint action of peaceful nations.

We have tried "isolation"—and I say that without any desire of offense. It did not bring peace or security. Dictators planned their conquests upon the hope of "divide and conquer." Alone through cooperative action can their mad schemes be arrested. Isolation has failed. Let us try collective security.

The Senate of the United States will express the desire of the United States to join in the establishment of a world peace agency to curb international bandits and robbers and to preserve the peace of the world. Such an agency does not necessarily imply that world conditions will be frozen. It does not follow that the status quo in every particular will be preserved. The constitution of such a body could provide the necessary elasticity to meet the needs of the future. It will not be an easy task. Difficulties will be encountered. Obstacles will face us. But we need not despair. We have faced great national and international problems before. American genius and leadership and statesmanship will not be deterred by hardships and struggles. They are rather a challenge to the highest and noblest traits of national character. It will not be perfect. What human agency

reaches such a goal? The Constitution of the United States has been amended, and may be amended again. The British Constitution and the structure of other powers have yielded to change. They have responded to the need of changing times. The sublime objective of world peace is worth the effort. The experiment commands our highest hopes and best aspirations.

The United States is so powerful, with such a tremendous striking power upon the sea and upon the land, that it is invincible against any single power on the globe. It is equally powerful in world councils. We gave freedom to the Philippines. We withdrew our Army from Cuba and granted it independence. The world knows that we cherish no scheme of conquest and no ambition for military rule. The hour has struck for America to instill those principles into world policy.

From our commanding point of vantage we must declare to the world that our influence and our might will be dedicated to the maintenance of world peace and the suppression of military aggression whenever it may lift its venomous head. [Applause.]

Tuesday, October 26, 1943

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

Mr. WHITE. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The Senator has referred to concessions which were made by various members of the subcommittee. Did his statement include the Senator from Texas?

Mr. WHITE. It most assuredly did. The Senator from Texas was patient and courteous, and he gave of his great abilities to the effort to frame a resolution upon which we could all stand, and which could be presented to the world as the united voice of the Senate.

Thursday, October 28, 1943

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

Mr. BURTON. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. I do not agree with the construction which the Senator places upon the present situation. I have nothing to retract from what I said. Those have been my views for 25 years or longer. I am not a new convert. I am not laboring under any fantastic illusion that my particular language or my particular words ought to be adopted in legislation. My conviction is that everything I said in that speech can be accomplished properly, legally, and constitutionally under the language of Senate Resolution 192 as presented to the Senate. I have surrendered nothing of principle. I may have surrendered phraseology. We may have taken out an "an". We may have used the word "authority" instead of "organization" on the theory that "authority" is broader than "organization." We used the word "authority" because it was broad enough to cover the utilization of the World Court, the League of Nations, if necessary or practicable, and The Hague Conventions; and broad enough to cover a further authorization to create a new and additional organization to effectuate the broad objectives of preventing aggression with power.

What is power? Let us look to the lexicographers, and not to the perfervid oratory of Senators. What does the dictionary say? Power includes mental power. There is the World Court, and there are other agencies for discussing and settling problems by mental processes. Power includes moral power. It includes physical power. Everyone knows what physical power is. It is a sword, a cannon, a piece of artillery, or a navy.

What is desired beyond this broad authorization? We are not agreeing in advance to ratify any treaty which may be brought back, but we are saying to the world, "We are willing to cooperate within this broad field." We are saying to the President, "This is our attitude, and this is our advice." After all, the President is the man who is going to make the treaty. Are the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. HATCH] and the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] so afraid of

their President that they must instruct him in the minutiae? Must we tell him where to put a comma and where to put a period? Shall we say to the President, "We are advising you, and if you do not use this language, we will not stand by you"?"

Monday, November 1, 1943

Mr. DANAHER. I yield to the Senator from Texas.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have placed in the RECORD following the statement read by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. BALL], a short statement dealing with the same subject matter. I hope the Senator from Minnesota and his colleagues will aid us in obtaining prompt action along the lines of the sentiments expressed in the Moscow declaration, and not consume too much time in iteration and reiteration, so that the countries of the earth may know our position.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the clerk will read.

The Chief Clerk read as follows:

The momentous agreements of the foreign ministers are along the general line of our war purposes. They pledge unity of action on the conduct of the war and the surrender and disarmament of our enemies. They comprehend the establishment of international authority to maintain peace and security. This is the purpose of the pending Connally resolution.

The declaration respecting Italy is in harmony with our purpose to extirpate fascism in Italy and nazi-ism in Germany. They caused the present war and their continuance would be a constant threat to the peace of the world. There will be no quarrel with the declaration respecting Italy.

All in all the agreements express our war policies and the broad foreign policy of the United States respecting post-war peace and security from aggression of all peaceful and law-abiding states. They will meet with the hearty approval of the people of the United States.

Mr. CONNALLY subsequently said: Mr. President, I have already made a public statement of my great satisfaction with respect to the Moscow conference. I wish, however, to add a word of con-

gratulations and praise for the Secretary of State, Mr. Hull, for the monumental accomplishment which he was able to bring about at Moscow.

Mr. Hull is a man of fine judgment and balance. He has pursued his duties in the State Department without seeking to interfere with the activities of other branches of the Government, and has thereby obtained a very wide and very great influence in his particular field of action.

I wish to say with reference to all these matters relating to post-war peace, that the Foreign Relations Committee has been in frequent contact with the Secretary of State. He knows their views and they know his views. Without undertaking to go into details, I may say that the draft of the pending resolution was cabled to Mr. Hull while he was in Moscow. He knew its general outlines and general terms before he left for Moscow. I feel that there is no difference whatever between the principles of the pending resolution and those set forth in the Moscow conference declaration. In fact I regard the Moscow conference as a complete confirmation and approval of the principles embodied in the pending resolution.

Wednesday, November 3, 1943

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I shall have to leave the floor in a moment, and I should like to ask the Senator from Vermont to yield to me in order that I may ask him one question.

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. The question which I wish to propound relates to the subject of the surrender of sovereignty. There are those who contend that by entering into a treaty a nation surrenders some of its sovereignty. Is not the implication just the opposite? Sovereignty implies an independent and free nation with the choice and with the power to do those things it wants to do, and the making of a treaty, instead of being a limitation upon its sovereignty, is really a demonstration of its sovereignty. So far as the terms of a treaty are concerned, a na-

tion's liberty of action is restricted until the treaty has expired. But if we were bound by the exaggerated view of sovereignty that a nation cannot make a treaty without giving up some of its sovereignty, we could never make a treaty respecting anything.

Mr. AUSTIN. Mr. President, the Senator from Texas has stated the proposition so clearly, as he always does, that I blush to go on with my discussion of the question. I agree with him, and I undertake to support what he has said.

Mr. CONNALLY. I thank the Senator from Vermont.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, will the Senator yield right on that point for about 2 minutes?

Mr. AUSTIN. I yield.

Mr. CONNALLY. As chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, I have been authorized and directed to offer an amendment to the original resolution.

Mr. CONNALLY. Or, as suggested by the Senator from Michigan, an annex.

We do not propose any change in the language of the original resolution, either as to substance or form or punctuation. However, we do propose the following amendment:

Amendment intended to be proposed by Mr. CONNALLY, in line 9—

I believe it is, or at the end of the resolution to insert the following:

That the Senate recognizes the necessity of there being established at the earliest practicable date a general international organization, based on the principle of the sovereign equality of all peace-loving states, and open to membership by all such states, large and small, for the maintenance of international peace and security.

The second paragraph:

That, pursuant to the Constitution of the United States, any treaty made to effect the purposes of this resolution, on behalf of the Government of the United States with any other nation or any association of nations, shall be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate of the United States, provided two-thirds of the Senators present concur.

Mr. President, the amendment is not being offered with a view that it in any

wise changes the purposes or the principles enunciated in the original resolution, but it is being offered upon the theory that the first paragraph of the present amendment is simply a restatement and a ratification and a confirmation of the language contained in the original resolution, which we think has met with the general approval not only of the people of the United States, but of foreign nations and their representatives.

With respect to the second paragraph, which refers to the necessity for the Senate acting upon any treaties, we do not think that that was legally necessary, because in the original resolution we used the language, "United States, through its constitutional processes." When that language was used, we used it with the specific intent of saying that this Government could act only through its constitutional processes, one of which is that any treaty negotiated by the Executive must be negotiated with the advice and consent of the Senate. That is still our view. We do not think it was necessary to add this supplement; but certain Senators were rather disturbed by some fear that this might be construed as a ratification in advance. We have seen fit to recognize their views in that respect, and to make perfectly clear what we intended in the original resolution. I hope that these views will meet with the approval of Members of the Senate.

Friday, November 5, 1943

Mr. VANDENBERG and other Senators asked for the yeas and nays, which were ordered.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. President, I crave the indulgence of the Senate for only 2 or 3 minutes. Now that we are about to approach a vote on the resolution, I, as chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, desire to express my very deep appreciation for the cooperation and help and aid which we have received from both sides of the aisle.

The criticism has been leveled at the committee from time to time that it did

not act more speedily and with greater haste. I leave it to the judgment of the future as to whether, in view of the developments and the situation, the course of the committee was not a wise one, and justified and vindicated by events.

Mr. President, the resolution has been criticized and denounced in many of the newspapers of the country. The committee has been assailed. I wish to state briefly what we are undertaking to do by the resolution. I shall refer for the moment only to paragraph 3. I wish to suggest that in paragraph 3 we express the willingness to "join with free and sovereign nations in the establishment and maintenance of international authority." The phrase "international authority," Mr. President, was chosen because it is broad enough to include all existing peace agencies and the utilization of their services, and the creation of such additional agencies as may be created by treaty or otherwise.

It is to be an "international authority with power"—to do what? "To prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world." These are the two great objectives of the resolution—"to prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world." The resolution contains the words, "with power" to do that.

The resolution has been assailed on the ground that it has no force, that it is not strong enough, that it does not carry any conviction with respect to means. But, Mr. President, the word "power" is a broad term, and it comprehends the exercise by the international agency of whatever power is necessary—to do what? "To prevent aggression and to preserve the peace of the world."

Mr. President, some criticism was made as to Moscow. There is a degree of harmony and cooperation between the language of section 4 of the Moscow Declaration, which we have inserted in the resolution, and the remainder of our own resolution, that is hardly subject to criticism.

So far as contact between the Committee on Foreign Relations and the Depart-

ment of State are concerned, I will say to Senators who are not members of the committee that there has been contact, and I can call as witnesses the minority members of the Committee on Foreign Relations—not contact once, but contact repeatedly with the Department of State on this whole subject matter; and Mr. Hull, when he sat at Moscow, had a copy of the resolution in his files. He knew what was in it. He knew the predictions of its adoption by this body.

Mr. President, it is said by some that the resolution has no power, that it has no teeth. Let me say that the resolution has in it the teeth of bayonets, if necessary to accomplish the prevention of aggression and the preservation of the peace, if that is the ultimate remedy. It has in it the teeth of airplanes that bite with bombs and with machine guns. It has the teeth of great navies and artillery, if need be.

But, Mr. President, its purpose is pacific. These are extreme remedies, only to be employed if peaceful measures and conciliation and diplomacy fail, and if necessary, they may be invoked, provided always their use is limited to the preservation of the peace and the prevention of aggression.

Mr. President, I look forward with the hope that the resolution may obtain an overwhelming vote in favor of its adoption. The resolution evidences a great stride in national policy by the United States. Not only will it bring cheer to our own people whose sons are fighting on far-flung battle lines, but it will bring cheer and satisfaction to the peace-loving peoples of all the world. I trust that the Senate may adopt the resolution by an overwhelming vote.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution as modified. On this question the yeas and nays have been ordered, and the clerk will call the roll.

The result was announced—yeas 85, nays 5.