

SENATE.

MONDAY, October 28, 1918.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we have met together in the Senate this morning to give directions to the civil order of this great Nation. Our duties increase with the days. Our responsibilities come upon us heavier with every hour. We turn to Thee, the God of our fathers, the God of infinite providence, for Thy hand has led us in all the past and Thou hast revealed in all our history great and glorious plans. We seek Thy guidance and blessing as we address ourselves to the tasks of this day. Recognizing our infinite debt of gratitude to Thee and renewing our ancient covenant with the God of all nations, committing ourselves this morning to the Divine guidance, we would face the tasks and pray for Thy blessing upon us. Guide us this day, O God of our fathers, in wisdom, in courage, in hope, and may we at the close of the day have the comfortable assurance that our work has been pleasing in Thy sight. For Christ's sake. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary (James M. Baker) read the following communication:

UNITES STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., October 28, 1918.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOE T. ROBINSON, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WILLARD SAULSBURY,
President pro tempore.

Mr. ROBINSON thereupon took the chair as Presiding Officer.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday last was read and approved.

NONCOMBATANT OFFICERS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of War, transmitting, in response to a resolution of April 18, 1918, a list of the men to whom commissions in the Army have been issued and who are not now and who have not heretofore been placed in command or had charge of any troops in the service of the United States, either here or abroad, etc., which, on motion of Mr. NELSON, was, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Military Affairs and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House disagrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13086) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes, agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. SHERLEY, Mr. EAGAN, and Mr. CANNON managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13086) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Presiding Officer:

S. 4886. An act providing for the sale of certain lands in the original town site of Port Angeles, Wash.;

H. R. 12404. An act authorizing the construction of a building for the Public Health Service, in the city of Washington, D. C.;

H. R. 12438. An act authorizing the conveyance of the United States jail and land on which the same is located at Guthrie, Okla., to Logan County, Okla.;

H. R. 12976. An act providing for the protection of the users of the telephone and telegraph service and the properties and funds belonging thereto during Government operation and control; and

H. R. 13036. An act transferring jurisdiction and control for the period of the war over the Southern Branch of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers from the board of managers of the National Home for Disabled Volunteer Soldiers to the Secretary of War for use for Army hospital purposes.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following act and joint resolution: On October 25:

S. 2493. An act to amend section 3 of an act entitled "An act to provide for stock-raising homesteads, and for other purposes," approved December 29, 1916.

On October 27:

S. J. Res. 63. Joint resolution to establish a reserve of the Public Health Service.

ZENG TZE WONG (H. Doc. No. 1334).

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed: *To the Senate and House of Representatives:*

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State inclosing a draft of a joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to permit Mr. Zeng Tze Wong, a citizen of China, to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point at the expense of the Government of China.

The Secretary of State points out that the passage of the resolution would be regarded as an act of courtesy by the Government of China and that it would follow established precedents.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, 28 October, 1918.

TRANSFER OF GOVERNMENT BUREAUS FROM WASHINGTON.

The PRESIDING OFFICER laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States, which was read and, with the accompanying papers, ordered to lie on the table and be printed:

To the Senate:

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Senate, in response to the resolution adopted by the Senate on September 6, 1918, numbered S. Res. 296, reports made by the heads of the several executive departments and independent Government establishments in reference to the matter of transferring from Washington to other cities in the country, for the duration of the war, such bureaus, or parts of bureaus, commissions, and subdivisions of the several departments as could discharge their functions and perform their duties as well outside of said District as within its boundaries. From these reports it will be noted that the heads of the executive departments and independent Government establishments do not deem it advisable to remove any branch of the Government service now located within the District of Columbia to any other location.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, 28 October, 1918.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON presented the petition of A. M. Sheldon, of Minneapolis, Minn., and a petition of the First National Bank, of Bemidji, Minn., praying for the repeal of the tax-exemption clause of the Federal farm-loan act, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the petition of Horace Lowry, president of the Twin City Rapid Transit Co., of Minneapolis, Minn., praying that utility corporations be placed in a separate classification in the pending revenue bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented the memorial of John W. Thomas & Co., of Minneapolis, Minn., remonstrating against the proposed tax on tapestries and textiles in the pending revenue bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a telegram, in the nature of a memorial, from the J. R. Watkins Co., of Winona, Minn., remonstrating against the proposed tax on nonbeverage alcohol in the pending revenue bill, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of the Security State Bank, of Lake City; the Citizens' State Bank, of Pine Island; of Lane, Jaffray & Piper (Inc.), of Minneapolis; the Security State Bank, of Owatonna; the Nobles County Bankers' Association, of Rushmore; the National Bank of Commerce, of St. Paul; the Farmers' and Merchants' State Bank, of Zimmerman; the Farmers' National Bank, of Hutchinson; the Fairmont Creamery Co., of Fairmont; the Merchants' State Bank, of North Branch; the Security State Bank, of Princeton; and the First State Bank, of Rochester, all in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the proposed tax on checks in the pending revenue bill, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. KIRBY (for Mr. THOMPSON) presented a petition of sundry citizens of Iola, Carlyle, Manhattan, Kansas City, and Humboldt, all in the State of Kansas, praying that osteopathic physicians be admitted to the medical branch of the Army, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill (S. 3219) to incorporate the Recreation Association of America, reported it with amendment.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 4991) to establish load lines for vessels in foreign trade, reported it with an amendment and submitted a report (No. 606) thereon.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 5006) granting a pension to Charles M. Woodworth; and

A bill (S. 5007) granting an increase of pension to John J. Duke; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FERNALD:

A bill (S. 5008) granting an increase of pension to Patrick A. Galvin (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PAGE:

A bill (S. 5009) granting a pension to Emeline A. Spaulding (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 5010) granting an increase of pension to Robert A. Carlton; and

A bill (S. 5011) granting an increase of pension to Indian war veterans and their widows; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PENROSE:

A bill (S. 5012) granting an increase of pension to Isabell Cunningham; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 5013) to amend so much of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919," approved July 9, 1918, as provides for "longevity pay for men other than the Regular Army"; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 5014) granting an increase of pension to Fannie R. Wells; to the Committee on Pensions.

THE REVENUE.

Mr. SHEPPARD submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 12863) to provide revenue, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 13086) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 3, 8, 20, and 25.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, and 32, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 7, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lines 7 and 8 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the following: "including necessary clerical help in the District of Columbia and other personal services," and insert in lieu thereof the following: "including not exceeding \$25,000 for personal services in the District of Columbia"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "\$500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate number 11, and agree to the same with an

amendment as follows: In line 3 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the word "authorized" and insert in lieu thereof the word "directed"; and in line 8 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out the word "six" and insert in lieu thereof the word "two"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 13, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment amended as follows: At the end of the matter stricken out by said amendment insert the following: " : *Provided further*, That property shall not be taken over under the foregoing power at an aggregate cost in excess of \$15,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 24, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Omit the matter stricken out and inserted by said amendment, and on page 37 of the bill strike out line 5; and the Senate agree to the same.

THOMAS S. MARTIN,
O. W. UNDERWOOD,
F. E. WARREN,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

SWAGAR SHERLEY,
JOHN J. EAGAN,
J. G. CANNON,

Managers on the part of the House.

The report was agreed to.

PEACE POLICIES AND THE POLITICAL CAMPAIGN.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I should like to request the privilege of the Senate to make a few observations upon a matter which the imminence of peace makes important. I shall not occupy a great deal of time. If I may proceed I will promise to conclude in about 30 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to address the Senate. Is there objection? The Chair hears no objection, and the Senator from Pennsylvania will proceed.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, as the Senate is likely soon to be brought to one of its most important functions in one of the most important periods of the world's history, I feel that we ought without delay to fix our attention most earnestly upon the intricate problems that we already face and so to anticipate and prepare for the wise discharge of that function. The gravity of our responsibility could not be exceeded. The measure of the wisdom with which we shall discharge it is the studious and independent forethought we now bring to the formulation of our views upon questions that are already too clear to be postponed or neglected. It is well, therefore, to examine into the responsibility of the Senate in the present critical situation and to remark upon some of the most salient and urgent phases of that situation.

When there is a question of America's going to war, the Congress alone can declare war. The act of declaring war includes necessarily the determination of the cause of war. The determination of the cause of war includes necessarily the determination of the aim of the war, which is the removal of the cause. Therefore it is through the Congress alone that the American people give their mandate to conduct war and their mandate as to what is the aim of the war.

While this country is at war, the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army and of the Navy, is charged with the conduct of hostilities. In addition to the powers incidental to that function the Congress has bestowed upon him many other powers. Nevertheless, it is the Nation, not the President or the "administration," that is at war; it is the whole Government of the United States, and each and all of its parts, not the President or the "administration" alone, that carries on the great business of war.

When there is question of America's ceasing to make war, war can only be ended by treaty. Treaties can be made only by and with the advice and consent of the Senate. Advice and consent to a treaty ending a war necessarily includes determination of the question whether the aim of the war has been achieved in accordance with the mandate of the American people—whether the treaty falls short of that mandate and also whether it goes beyond in a manner to violate that mandate. Therefore it is through the Senate of the United States, quite as much as through the President, that the people of the United States are to say when, whether, and how their mandate to conduct war has been executed by the attainment of their war aim.

To begin war has always been a comparatively quick transaction; to end war has always been a much more long-drawn-

out transition. This is because a nation generally enters war with a clear-cut, simple aim; but the course of events, the fermentation of political theories in the cauldron of war, and the ambitions and pet theories of statesmen, cause to cluster around the prime war aim a multitude of corollaries and subsidiary objects, many of which may not be essential at all to the prime war aim for which the people have given their mandate. These are vastly multiplied when the number of nations at war is great.

Now, the ending of a particular war and the firm founding of the future general peace to follow it may well be regarded as two separate functions, at least in theory. And in practice the two tasks should at least be kept separate in our conceptions.

To the task of ending the war belong all things essential to our prime war aim.

To the task of firmly founding a future general peace belongs the careful examination of each and every thing that has been proposed as a corollary to our prime war aim or as a subsidiary war aim. This task is an especially heavy one, because, be it remembered, upon none of these corollaries, upon none of these proposed subsidiary war aims, has the American people given its mandate; and it will be through the Senate that such mandate must come.

The separation of the two tasks of ascertaining when the prime war aim of this Nation has been achieved and, secondly, of accepting or rejecting one by one the multifarious corollaries and subsidiary war aims that have been proposed—and many of them are adventitious and questionable—is heightened by the facts, first, that it has been sought to make this mass of clustering ideas a part of the *res gestae* by linking them with tentative discussions with the enemy; and, secondly, because the array of ideas referred to has not been tested by an attempt to implement them in the form of concise, practicable stipulations.

But upon all these things, as trustees of a large share of the people's authority to make treaties, the Senate has the appalling responsibility of being prepared any day to pass.

Everything possible has been done to lighten the task of the Executive in the conduct of the war. An ephemeral proposal was made at an early stage that there should be a congressional committee to keep Congress informed on the conduct of the war. That proposal failed. No other committee was ever seriously proposed except one of consultative advisory character, designed to secure common counsel and universal cooperation so indispensable alike to democratic government and to true efficiency in statesmanship.

There have, indeed, been various attempts to create deliberative and consultative relations on matters of policy between the Executive and the Congress. Such opportunity for counsel would have enormously lightened the task of the Nation's representatives. It would have informed them for the discharge of responsibilities from which they can not in any case escape.

Even an entirely regular and proper resolution of Congress to inform itself in relation to its function of appropriating money to carry on the war was hotly branded by the Chief Executive as showing "want of confidence in the administration" when it was proposed to investigate the airplane expenditures. Now, the making of this investigation was the constitutional duty of the legislative branch. The principles upon which this is true have been followed since the foundation of our Government, and in the light of these principles it was most unfortunate that this proposal of the legislative branch to exercise its clear right and perform its imperative and indispensable duty should have been branded as a "want of confidence in the administration." One is compelled to say that heretofore Executives have rightly not so considered it.

On the occasion to which I allude, and it is quite typical, the President, in his letter to the Senator from Virginia, said:

I protest most earnestly against the adoption of any such action and shall hope that every Senator who intends to support the present administration in the conduct of the war will vote against it. These are serious times, and it is absolutely necessary that the lines should be clearly drawn between friends and opponents.

Lincoln, speaking to a delegation in 1864, which was urging him to separate the sheep from the goats—those for him, as were the delegation, and those against him—at a time when it might mean his own defeat for reelection, uttered these lofty sentiments:

You have spoken of the consideration which you think I should pay to my friends as contradistinguished from my enemies. I suppose, of course, that you mean by that those who agree or disagree with me in my views of public policy. I recognize no such thing as a political friendship personal to myself. * * * Now, when you see a man loyally in favor of the Union, willing to vote men and money, spending his time and money and throwing his influence into the recruitment of our armies, I think it ungenerous, unjust, and impolite to make his views on abstract political questions a test of his loyalty. I will not be a party to this application of a pocket inquisition. * * * I have no right to act the tyrant to mere political opponents. If a man votes for supplies

of men and money, encourages enlistments, discourages desertions, does all in his power to carry the war on to a successful issue, I have no right to question him for his abstract political opinions. I must make a dividing line somewhere between those who are the opponents of the Government and those who only oppose peculiar features of my administration while they sustain the Government.

And the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] has just handed me a copy of the Providence Daily Journal in which is printed an extract from a letter by President Lincoln.

Mr. LODGE. From a letter to Gov. Johnson, to be found on page 359 of volume 9 of the *Life of Lincoln* by Nicolay and Hay.

Mr. KNOX. In that letter this sentence occurs:

Except it be to give protection against violence, I decline to interfere in any way with any presidential election.

Mr. LODGE. I ask the Senator if he will read the previous letter in regard not to the election but the nomination of Judge Kelley, of Philadelphia—a letter of June 20, 1864, addressed to the postmaster there.

Mr. KNOX. I will send it to the desk and ask the Secretary to read it as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

The postmaster of Philadelphia being accused of interference against William D. Kelley, President Lincoln sent for him, and following his custom in grave matters, he read to him reprimand which he had committed to paper in the following words:

"Complaint is made to me that you are using your official power to defeat Judge Kelley's nomination to Congress. I am well satisfied with Judge Kelley as a Member of Congress, and I do not know that the man who might supplant him would be satisfactory; but the correct principle, I think, is that all our friends should have absolute freedom of choice among our friends. My wish, therefore, is that you will do just as you think fit with your own suffrage in the case, and not constrain any of your subordinates to do other than as he thinks fit with his."

Mr. LODGE. That relates to a party nomination.

Mr. KNOX. Alas, Mr. President, what a difference between that spirit and the partisanship and secrecy of the present administration. Of its partisanship Republicans are the peculiar victims. Under its secrecy and its aversion to taking counsel Democrats and Republicans in Congress, in office, and, with one conspicuous exception, in private life appear equally to suffer.

But Executive methods so unique in American history, so aloof in isolation from the people's representatives, so absolutely prohibitory of anything like counsel can never for one moment abrogate the constitutional power and solemn duty of the Senate to disentangle the mesh of words that cling, some as healthy growth and some as dangerous fungi, upon the sturdy tree of America's war aims, which are America's peace terms, and from which will germinate America's after-war policies. A solemn duty is before the Senate.

I will merely touch some of the quite open questions upon which the American people have never passed, but which we are warned may quite possibly be treated by the Executive in contradistinction to the senatorial branch of our treaty-making power as adjuncts to our war aims to be attained by altruistic negotiations. To be sure, all the ideas in question are so expressed as to make it difficult even to do so much, and it may be that therein lies salvation here and in the practical good sense of the American and allied nations. For example, are we, a naval power with a proud history, and whose greatest ally is the greatest sea power, to be committed in advance to sweeping changes in the well-established international law of the sea, which we did so much to fashion, while the land is conveniently left as a battle field for the military nations? Are we to be committed in advance to deny ourselves the right to make mutually beneficial understandings with the other English-speaking peoples, or with France or Italy, or with South American countries, or with Japan, or with any other power? Are we to be committed in advance to forego the tariff protection of our labor and our national prosperity and the vindication of our own treatment by other nations by means of reciprocal arrangements we may find it desirable to make?

It was always true and was early recognized by all that the object of this war was and is the permanent removal of the German menace. In the formula "restitution, reparation, and guarantees," the word *guaranty* is not to mean written guarantees, such as we have seen treated as scraps of paper in the cases of Belgium's neutrality, of accepted international law, of Hague conventions, of the rules of civilized warfare on land and seas. We shall have the guarantees we seek only when we know as a fact, irrespective of the solemnities of diplomatic promises, that the German menace is at an end once for all. Even "restitution and reparation"; even the return of Alsace-Lorraine to France; even just frontiers for Italy and Roumania and the rescue and restoration of Russia and independence for Jugos-Slavs, Czechos-Slovaks, and Poles, and for the nationalities

oppressed by Turkey; even the liberation of Africans and others from German colonial oppression—all these matters—however absolute their intrinsic importance—for the prime purpose of the war, which is, I say again, for our guaranty against the German menace—are of chief interest because they subserve that guaranty. Viewed in any other light they are matters of post-bellum reconstruction.

We shall have our guaranty against the German menace when we know that Germany, whether as autocratic monarchy, as republic, or as democratic monarchy, can not again menace us. On this we shall require the word of Foch, of Haig, of Diaz, and of Pershing, for wars are won by bullets and blood, not by ink and eloquence.

We shall require also evidence that the German grip upon Russia, the Balkans, and Turkey has been loosed. We must never allow to be obscured the prime purpose of the war. From that purpose flows as a corollary the purpose to strive to make the menace of unjust war from any quarter as improbable as we can. From that, again, and from the chivalrous spirit of the entente allies flows the demand for restitution and reparation and for all the complicated territorial and racial readjustments, to some of which I have referred. So flows, too, the aspiration for some salutary league of nations.

As to the "league of nations" question, I will add a few words. The phrase is heard much of late. Some envisage it as a Eutopian world state. Others, less visionary, think of it as a league to enforce peace. In its most extreme form any league of nations will, I believe, have to be relegated to a future quite beyond the purview of the ending of this war or of the reconstruction of peace immediately after this war. There will be no room for a task of such problematical possibility in either of the phases of negotiation that now confront us.

We can aspire, with hope of success, to somewhat higher ideals than it would have been practicable to pursue to earth in the past. National traditions and institutions must yield something to the emancipating forces of progress. Instantaneous world communication has bound nations together in a single body for many purposes and has enabled them, sharing a common knowledge, animated by a common conscience, to take common and contemporaneous action while the need is yet fresh. It is this fact rather than broader and more enlightened views that furnishes the reason for the progress and effectiveness of international cooperation in recent as compared with earlier times. One can readily understand the force and effect of a concurrent expression of international opinion made while the subject upon which it operates is a fresh and burning one as compared with the disconnected and ineffective expression of the same opinion when made at different times after the facts upon which it rests. The peace that follows this war must rest upon a recognition of this interdependence of nations. It must satisfy the international conscience and revivify the sanctions for the rules of international conduct.

The world is in no frame of mind to forget how perfidiously Germany has violated the great compacts of international cooperation for the mitigation of human suffering which expressed the sense of the interdependence of nations and the sodality of human interest. But this sodality will not be best subserved if concurrence upon too many and too Utopian proposals and too great abnegation and too difficult obligations are made the *sine qua non* of its preservation.

The league of nations that now challenges our solicitude is the league of nations of which we are now a member—the glorious present alliance of the many powers with whom we are now fighting as a league to enforce and to maintain peace from disturbance by the German menace. If we should allow that league to fall apart or to be pried apart by German machinations, who can say when this world will ever again be so near to having a general league to enforce peace as it is to-day? Only a dire menace from without has given this league such solidarity. The centripetal force of a common danger has created the league we have, the entente alliance. Remove the common danger and the centrifugal forces of national individualism, if unrestrained by a firm understanding, will at once come into play. Out of the present alliance to-day, and quite irrespective of any discussions with the enemy, it would seem possible to perpetuate the league we have, already embracing the majority of the population of the globe, as a league for one single purpose of enforcing peace. The function of such a league, I take it, would be to examine any controversy that threatened war and then to throw its weight to the side of such controversy where justice and equity lay, and also to suppress with its overwhelming power any war that might break out and to indicate the just solution of the contention. Such a league, like any league, will demand some encroachment upon the conception of complete and independent sovereignty. The simpler

the league, the less of such encroachment it demands, the fewer the subjects it attempts to touch, the more likely it is to prove practicable and permanent.

One must be visionary indeed to suppose that the heterogeneous peoples of the earth could so completely overcome human nature as to combine now in the real internationalism of a world State or even in a league involving a great catalogue of unnatural self-restraints. Such conceptions to-day touch rather the postulates of religion than the facts of statesmanship.

If internationalism can go far enough to minimize the possibility of wars and to enforce approximate equity and justice amongst the peoples of the earth, it will have done much. Indeed there is only one other general subject that seems to me already ripe perhaps for international action by a league of the kind I am discussing. The welfare of a people should be the first concern of government. A league might take such action as would prevent international competition from obstructing that function of government. It might do so by covenants as to hours and conditions of labor, for example.

Let me return for a moment to the two tasks that confront us. The first is the task of ending the war by the sure achievement of its prime aim—the permanent removal of the German menace. The second is the task of weeding out from the mass of proposed corollary aims and subsidiary purposes those things which are safe and wise, those things which the American people and their allies will approve, and which the Senate could approve.

Here, too, when one considers the number of nations concerned and the multiplicity of the subjects presented and of the interests involved, it requires no clairvoyance to foresee the dangerous chaos that will arise if we and our allies are to drift into an ultimate peace conference with a nebulous program, with agreement "in principle" where we should have precise understanding. Here, too, we can readily see, the simplification of the program will be vital to the preservation of that indispensable solidarity which alone is bringing victory to America and her allies.

Simeon E. Baldwin, the learned jurist and one-time governor of Connecticut, made last summer the following observations upon methods of dealing with the two questions of ending the war and of building for the future which now hang over us in mixed and complex form, surcharged with problems of vast variety:

It may be assumed that there will ultimately be either a peace congress to close the present war, composed of representatives of the leading belligerents on each side, and probably of all the belligerents, or two peace congresses for that purpose, one composed of all the nations which are at war with Germany and her allies and one representing the latter. * * *

The office of a peace congress is to make peace. Whatever more it might effect in defining or improving the public law of the world, or creating new facilities for defining or improving it, could probably be better effected by a congress called specially for that purpose, and proceeding with the deliberation necessarily to be expected from such a body.

It is also true that a peace congress, after bringing a war to a close, can adjourn for a considerable period, to be reconvened as a congress for the settlement of general principles of international conduct. It may be doubted, however, whether a congress of the latter kind, even with large changes in its membership, could ever approach the subject with the freedom from influences occasioned by the war and the juristic sense and power that might be expected from a body newly and specially constituted for its consideration.

The excessive intermingling of the problem of a victorious ending of the war with a great variety of projects of world reconstruction renders our task, as I have said, most difficult. As a coordinate branch of this Government it is our duty, I believe, to make clear the Senate's sense of the immediate necessity of clarification and simplification of any program that enters into the ending of the war or the building of the future and the Senate's sense of the instant necessity of full counsel and accord upon all such programs between the Government of the United States and the Governments of our allies.

And there is a necessity that underlies these urgent needs. That is a clarification for the Senate itself of the policies to which it may later be called upon to consider giving its sanction. In this matter we are guardians of the Nation's mandate, and we can not default.

Some days ago there was made on this floor the preposterous suggestion that the Senate ratify in advance whatever might be the will of the Chief Executive. A few days ago the country was astounded and shocked to find that Chief Executive calling for the election of Democratic Senators and Representatives precisely in order that his individual authority should be untrammeled by counsel. I pass by the unjust, not to say outrageous, implications of that unique document of partisan politics. That the two proposals should associate themselves in one's mind is, I regret to say, due to the proneness of some Senators and Representatives to make themselves mere regis-

trans of the will of the Chief Executive instead of independent deliberators upon the country's problems.

Ex-President Taft has said this of the situation in which we find ourselves:

The unified leadership he (the President) asks is autocratic power in fields in which the Constitution and principles of democracy require that he should consult other representatives of the people than himself. In pursuit of his policies he consults neither his own party nor any other. He wishes a Democratic Senate, not because he would seek the assistance of Democratic Senators in the foreign policy concerning which by the fundamental law they are to advise and consent, but because he can mold them absolutely to his will without consulting them. He has visited his displeasure on every Democratic Member of either House who has differed with him and called upon that Member's constituency to reject him.

Is it necessary for the country's welfare that he should be absolutely ruler of this Nation for the two years ensuing from March 4 next? That is the premise upon which the soundness of his appeal, in its ultimate analysis, must rest. Do we need during the life of the next Congress a dictator? One who knows the facts of this war and our part in it and who loves liberty and popular government must answer "no." The war is nearly won. It may take a year longer. We hope it will be less. The complex questions of the terms of peace are to be settled in the term of the Congress now to be elected.

The still more difficult questions of reconstruction after the war are to be met by that Congress. Do the American people by their action in the next election wish to make both the terms of peace and the reconstruction after the war depend on the uncontrolled will of Woodrow Wilson? That is the issue which he puts to them in his appeal. "Unless you give me uncontrolled power you repudiate me and my leadership before the world." *Aut Cæsar aut nullus.*

When there is talk of the abdication of the Kaiser it is a peculiar moment to propose that the American people should abdicate their right to have opinions or that the Senate and the House should abdicate their sworn and independent duties.

I ask Senators whether it is the will of the American people or the will of Woodrow Wilson that is to determine the policy of the United States in the two matters of ending this war and of founding a future peace? I ask them whether they propose to subject the vital interests of the American people to their own independent judgment or whether they are content, before their conscience and their country, to be the mere registrars of the will of one man? This is the issue before us.

The abdication of their constitutional duty of independent judgment by the Senate or by the House spells autocracy. No more; no less. If Democratic Members are for such abdication, if they are reluctant to join their Republican colleagues in nonpartisan, independent scrutiny of proposed policies, in insistence upon information and upon rightful share, on behalf of the people, in the determination of the courses of the American Government at this most grave and difficult time, then truly the coming elections have for the American people a transcendent importance.

During the period from 1914 until to-day, Senators will remember, the President has expressed, and always with the same solemn emphasis, the greatest possible variety of ideas and attitudes upon the nature of the war, upon America's relation to the war, and, what is now most in point, upon the terms upon which America is willing to live at peace with Germany and the world. I need not weary you with recital of how the winds of administration opinion have veered all around the compass from exaggerated neutrality even of thought; through a pride too great to be provoked to fight; through readiness, after the *Lusitania*, to compromise the U-boat barbarity as a breach of world law in return for a half-hearted promise to try to spare our ships; through the idea of peace without victory, and so forth and so forth, the long way around to "force without stint." This strange evolution, too, has not connoted the revealing of fundamental facts that need ever have been hidden from the clear eye of wise statesmanship. I ask, then, this question: With what reason can the Senate, can the American people, be asked to assume for the latest ideas scattered through the address of January 8, 1918, and all the later addresses, an immutable wisdom evidently lacking in the earlier ones? Yet these latest ideas, still in indefinite form, have actually been officially referred to, some as terms, others as principles, of settlement. Be they wise and safe or be they foolish and dangerous, that is not the question. The question is, Shall the conditions upon which the Senate and the American people believe they can safely live at peace with Germany and with the world—shall these conditions be decided by the fiat of one man, or shall they be tested by the unbiased, sober judgment of the Nation's representatives whose duty it will be to accept or reject, by a two-thirds vote, whatever terms may be finally presented to end war and to establish lasting peace?

Are the American people a free people of high spirit and of an intellectual ability and energy equal to the obligation of democracy, the obligation to form and to assert, through their chosen representatives, their judgment upon the policies of their country? Or are we merely a complacent people, intellectually indolent, lazily acquiescent, looking for masters and

not for leaders? Which is the true American? Which type is the Senate to reflect in its action and thought on behalf of the Nation?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I am glad that the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. Knox] has brought this matter before the Senate and before the country at this time as he has, because it affords an opportunity to state the facts of the case in such a way as it seems to me will go far to relieve the fears and the objections to which the Senator from Pennsylvania gives voice.

Condensed, the anxiety of the Senator from Pennsylvania seems to be that the President of the United States will take into his own hands the decision of the settlement of this war. It seems to me the course of recent history indicates that the President has pursued the natural and the logical course which he is called upon to pursue, and that he occupies at this time an impregnable position.

As long ago as the 8th of January the President of the United States asked the two Houses of Congress to meet him in joint session. He came before that joint session at that time and delivered a message in which he boiled down into 14 propositions what he deemed to be the minimum essentials of peace terms which the United States should insist upon. Now, certainly that act of laying his views before the Congress did not have any relation to an attempt, in secret and personally, to settle the war alone. He took the Congress into his confidence, practically seeking its cooperation.

Mr. President, what was done with that message of the President? Ordinarily messages of the President recommending policies, or stating his attitude upon policies, are referred to the committee or committees having jurisdiction of the matter; and then is the time for anyone having opposition to those views, or proposing to question that they embody the attitude of the country, to come forward and state his case.

Was opposition raised? Was any effort made to refer this great message to one or more committees? Did anyone stand here upon the floor of the Senate to question the American principles of peace laid down in the President's message? No, Mr. President. On the other hand, almost as with one voice, Senators and Representatives, Republicans and Democrats, here and throughout the country, newspapers of both parties and all parties, acclaimed that declaration of the American terms of peace as a correct statement of the attitude of the United States.

I shall not refer to many of these statements, but I want to refer to a few statements of Republican Senators and Representatives. Before I do that, however, I want to refer to the present partisan effort on the part of the Republican Party and its responsible leaders to make political campaign issue out of article 3 of the President's declaration of terms of peace. As I said, no opposition was raised at the time; but in the exigency of this political campaign, and for the purpose of furthering an attempt to secure control of the Senate and the House of Representatives, the Republican organization has gone to work not merely to exploit this article 3 of the terms of peace, but to misrepresent its purpose and its purport.

I want to read to the Senate now an extract from a document sent out by the national Republican congressional committee under date of October 21:

WASHINGTON, D. C., October 20.

The Democratic Party is committed to a free-trade policy.

In the 14 terms in President Wilson's peace program, stated to Congress January 8, the third clause reads:

"The removal, as far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance."

Now I come again to what the national Republican congressional committee says:

This is a positive declaration that the treaty of peace must guarantee to Germany free trade with the United States, without any tariff safeguards whatever to protect the American laborer, manufacturer, farmer, and business man from foreign competition in his home markets.

Under such a policy Germany will buy raw materials in the United States, manufacture these materials in Germany, and sell the manufactured products in American markets in competition with similar products "made in America" by American manufacturers, without the slightest tariff restrictions for the protection of American labor, business, and farming.

Mr. President, that was a misrepresentation of article 3. That was an attempt to make political capital by the false statement that the President was endeavoring to put into a treaty a permanent commitment of the United States for free trade. I have no doubt that it was a misrepresentation.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an inquiry on that point?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Yes.

Mr. PENROSE. I want to say to the Senator that I have made no public comment upon that paragraph of the President's message; but my own conclusion, as I understand the English language, was that the President did mean a free-trade propaganda. I may be unusually dumb in reading the presidential messages; I do not know.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, that may be the Senator's conclusion now, but he certainly did not come forward and say so at the time. He did not stand upon the floor of the Senate and condemn this specification of peace terms on the ground that it meant free trade; and, on the other hand, a number of his associates publicly indorsed the President's message.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I want to state to the Senator on that point that I was restrained by some of my colleagues from criticizing that part of the message. I mentioned it to some of them sitting in the vicinity here, and they suggested that it would come with greater propriety at a later date. We certainly can not be expected to criticize every day the presidential utterances, or we would do nothing else. I do not want the Senator to think that silence means acquiescence by any means.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, it was not altogether a matter of silence. In the Washington paper next day former Speaker CANNON said:

The President is always strong in his addresses. I wish this one could be read to every man, woman, and child and thoroughly explained in Germany and Austria.

And Representative FESS, who has now come forward and signed a bitter partisan appeal to the American people, based largely upon this misrepresentation of article 3, in that same paper used this language:

I am wonderfully pleased with the message. It contains no cheap diplomacy. It is very firmly stated, leaving no doubt that Germany must be defeated as a condition of peace. It reassures the country that the loss of life and treasure thus far will not be wasted by an inconclusive peace which if made at this stage would be deferring the time when this Nation would be called upon to make a test with Germany. We are in a better position now to make that test than we will be in the future.

And Representative GILLETT, leader of the Republican minority on the floor of the House of Representatives, said:

I am in hearty accord with the President's address unless he meant universal free trade by his allusion of economic freedom, and I do not believe that could have been his intention.

And yet Representative GILLETT is also a signer of this partisan appeal, which proposes to deprive the President of a supporting majority in Congress.

The senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] was quoted thus briefly and effectively:

It is a very able message, presenting a concrete proposition.

So it was not altogether the negative action of Senators like the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] who restrained themselves for a more "propitious" occasion—when a campaign might be on, for instance—but it was the affirmative statement of Republican leaders at that time which gave the impression and justified the conclusion that the people of the United States of all parties were behind the President in his address of January 8; and not until this campaign comes on, in an effort to secure control of the Congress, does it develop that there is criticism.

But, Mr. President, I am not going to leave this matter of the meaning of article 3 in any doubt.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, before the Senator leaves this subject, may I ask him a question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Massachusetts?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. LODGE. The other day the President wrote a note to Austria with which I was in very full sympathy, in which he said, referring to one of the 14 points, that times had changed since that was written; that we had recognized the Czechoslovaks, and so forth; and he was quite right. Times have changed. Is the President the only person to whom times have changed? Is he alone to have the right to change his mind? He exercises it freely.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I suppose the Senator from Massachusetts means that when this declaration of the position of the United States was made, the Republicans indorsed it then, while now for some reason they are raising a question about it.

Mr. LODGE. I never indorsed it, Mr. President. I said it was an able message. It was. I took pains the other day, when I was speaking, to say that with some of the 14 points I agreed. I do agree with some of them. I agree with the one about Poland. It is definite. I disagreed from the beginning utterly with the one about Turkey, which proposes as the thing that we should make secure the sovereignty of Turkey over the

Ottoman Turks. I do not think we went to war to make any part of Turkish sovereignty secure.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I trust the Senator will not divert me from the question at issue.

Mr. LODGE. No; I will not divert the Senator. I beg his pardon.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. We have here a very plain proposition. I am willing to be interrupted for any question, but I want to stick to the issue. The issue is the proposition I have made, that the President of the United States, in fulfilling his highest duty, nine months ago came to the Congress of the United States and proposed terms of peace which should represent the minimum demands of the United States—not the demands of other countries, but our demands. That proposition was accepted with practical unanimity by House and Senate, by the country, by newspapers, and by individuals; and now, at this late day, in the midst of a campaign, an effort is made—for partisan purposes, I believe—to misrepresent and distort article 3, which relates to trade conditions.

Mr. President, I felt that this attempt to misrepresent that article should receive some attention from the President of the United States; and about a week ago I addressed a letter to him, asking if he did not think it might be wise for him to pay some attention to those misrepresentations.

While I had not originally intended to do so, I am now going to read into the RECORD the reply which the President sent me at that time:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, 23 October, 1918.

MY DEAR SENATOR: In reply to your letter of October 21st, let me say that it seems to me really not worth while to answer the Republican attacks on article 3 of the peace terms I suggested in my address of January 8th. The words I used are perfectly clear to any honest mind. They leave every nation free to determine its own economic policy, except in the one particular that its policy must be the same for all other nations and not be compounded of hostile discriminations between one nation and another, such weapons of discrimination being left to the joint action of the nations for the purpose of disciplining those who will not submit to the general program of justice and equality.

It would be impossible to follow up all the perversions and misrepresentations that some of the Republicans are now indulging in, and my own judgment is that we can safely leave the matter to the good sense of our fellow countrymen who can read English.

Sincerely yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

HON. G. M. HITCHCOCK,
United States Senate.

MR. KELLOGG. Mr. President—

THE PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Minnesota?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

MR. KELLOGG. After having read the letter, will the Senator please tell us what the economic barriers are which should be removed?

MR. HITCHCOCK. I prefer not to go any further in placing an interpretation on that language than the President has gone. We are not here for a refinement of terms.

This is the fact, Mr. President, that the President laid the matter before the country nine months ago as to what he believed the terms of peace should be. The terms were accepted by this country and the President has felt justified and has been justified in assuming that they represented the will of the country. He has gone forward.

MR. KELLOGG. I ask in perfect good faith. I want to know what those economic barriers are, and if it is so perfectly plain from the letter I think the Senator might inform us.

MR. HITCHCOCK. I am sure the Senator is as capable of placing an interpretation on it as I am, and I only omit to do so because I want to speak to the point and yield to my friend, Senator PITTMAN, who kindly gave me the floor.

The President must have the initiative in any negotiations, whether they are with our enemy, Germany, or with our allies engaged in this war, Great Britain, France, Italy, and other countries. He must have the initiative. It belongs to him. Knowing that he has the initiative he told us nine months ago what he proposed to stand for; and he has stood for it consistently with such modifications since that time as the events of the war called for.

Senators need not assume that the President is going to secretly negotiate a treaty and force it through the Senate. Senators know very well that a treaty before it can go into effect must have the approval of two-thirds of the Senate. It must not only have the approval of all the Democrats who might sympathize with the President, but it must also have the approval of enough Republicans to make the two-thirds majority required by the Constitution. That is not all. The President has got to have, must have, the full approval of our associates in this war. Then why assume and assert that he is attempting

as an autocrat to dictate terms of peace? He is merely carrying out what he believes to be the will of the American people and is standing for the ideas the country accepted with approval nine months ago.

Mr. President, before I sit down I may say that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], not having any knowledge of my action, a week later addressed a letter to the President of the United States, calling his attention to the same political assault being made upon article 3. If the Senate will permit, I will insert it in the RECORD without taking the time to read it, or would the Senator prefer that I should read it?

Mr. SIMMONS. Let the Senator read it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will read it. The letter from Senator SIMMONS can be inserted in the RECORD without reading.

The letter referred to is as follows:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCE,
October 26, 1918.

To the PRESIDENT,
White House.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: Certain Republican leaders are attempting to make a partisan use of paragraph 3 of your peace terms found in your address to Congress January 8, 1918. No one has authority to reply to a misconstruction of any part of your address excepting yourself; but I, as chairman of the Finance Committee of the Senate, wish you would make a reply to these statements and insinuations which are being industriously circulated by the opposition to embarrass you in the handling of these delicate matters.

Sincerely yours,

F. M. SIMMONS.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The reply of the President is as follows. It is dated the 28th of October:

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, October 28, 1918.

Hon. F. M. SIMMONS,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR: I am glad to respond to the question addressed to me by your letter of October 26. The words I used in my address to the Congress of January 8, 1918, were:

"The removal, so far as possible, of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance."

I, of course, meant to suggest no restriction upon the free determination by any nation of its own economic policy, but only that, whatever tariff any nation might deem necessary for its own economic service, be that tariff high or low. It should apply equally to all foreign nations; in other words, that there should be no discriminations against some nations that did not apply to others. This leaves every nation free to determine for itself its own internal policies, and limits only its right to compound those policies of hostile discriminations between one nation and another. Weapons of economic discipline and punishment should be left to the joint action of all nations for the purpose of punishing those who will not submit to a general program of justice and equality.

The experiences of the past among nations have taught us that the attempt by one nation to punish another by exclusive and discriminatory trade agreements has been a prolific breeder of that kind of antagonism which oftentimes results in war, and that if a permanent peace is to be established among nations every obstacle that has stood in the way of international friendship should be cast aside. It was with that fundamental purpose in mind that I announced this principle in my address of January 8. To pervert this great principle for partisan purposes and to inject the bogey free trade, which is not involved at all, is to attempt to divert the mind of the Nation from the broad and humane principle of a durable peace by introducing an internal question of quite another kind. American business has in the past been unaffected by a policy of the kind suggested, and it has nothing to fear now from a policy of simple international justice. It is, indeed, lamentable that the momentous issues of this solemn hour should be seized upon in an effort to bend them to partisan service. To the initiated and discerning, the motive is transparent and the attempt fails.

Sincerely yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Will the Senator from Nebraska yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I yield.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. As the Senator from Nebraska understands that letter, would it not prevent any discrimination by the United States against goods produced in Germany?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It would; it has that effect. It leaves that to the league composed of nations with which we are associated now in war and with which we will be associated in the league of nations to maintain peace.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator is saying these 14 points constitute the conditions precedent upon which any peace may be made and they are the minimum to be demanded by the United States. If those 14 points, including this one, as explained by the President and agreed to by the other nations, prevent either us or the other nations from ever discriminating by a tariff against any goods produced in Germany, I simply want to get it in the RECORD that that is the Senator's understanding of the President's paragraph 3.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The President maintains that such discrimination is an international matter involving the peace of the world and should be left to the league of nations.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Of course it is an international matter, and inasmuch as it is an international matter and the Senate

will be called upon to confirm the treaty by which the war is settled, it becomes pertinent that the Senate should understand what is meant by these various theories on these various points.

Mr. PENROSE. Do I understand the Senator from Nebraska to say that the determination of an American tariff is an international matter?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. No, sir; not at all; quite the opposite. An American tariff is a matter for the American Congress.

Mr. PENROSE. So, regardless of any other nation on the face of the earth—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But the use of the tariff as a hostile war measure is a matter for the league of nations.

Mr. PENROSE. Then I understand that the league of nations is to have some kind of a right to pass upon whether an American tariff is equitable to all nations or not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Not at all.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator from Nebraska is just as obscure to my mind as the President of the United States as to the meaning of article No. 3.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am very glad to be in that company. If I am no more obscure I am very fortunate.

Mr. PENROSE. What does the Senator mean?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I have stated my meaning, and I am willing to leave it at that. I merely rose because I thought the time had come when it should be frankly stated here definitely, and the matter called to the attention of the country, that Congress received from the President, as it received nine months ago, a definite statement of his idea of war terms and that Congress as well as the whole country practically accepted those war terms. Not only that, but later when Austria asked of the United States what terms of peace she could have, the President replied, "You know already what the terms of peace are"; and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and other Republican Senators, acclaimed the response as happy and adequate to the situation. They evidently knew and approved the American terms of peace.

Mr. PENROSE. I asked the question of the Senator in entire good faith. Will the Senator enlighten me as to this final point, and then I am done? Under the President's economic theory when peace among the nations of the world is declared, would the United States have a right to make a more favorable economic agreement with the allies than with Germany?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am going to state it in my own words and not in the language of the Senator from Pennsylvania. The United States would have the right to make any tariff it pleased against the whole world, but if the treaty is made and includes the terms outlined January 8, and Great Britain and France and Italy and our associates agree to it, it would be then improper for the United States to adopt a tariff discriminating between nations. Such a tariff if hostile toward any nation would be practically commercial war against that nation. That the President opposes.

Mr. PENROSE. Including Germany?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Any nation.

Mr. PENROSE. Then German goods must be left to come in under the presidential theories on the same equality the allies would have.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That does not follow.

Mr. PENROSE. It comes very near following. I am glad I smoked the Senator out.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What follows is that if a league of nations is formed, and if the United States agrees to its formation and Great Britain agrees to its formation and France agrees to its formation and the other nations agree to its formation, the league of nations will take jurisdiction over the question of hostile tariffs or trade barriers to discipline a nation where it is engaged in something contrary to the peace of the world.

Mr. PITTMAN obtained the floor.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, I just want to make a brief statement. Then the Senator may want to speak at length. It will take me only a minute.

Mr. PITTMAN. I will yield to the Senator.

Mr. PENROSE. The Senator from Nebraska has made reference to this solemn hour, and it is a correct statement of facts, but partakes a little of cant in view of the following telegram I have been asked to read to the Senate. I will ask the Secretary to read it.

The Secretary read as follows:

Hon. BOIES PENROSE,
United States Senate, Washington:

The Postmaster General's office is sending out to every postmaster in Nevada the following personal letter:

"MY DEAR MR. _____, Postmaster: I know the Postmaster General feels a deep interest in the senatorial race in your State. He has come to know Senator HENDERSON quite well since his service in the Senate and esteems him highly. Will you drop me a line as to the out-

RENO, NEV., October 24, 1918.

look for the Senator at your voting box? As you may know, for 17 years I was the private secretary of the Postmaster, and am still with him in the department. Inclosed please find stamped envelope for your reply. Thanking you in advance for your attention to this request, I am,

"Yours, truly,
RUSKIN MCARDLE."

I suggest that you give this damnable outrage fullest publicity.
HARRY J. HUMPHREYS,
State Chairman Republican State Central Committee.

Mr. PENROSE. Now, Mr. President, I am through. This young Democrat who writes this letter was covered into the civil service by presidential order, a favorite method, and his biography is to be found in an available publication issued by the Government. I desire to have inserted in the RECORD as a part of my remarks—it is not necessary to read it—the civil-service rules and regulations concerning the activity of persons within the classified service in connection with elections.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter will be inserted in the RECORD. The Chair hears no objection, and it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

IV.—POLITICAL CONDUCT.

SECTION 162—POSTAL LAWS AND REGULATIONS.

No person in the executive civil service shall use his official authority or influence for the purpose of interfering with an election or affecting the results thereof. Persons who by the provisions of these rules are in the competitive classified service, while retaining the right to vote as they please and to express privately their opinions on all political subjects, shall take no active part in political management or political campaigns.

Officers and employees of the Post Office Department and Postal Service are not precluded from exercising their political privileges, but shall not use their official positions to control elections or political movements.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, on October 10 I announced on this floor that the issue in the present campaign is between the policies and principles pronounced by Woodrow Wilson for a lasting world's peace and for reconstruction after the war and the policies and principles of the leaders of the Republican Party as they appear from their statements in this body and in the public forum. If there was any doubt with regard to the political issue that was being made by the Republican leaders, that doubt has disappeared to-day. The Republican leaders are seeking an issue for the sole purpose of attempting to establish themselves in power in the Senate and in the House of Representatives, not for the purpose of aiding in carrying out this war, because they do not condemn the conduct of the war. They dare not attempt to condemn the conduct of the war.

Never in all history have preparations been made so expeditiously and a war carried out with such vigor, ability, and grandeur as the war of America and its allies against Germany has been carried out. And yet, unless the Republican Party has an issue it has got to stand by and see the people continue in power an administration that has carried on this war successfully and has laid down a peace program that will be carried out if the Democratic majority is maintained in the Senate and House of Representatives.

They raise their hands in holy horror because, they charge, the President was insincere on January 8 at the time he delivered his message to Congress when he said politics was adjourned. The President has given no evidence of insincerity, and they have not been able to place their finger on a spot save and except his message to the American people delivered a few days ago. They know that that message was not delivered to the American people until Republican leaders and the Republican Party and the Republican campaign managers had been in politics for months in violation of the armistice that he tried to establish on January 8.

The Republican Party charges the President with violating a proposition he made that politics be adjourned, and yet as far back as February 14, 1918, a telegram of Will H. Hays, who had then been elected chairman of the Republican national committee, was quoted as follows in the public press:

I accept the chairmanship with a full knowledge of the responsibility—responsibility multiplied many times by reason of a national situation and the reconstruction that is to come.

Everyone knows that there will be political activity. The Democratic Party has been busy for months. This political activity should be open and accepted and of a character and on a plane that needs no subterfuge.

And again later, on February 26, 1918, the Republican congressional committee gave a reception at the Willard Hotel, in Washington, at which they entertained Mr. Hays. All factions, both Republican and Progressive Parties, attended the gathering. In the New York Times of February 20 it was stated that Mr. Hays had called upon Mr. Roosevelt and ex-Justice Charles E. Hughes and had talked over the political situation with them. Ex-President Taft wired him congratulations, and Mr. Hays was to talk on February 27 with Senator JOHNSON of California and Representative MEDILL MCCORMICK,

of Illinois, representing the Progressive wing. Mr. Hays is quoted as saying:

The country needs to-day, as it never needed before, a united militant Republican Party. Every man who ever voted the Republican ticket, and most every other disinterested individual, knows that this is true, and what this country needs it is the duty of every man to give, regardless of personal influence, anger, pique, greed, or ambition. * * * I do not care how a man voted in 1912, 1914, and 1916, nor his reason for so doing. We are all one to-day, for we have work to do for the good of the country, and it takes us all to do it.

Again, you will find on March 2 that a luncheon was given at 120 Broadway, New York, in honor of Mr. William R. Willcox, the retiring chairman of the Republican national committee.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. PITTMAN. I shall do so when I finish this sentence. On that occasion there was again a meeting of Republicans and again political speeches were made. Now I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. I merely wish to correct the Senator in his statement that it was January 8 that the President made this proposition. It was May 27, long after the occurrences of which the Senator now speaks, that the President declared that politics was adjourned.

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator from Wisconsin is correct; but the activities of Mr. Hays and the Republican leaders never moderated. Subsequent to that time ex-President Roosevelt, the self-announced candidate of the Republican Party for the Presidency, a man who no leading Republican dare deny will be their candidate—not particularly because they want him, but because he is the only man who has the temerity to make an issue against the Democratic Party when there is no issue—ex-President Roosevelt ever since the President proposed an armistice has been engaging in politics throughout the United States at all times. Will H. Hays has been busy at all times since the declaration was made by the President for an armistice. Not only that, but under the guise of a liberty-loan campaign the admitted candidate of the Republican Party for the Presidency for a third term spoke politics from one end of this country to the other and apparently sought to speak in those States where there were close contests for the United States Senate.

If anyone doubts that the liberty-loan speeches which he made were of a political character, I ask him to read them. They have been printed. He stated in Montana, when he commenced his speech making, that the liberty loan having already been oversubscribed, he had nothing to say upon that subject; and then he attacked the proposal for a league of nations; then he attacked the principle of a gradual reduction of the armaments of nations. Again, he uttered his militaristic principles throughout Montana. Again, by every form of insinuation, of which he is a master, he attempted to convince the people of Montana that the Government was now in wishy-washy hands; and he attempted to convince them in all of his speeches there that there was but one hope of this Government, and that was in the election of a Republican majority in the Senate and in the House of Representatives. Yet you condemn the President of the United States because he addresses the American people with regard to these issues that he considers more vital than any that have ever affected our people since the days of the Revolution.

What Democrats have been speaking of politics throughout the country? When did that occur? What Democrats were speaking politics upon the floor of this body until the armistice was violated by Senators on the other side of the Chamber? I suppose that you on the other side feel that you have the right, through interviews, through public speeches, through speeches in this body, to discredit the President of the United States; yes, to go further—to attempt to destroy the great humane program that he has for a lasting world peace; and you expect the President to stand mute through false modesty while you obtain the control of the Senate and the House of Representatives. You do not know that the President of the United States can rise above miserable, contemptible party politics; you can not understand that. You can not understand why any President in the hour of need, when the great prize that we must receive after this war is about to come to us is being grasped out of his hands for partisan purposes, should appeal directly to the people of the country to cast those who attempt that down into utter darkness and support him as they have supported him in the past.

There is no doubt that some of you on the other side—there is no doubt there are some of the Republican leaders throughout the country—who sincerely differ from the President of the United States. There are some of them who can not understand that humanity has any place in law; there are some of them who can not dream of justice ever controlling and directing

nations as it directs individuals within nations; there are some of them—and they are the leaders to-day of the Republican Party—who believe that the only right, the only justice, is force, force, force to the end. I am not attacking the sincerity of those men. I pity them; I pity them as I would pity a murderer who was guilty of murder by reason of a form of insanity. I know some of the leaders on the other side whose ice-bound souls could never understand what a world democracy means. I know that there are Members on the other side to whom the very name democracy is the cause of silent mirth. Those men only differ from the Kaiser in that they are jealous and resent the power of the Kaiser that they themselves would exert with happiness and pleasure if it were in their power to do so.

Oh, the President of the United States in his message has stated that we must do justice not only to those to whom we want to do justice, but to those to whom we do not desire to do justice. That is a principle of humanity; that is a principle of Christianity; and yet that principle arouses the anger, arouses the contempt, of the leader of the Republican Party, arouses his ire to such an extent that he publicly condemns it as silly, as foolish, as mischievous. Yet the President of the United States under attacks of this character is supposed by these leaders to sit silently by and see not only a Nation but the world cast back hundreds of years because, forsooth, he might personally be charged by some one with an ulterior political purpose. Listen to this charge and tell me if there are any Republicans on the other side who indorse it. I know there are few who indorse it in their hearts; I know they permit it to go out as an argument throughout this country, and that they will utilize it for the pure, simple, unjustifiable purpose of getting back here and nothing else. Listen to this by the chairman of the Republican national committee, Mr. Will H. Hays, speaking of the address of the President of the United States to the people of the United States. What does he say?

A more ungracious, more unjust, more wanton, more mendacious accusation was never made by the most reckless stump orator, much less by a President of the United States, for partisan purposes.

The chairman of the Republican national committee charges the President of the United States with making a mendacious statement. I do not know whether Mr. Hays believes that; I do not know whether Mr. Hays made that as a serious expression of his party's viewpoint of the President of the United States or whether it is due to an immaturity of mind; I do not know whether that represents the character of the present Republican Party or whether it represents the ignorance of the present Republican Party; yet the leaders of the Republican Party issue a statement in answer to the President's message to the people, and in that statement they insinuate that he has violated his agreement of an armistice between the parties by the issuing of this statement. The leaders of the Republican Party know that he stood to the utmost and to the last minute the worst character of political attack that has ever been made by any party before he found that it was his duty to come to the front.

When was it that the leaders of the Republican Party were opposed to doing justice to those they did not like as well as to those they did like? When was it that the Republican Party turned its back upon the effort of the world to reduce armaments? When was it that the Republican Party was willing to trample under foot the hope of all of the liberty-loving people of the world that they might get together and in one great combine rectify the wrongs of nations and perpetuate peace? When was it that the attacks upon these great principles of the President commenced? Not until it became necessary to make an issue with the President. They now shamelessly take that stand and attempt to defend it.

The Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE], long one of the leaders of the Republican side and now a leader of the Republican side, has answered. He has answered that he did not make objection to the President's principles at an earlier date because he wanted to await a more opportune time. Are not these principles too sacred to the people of this country, are they not too necessary to the people of the world, to be held as a tool of petty politics? Would the Senator from Pennsylvania conceal a mischievous, treacherous provision in these 14 articles of the President for months and months, with the danger that they might be enforced to the detriment of his own people, in order that he might obtain a political advantage at the right time? Is that politics or is that patriotism?

Let us see. I want to read you in a few minutes what the leader of your party says on this subject, but in the meantime let me read the sentiment of the Republican Party; let me set out the issue that the Republican Party are making through their leader in this campaign. You know what that issue is

as made by the Republican leaders, do you not? That the President of the United States is incompetent; that the President of the United States is dealing with mischievous, treacherous principles; that the President is about to do something that will be virtually a surrender of the United States to Germany. Those are the statements, practically and substantially, of the Republican ex-President and candidate for a third time as President of the United States, and the Republican Party have not the nerve to deny them. I will take that back and will say that the leaders of the Republican Party, the officeholders of the Republican Party, have not the nerve, have not the manhood, have not the humanity and the patriotism to throw those words back in the teeth of their perpetual candidate. If they would only find out once and for all that whenever an office seeker becomes a perpetual candidate, when he has an obsession for something for himself, he ceases to be of value to the country or to anybody else.

Listen to this; listen to what your leader says; listen to the platform of the Republican Party. On October 17, in a signed article in a Kansas City paper, Mr. Theodore Roosevelt says this:

As regards some of the points, either the meaning is so muddy as to be wholly incomprehensible or else the proposals are very treacherous.

There is a statement, not by an ignorant man, not by a man unfamiliar with diplomatic language. There is a statement by a man who has served as President of the United States, and he insinuates that the proposals of the President of the United States are treacherous!

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, will the Senator submit to an interruption?

Mr. PITTMAN. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I would suggest that that criticism of the ex-President and the ex-Progressive and the ex-Republican and the ex-Colonel Roosevelt was not only denied at the time of its fulmination by everybody of prominence that we heard from in the United States, but the denial met with the absolute approbation of every one of our allies in this war—every one of them.

Mr. PITTMAN. In the same article this maker of platforms for the Republican Party, this perpetual Republican candidate for the Presidency, this man who has a right to make issues for the Republican Party, this man without asking whose views on the matter no Republican leader will dare speak, goes further. He says, in speaking of the President's program for a reduction of armaments and for a league of nations, this:

I gravely doubt whether a more silly or more mischievous plan was ever seriously proposed by the ruler of a great nation.

That is the issue. The Republican Party are opposed to the reduction of armaments. The Republican Party are opposed to the utilization of a league of nations as an instrumentality to hold down the increase in armaments and to rectify the little wrongs which frequently cause wars between nations. I am not here to argue now the question of a league of nations or a reduction of armaments. I stand for both. I am here to show the stand of the Republican Party as announced through their own leaders. The statesmen of the civilized world to-day, with the exception of the few in the Republican Party who are seeking office or following their candidate, stand for a reduction of armaments and a league of nations.

James Bryce, former ambassador to this country, and one of the greatest Englishmen alive to-day, stands for a league of nations. Lloyd-George, next to the President of the United States the most pronounced statesman of this era, stands for a league of nations and for a reduction of armaments.

Oh, the Republican Party have their issues. God pity the Republican Party! God pity the Republicans who have got to have these men who now constitute themselves the leaders of the Republicans Party write their platforms for them!

Ah, there are thousands of intelligent, high-class Republicans in my State who I know will never follow your candidate, will never follow your leaders against a reduction of armaments and a league of nations. It is pure delusion to think they will. They will not stay with you. Your chances are gone. Those were the statements of your candidate; those were the statements of the leader of your party; and your floor leader on that side, the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], will not deny, I believe, that he concurs entirely with the position taken by Theodore Roosevelt. If he does not agree with him, there is every opportunity for him to state that he does not agree with him.

The Senator from Massachusetts, the leader of the Republicans in this body, has stated his opposition to a league of nations. He has stated his opposition to the 14 points of the President. Oh, yes; not only has he stated his opposition to the President's pronounced words and programs and promises but he has gone further; he has shown his lack of confidence in the Chief Executive of this country. He has shown his lack of respect for a

man who is respected throughout the world to-day. He has questioned the leadership of Woodrow Wilson when his leadership is admitted by Great Britain, by France, by Italy, by all of our allies, and by all the neutral countries of the world.

That is your issue. You have made it. You will stay with it. You will fight for militarism of the Czar's kind—not for victory that there may be peace and justice throughout the world, but victory that you may make something out of it, that you may make a profit out of victory. Oh, yes; and in this hour, when the principles that must control the world for years and years to come are under consideration, instead of helping the President, who has the constitutional authority to negotiate those principles, you are doing everything in your power to discredit and obstruct him.

What do you suggest in lieu of a league of nations? What do you suggest in lieu of the reduction of armaments? Nothing except an alliance—an alliance such as Germany had with Austria and Italy; an alliance such as Great Britain had with France and with Russia; an alliance such as has existed from the very beginning of history, and has been, if not the cause, at least the opportunity of every war since the beginning of time. Every Senator on that side who speaks for his party speaks for the old theories of life, for the old theories of nations, for force, for war, for murder, for death, for slaughters throughout all time, and not one word for justice or humanity or peace in the future. Those thoughts are in their souls. They have not lived the lives that lead men to think of justice, humanity, and democracy; and yet they, by fortuitous circumstances, are to-day the leaders of the great Republican Party in the United States—a party that anyone must admit has done wonderful good in its time. They are its leaders, and no matter who the Republicans may elect to this body or to the House of Representatives, those leaders will dominate and control and mold them to their way of thinking.

Oh, yes; suppose you should put five Progressive Republicans on that side, as it is constituted to-day. They would have just as much chance as a humanitarian would have to-day in the palace of the Kaiser. In one week's time they would not know whether they were on the other side of the Chamber or not. They would not know where they were or what their duties were; and yet the Republican leaders urge in one voice that they want Republicans here so as to support the President of the United States, and in the next voice they say that the President of the United States is unworthy of support. In one voice they say that they have supported the President better than the Democrats have supported him, and in the next voice, through their leader, through their perpetual candidate for the Presidency, they warn the people of the country to elect Republicans to the Senate and the House, so that the President will not have his own way and so that they can control the actions of the President.

Is that consistency? Which side do they intend to take? They know that they can not pick out any past events of this administration as the grounds of attack; therefore they are looking to the future for an issue. They not only are moved by their desire for militaristic power in the world, but they are moved by a greed which has been stimulated by an opportunity that never before existed in this country.

The Government of the United States to-day is more powerful than in all of its history. The Government of the United States to-day is more powerful than any other democratic government in the world. The Government of the United States to-day has its hand more closely upon the industry and life of the people than ever before in its history, and that life and that industry would be in danger if the reins of the Government were not in the hands of a man and supported by a Congress who believe in the people, who believe in democracy, and who believe in humanity. Oh, yes; the issues in this campaign do amount to something to the people of this country, and it was the duty of the President of the United States, in view of the character of campaign that was being made, to submit those facts to the people.

I have charged that the civilized world stood for the propositions of President Wilson. Let me read what Lloyd-George had to say with regard to the program of the President of the United States. This speech was delivered on July 5, 1918, at the battle front in France. In it he said:

President Wilson yesterday made it clear what we are fighting for. If the Kaiser and his advisers will accept the conditions voiced by the President they can have peace with America, peace with France, peace with Great Britain to-morrow. But he has given no indication of an intention to do so. Because he will not do so is the very reason we all are fighting.

Lloyd-George sustained it. Take the statement of Bryce, to which I referred before. It is reported in a telegram from London under date of January 10:

The address is admirable in spirit and contents. Mr. Wilson rightly points out that an international combination to arrest the aggressions of ambitious sovereigns and military castes and to secure the rights of peace-loving peoples is essential to the future well-being of mankind. In his enumeration of objects to be secured by peace, the following points seem specially important:

His broad, clear assertion of the right of a nationality to self-determination, removal of economic barriers to trade, adequate guarantees for reduction of armaments, absolute independence for Belgium and full compensation for her wrongs, sympathetic comprehension and consideration of the present situation of Russia, and deliverance of all subject nationalities from the brutal and sanguinary rule of the Turks.

Those in Great Britain who know how abominable the rule of the Turks has been heartily welcome this declaration and that recently made by the British prime minister that the allies and the United States regard liberation of the Christian and Arab peoples of Armenia, Syria, and Palestine as an essential condition of any just and durable peace.

Let us see what has been said in the past. There is one Republican on the other side who seems to appreciate the meaning of democracy. There is one Senator on the other side who will not utilize the power of misconstruction of language for political purposes. There is one Senator on the other side whose patriotism has always risen above his partisan politics. Yes; there is more than one; there are others. There are some, however, whose every action condemns them to the suspicions of the public. As to those the public will form their own conclusions; but I want to read what the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], a Republican, had to say about the President's 14 points. It was published on January 9 in the New York Times:

Senator BORAH, of Idaho. I am particularly pleased with that part of the message which relates to Russia. I believe it will have a good effect in Russia. I have thought from the beginning of the Russian revolution that we should give more consideration and greater encouragement and sympathy to the people of Russia. I think in this respect the message is admirable.

As to the other portion of the message, I want to say that I am in favor of prosecuting the war to an honorable and permanent peace; that is, as nearly permanent as the human mind can foresee now. Whatever readjustment of territory and other details are essential to that will have to be arranged, but the details can not, in my opinion, be known very far in advance of some intimation of Germany's breaking down.

I say this, however, that I hope we will not get in the habit of discussing territorial readjustment too much. That is the European vice. What we all want is a permanent peace, and anything that is essential to that as matters develop from time to time must be made to harmonize with it.

I think the paragraph of the President's peace terms with reference to trade conditions is also worthy of particular mention. The Paris conference, in my judgment, was a mistake. It was a start along the wrong line, and the President's message dealt with it in a proper manner.

There is the answer to the Senator from Pennsylvania by one of his own Republican colleagues. There is the answer by a Republican whose knowledge of international law and the language of international communication is not exceeded in this body. He says that that statement of the President requires particular attention, and he tells why, in his opinion, the President puts it in that message. He refers to the conference at Paris. He refers to that conference which intimated that it was going to discriminate against the enemy after this war was over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BENET in the chair). The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, it becomes the duty of the Chair to lay before the Senate the unfinished business, which will be stated by the Secretary.

The SECRETARY. A bill (S. 4637) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, two Republican leaders are attempting to find fault with the principles and policies of the President of the United States. They particularize on three points; that providing for a league of nations, that providing for the reduction of armaments, and that providing for a limitation of trade restrictions as far as possible. I have discussed the first two. Now, as to the last. I have read the interpretation placed upon it by the distinguished Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH]. The construction placed upon it by the President of the United States has been read into the RECORD. But the astute politician, who occupies the Senate seat from Pennsylvania, is not satisfied with the assurance of the President of the United States that the provision in no way shall affect the rights of any nation to regulate its own tariff and other economic laws. He is not satisfied with that. He goes further and demands of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to know how this provision will affect Germany. The language itself states how it will affect Germany. The language is so clear that except for the misconstruction placed upon it, it would never have been the subject of argument. It reads as follows:

The removal so far as possible of all economic barriers and the establishment of an equality of trade conditions among all the nations consenting to the peace and associating themselves for its maintenance.

The provision, in the first place, only applies to those nations that associate themselves together under the provisions for a league of nations. If Germany comes into that league of nations, then, of course, Germany will be treated by the United

States as every other member of that league of nations. If there is a league of nations, every nation which is worthy of confidence must be entitled to come into that league or it ceases to be a league of nations, and is simply an alliance. The President has stated under what terms and conditions Germany might enter that league of nations. The distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] seems afraid of free trade or protection or something else. He knows the language there means that as among those nations which shall constitute the league of nations no tariff, no financial law shall be so constructed as to favor one or more of those nations to the prejudice of one or more of the other nations.

Mr. WATSON. Will the Senator allow me?

Mr. PITTMAN. He must know that it makes no difference how high or how low the tariff in all those nations may be, it applies equally or justly to all the other nations.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. PITTMAN. I do.

Mr. WATSON. Did the United States ever have a tariff at any time that did not embody these features aside from a reciprocal arrangement?

Mr. PITTMAN. I think not, and I do not think it ever should have. The only reason why that statement was put forward was not because the United States has ever proposed such a plan but because it has been suggested on behalf of some other nations which will be members of this league of nations. The principle that we shall not utilize our tariff or other economic laws for the purpose of discrimination is recognized in this country, but it may not be recognized in all the other countries, and Woodrow Wilson found it necessary to make that pronouncement.

I ask at this time that I may print in the Record the statement of Representative GILLETT with regard to the President's message of the 8th of January.

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

The statement referred to is as follows:

I am in hearty accord with the President's address unless he meant universal free trade by his allusion of economic freedom, and I do not believe that could have been his intention.

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, I have very little more to say on this matter. I feel that the integrity and the sincerity of the President of the United States having been attacked by the chairman of the national committee of the Republican Party, the President's address, which was the foundation of that attack, should be included in the Record; and in justice, of course, to Mr. Will H. Hays, I will ask that his whole statement be published at this point, following the statement of the President of the United States.

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

The matter referred to is as follows:

THE PRESIDENT'S APPEAL TO YOU.

My fellow countrymen, the congressional elections are at hand. They occur in the most critical period our country has ever faced or is likely to face in our time. If you have approved of my leadership and wish me to continue to be your unembarrassed spokesman in affairs at home and abroad, I earnestly beg that you will express yourselves unmistakably to that effect by returning a Democratic majority to both the Senate and the House of Representatives. I am your servant and will accept your judgment without cavil, but my power to administer the great trust assigned me by the Constitution would be seriously impaired should your judgment be adverse, and I must frankly tell you so because so many critical issues depend upon your verdict. No scruple of taste must in grim times like these be allowed to stand in the way of speaking the plain truth.

I have no thought of suggesting that any political party is paramount in matters of patriotism. I feel too keenly the sacrifices which have been made in this war by all our citizens, irrespective of party affiliations, to harbor such an idea. I mean only that the difficulties and delicacies of our present task are of a sort that makes it imperatively necessary that the Nation should give its undivided support to the Government under a unified leadership, and that a Republican Congress would divide the leadership.

The leaders of the minority in the present Congress have unquestionably been prowar, but they have been antiauthority. At almost every turn, since we entered the war they have sought to take the choice of policy and the conduct of the war out of my hands and put it under the control of instrumentalities of their own choosing. This is no time either for divided counsel or for divided leadership. Unity of command is as necessary now in civil action as it is upon the field of battle. If the control of the House and Senate should be taken away from the party now in power an opposing majority could assume control of legislation and oblige all action to be taken amidst contest and obstruction.

The return of a Republican majority to either House of the Congress would, moreover, certainly be interpreted on the other side of the water as a repudiation of my leadership. Spokesmen of the Republican Party are urging you to elect a Republican Congress in order to back up and support the President, but even if they should in this way impose upon some credulous voters on this side of the water, they would impose on no one on the other side. It is well understood there as well as here that the Republican leaders desire not so much to support the President as to control him. The peoples of the allied countries with whom we are associated against Germany are quite familiar with the significance of elections. They would find it very difficult to believe that the voters

of the United States had chosen to support their President by electing to the Congress a majority controlled by those who are not in fact in sympathy with the attitude and action of the administration.

I need not tell you, my fellow countrymen, that I am asking your support not for my own sake or for the sake of a political party, but for the sake of the Nation itself, in order that its inward unity of purpose may be evident to all the world. In ordinary times I would not feel at liberty to make such an appeal to you. In ordinary times divided counsels can be endured without permanent hurt to the country. But these are not ordinary times. If in these critical days it is your wish to sustain me with undivided minds, I beg that you will say so in a way which it will not be possible to misunderstand either here at home or among our associates on the other side of the sea. I submit my difficulties and my hopes to you.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE,
Washington, D. C., October 25, 1918.

"IDEA OF AUTOCRAT," HAYS CALLS APPEAL BY WILSON FOR DEMOCRATIC CONGRESS.

NEW YORK, October 27.

Will H. Hays, chairman of the Republican national committee, made public here to-night a statement in which he replied in behalf of his party to President Wilson's appeal to the Nation to return a Democratic Congress. In his statement, Mr. Hays said:

"President Wilson has questioned the motives and fidelity of your representatives in Congress. He has thereby impugned their loyalty and denied their patriotism. His challenge is to you who elected those representatives. You owe it to them, to the honor of your great party and to your own self-respect to meet that challenge squarely, not only as Republicans but as Americans. I, as your chairman, call upon you to do it."

"Mr. Wilson accords the Republicans no credit whatever for having supported the 'war measures' proposed by his administration, although they have done so with greater unanimity than the members of his own party. Despite that fact, he accuses them of having tried to usurp his proper functions.

AN INSULT, HE DECLARIES.

"At no time and in no way have they tried to take control of the war out of his hands. The President knows that. The country knows it. You know it. A more ungracious, more unjust, more wanton, more mendacious accusation was never made by the most reckless stump orator, much less by a President of the United States, for partisan purposes. It is an insult not only to every loyal Republican in Congress but to every loyal Republican in the land."

"It fully merits the resentment which rightfully and surely will find expression at the polls."

"Mr. Wilson grudgingly admits that the Republicans have been 'prowar.' Then why does he demand their defeat? Because they are still 'prowar'? Hardly that. No. It is because they are for peace, though not without victory, because they do not believe lasting peace can be obtained through negotiation; because they consider that 'U. S. stands for unconditional surrender as well as for the United States and Uncle Sam.' The Democratic Congress does not. Mr. Wilson does not. There is the issue as clear as the noonday sun. The country will decide."

THE IDEA OF AN AUTOCRAT.

"Mr. Wilson wants only rubber stamps—his rubber stamps—in Congress. He says so. No one knows it better than Democratic Congressmen. He calls for the defeat of prowar Republicans and the election of antiwar Democrats. He, as the Executive, is no longer satisfied to be one branch of the Government, as provided by the Constitution. Republican Congressmen must be defeated and Democratic Congressmen must, as they would, yield in everything. That is evidently his idea—the idea of an autocrat calling himself the servant, but bidding for the mastery of this great, free people."

"Republicans in Congress have seemed to him good enough when they assented, as they did assent with highest patriotism and sometimes against their best judgment, to his proposals. Republicans at home have seemed to him good enough to send fully a million of their sons into battle, to furnish at least half of the Army and far more than half of the money for winning the war. But they are not considered good enough to have a voice in the settlement of the war."

SAYS PRESIDENT WANTS "TWO THINGS."

"But Mr. Wilson's real purpose has nothing to do with the conduct of the war. He has had that from the beginning, has it now, and nobody dreams of interfering with his control. He wants just two things: One is full power to settle the war precisely as he and his sole, unelected, unappointed, unconfirmed personal adviser may determine. The other is full power as the 'unembarrassed spokesman in affairs at home,' as he actually demands in his statement, to reconstruct in peace times the great industrial affairs of the Nation in the same way, in unimpeded conformity with whatever socialist doctrines, whatever unlimited Government-ownership notions, whatever hazy whims may happen to possess him at the time; but, first and above all, with absolute commitment to free trade with all the world, thus giving to Germany out of hand the fruits of a victory greater than she could win by fighting a hundred years."

"A Republican Congress will never assent to that. Do you want a Congress that will? Germany does."

"Mr. Wilson forces the Republican Party to lie down or fight. I say, fight! Answer with your votes!"

"Mr. Wilson is for unconditional surrender—yes; for the unconditional surrender to himself of the Republican Party, of the country, of the allies—all to him, as the sole arbiter and master of the destinies of the world. Do you stand for that? Answer with your votes!"

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, one of our distinguished Senators here to-day was taking the President to task for having sent this message to the American people, and in that attempt he compared the President to another one of our great Presidents. There is no parallel between the two acts. One was the prevention of the interference in politics by a politician and the other was an open, free, frank message to those who elected the President of the United States. Is the time ever coming in a democracy when the President of the United States shall not be recognized as having the right to address a statement directly to the people of the United States? It was not concealed. It

was not hid from the Republicans. No; it was addressed to the Republicans of this country just as much as it is addressed to the Democrats of the country. It is not an appeal, however, to the leaders of the Republican Party, because the leaders of the Republican Party have publicly demonstrated that they are beyond the barrier of any appeal on the ground of humanity or democracy. The President is appealing to Republicans against Republican leaders. He is appealing to Democrats and the men who elected him to office and who placed upon him the responsibility of that office.

But this is not the first time that these things have been done. Let me read just a few remarks here by President McKinley at the time of the campaign of 1898. In a speech delivered at Boone, Iowa, October 11, 1898, he said:

This is no time for divided councils. If I would have you remember anything I have said in these desultory remarks it would be to remember at this critical hour in the Nation's history we must not be divided. The triumphs of the war are yet to be written in the articles of peace.

Again in a speech delivered at Carroll, Iowa, October 11, 1898, he said:

Just at this hour, although hostilities have been suspended, we are confronted with the gravest national problems. It is a time for the soberest judgment and the most conservative and considerate action. As we have stood together in the war, so we must stand together until the results of that war shall be written in peace.

In a speech delivered at Creston, Iowa, October 13, 1898, President McKinley said:

My fellow citizens, I want to leave one more thought with you and that is, as we have been united and therefore strong and invincible in the war, we must continue united until the end of this struggle; we must have no differences among ourselves while we are settling differences with another government. When we have made that settlement in the interest of justice and civilization and humanity, then we can resume our domestic differences.

In a speech delivered at Springfield, Ill., October 15, 1898, President McKinley said:

Now, my friends, what we want is to have no dispute or difference among ourselves to interfere with our united judgment in dealing with the foreign problems that are before us. As we stood together in war, let us stand together until its settlements are made.

Now, then, be it remembered that at that time President McKinley was speaking in a campaign—the campaign of 1898. The country was involved in a campaign at that time, and all the campaign orators were on the stump and the politicians of both parties were in the field. The same Theodore Roosevelt, who to-day is doing everything in his power to discredit the President of the United States and to make him powerless in the execution of a peace program upon the settlement of this war, was then active in politics. He stated in the campaign of 1898 as follows in one of his speeches:

Remember that, whether you will it or not, your votes this year will be viewed by the nations of Europe from one standpoint only. They will draw no fine distinctions. A refusal to sustain the President this year will, in their eyes, be read as a refusal to sustain the war and to sustain the efforts of our peace commission to secure the fruits of war. Such a refusal may not inconceivably bring about a rupture of the peace negotiations. It will give heart to our defeated antagonists; it will make possible the interference of those doubtful neutral nations who in this struggle have wished us ill.

You could get the benefits of the victories of Grant and Sherman only by reelecting Lincoln, and we will gain less than we ought from the war if the administration is not sustained at these elections.

Again, we find former President Harrison using this language in the 1898 campaign:

If the word goes forth that the people of the United States are standing solidly behind the President, the task of the peace commissioners will be easy, but if there is a break in the ranks—if the Democrats score a telling victory, if Democratic Senators, Congressmen, and governors are elected—Spain will see in it a gleam of hope; she will take a fresh hope, and a renewal of hostilities—more war—may be necessary to secure to us what we have already won.

In that same campaign in 1898, when President McKinley was stumping the country and was speaking throughout the United States and delivering the very speeches that I have quoted, we find Senator Lodge, now the senior Senator on the Republican side, now the leader of the Republican Party in this body, now the Senator who in a signed statement condemns the President of the United States for appealing to the people for a Democratic Senate and a Democratic House, appealing on behalf of McKinley for a Republican Senate and a Republican House said:

But there is one question on which I wish to say a few words, and that seems to me to override all others. It is whether we shall stand by the administration and the President at this juncture. If we give a victory to his political opponents we say not only to the United States but we say to the world, we say to the Spanish commissioners in Paris, that the people of the United States repudiate its result and repudiate the man who has led victoriously the war and is now leading us back to peace—William McKinley.

Then, at the same time, we find another distinguished leader on the other side who is doing all in his power to obstruct the principles and policies announced by the President of the United States and to tie his hands with a Republican Senate and a Republican House taking this position in the 1898 campaign.

I have read you the speeches of President McKinley at that time. I have not attempted to interpret those speeches. I intend to let the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] interpret President McKinley's speeches. What did the distinguished Senator from Pennsylvania have to say in preparing to introduce President McKinley at the time he was making those speeches? This is what he said:

In a few hours President McKinley will be your guest to witness the greatest pageant the country has ever known. In his recent speeches the President has appealed not to a partisan but to a national spirit. He asks the aid of the Nation. He seeks the support of every man who believes in the result of his administration. I appeal not to the martial spirit of the Nation, great as have been our victories on sea and land. I appeal to the quiet, sober thought of the American people, who do not go to war unless for honor and humanity. I make this appeal to you that you give loyal support to President McKinley and the Republican Party in the spirit he has asked for it.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President—

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield to the Senator from Ohio.

Mr. POMERENE. In view of the course the Senator's speech has taken I think it not inopportune to read a similar statement made by the Hon. Charles Wilhelm Frederick Dick, whom I had the honor to succeed in the Senate. This speech was made in 1898. It reads as follows:

[From the Akron Evening Times, Akron, Ohio, Friday, Oct. 25, 1898.]

DICK'S PLEA AS MADE TO THE VOTERS IN 1898.

We have had a recent example of what patriotism can do. We have just concluded a successful war against a common foe. The last trace of Spanish sovereignty has been driven from the Western Hemisphere. * * * The results of the war have thrust upon us mighty responsibilities * * * and it belongs to the party of progress to solve them.

In this hour of ballots what message are you going to send to Washington, to Paris, and to Spain? Are you going to cast a vote of confidence in the Government or will you show a lack of confidence? Suppose the situation was reversed and Spain were to hold an election in which support of the Government was the issue, with what eagerness, with what hope and fear, would you await the results?

What effect would it have on other countries if it should be cabled to Paris and Madrid that the Government at Washington is not upheld? That the people of the United States had elected a Congress not in accord with the President. Is it not our duty as Americans to do everything possible to prevent such a disaster?

This is a time to appeal to patriotic hearts. It is not a time to stand with yellow journals and yellow speakers, but a time to hoist the Stars and Stripes higher than ever before. Let us say on election day that liberty and freedom yet live in the hearts of the American people.

This is not only an election of county, of State, and the Nation—it is international. Every nation in Europe, friendly or unfriendly, is watching with jealous eyes the results of this election. They are watching to see whether we will take advantage of the opportunities that are offered us, opportunities that would be eagerly seized by them.

The administration should be supported by the whole people. It is in the interests of the whole people. When we are engaged in mighty contests with other nations there should be no doubt where the people stand.

To-day more than usual the administration represents the Government. The course of William McKinley appeals to the patriotism and the support of the whole people. Give him a Congress that will stand at his back; then if they fail it will be time to condemn and reject.

You know without my telling you that the affairs of the State are well and wisely conducted. I want to say one word, however, on county affairs.

Here Senator Dick disagreed in an appeal for the Republican county ticket, after which he continued:

This is no time to change the party at the helm. Men are but the representatives of principles, whether it be in county, State, or Nation.

The world is looking to the United States. We are now in the very vanguard of the procession, and our civilization will make the coming century the greatest in the world's history. If as a people we measure up to every responsibility we have no cause for alarm. There is no doubt that the American people will meet and discharge every duty. When God selected us to make the test of free government He did so with a jealous eye. We must neglect no opportunity. Patriotism should dominate every man in his political creed, and on November 8 Americans should do their full duty.

My good friend, Senator Dick, is now a candidate for Congress in his district in Ohio, and if he is to be sustained in his views then every Republican in that district will have to vote for his opponent.

Mr. PITTMAN. I wish to read at the request of Senator THOMAS, who sent it to me, as he was compelled to be absent, a statement from the Indianapolis Journal of September 17, 1898, which has the following headline to it:

Albert J. Beveridge's keynote speech delivered at Tomlinson Hall at the opening of the campaign of 1898. Mr. Beveridge was a candidate for United States Senator to succeed Senator Turpie, a Democrat.

This is the speech:

In a sentence, shall the American people indorse at the polls the administration of William McKinley, which, under the guidance of Divine Providence, has started the Republic on its noblest career of prosperity, duty, and glory, or shall the American people rebuke the administration, reverse the wheels of history, halt the career of the flag, and turn to that purposeless horde of criticism and carping that is assailing the Government at Washington? * * * In the only foreign war this Nation has had in two generations will you, the voters of this Republic and the guardians of its good repute, give the other nations of the world to understand that the American people do not approve and indorse the administration that conducted it? These are the questions

you must answer at the polls, and I well know how you will answer them. The thunder of American guns at Santiago and Manila will find its answer in the approval of the voters of the Republic. * * *

And the first question you must answer by your vote is whether you indorse that war. We are told that all citizens and every platform indorse the war, and I admit, with the joy of patriotism, that this is true. But this is only among ourselves, and we are of and to ourselves no longer. This election takes place on the stage of the world, with all earth's nations for our auditors.

Not a foreign office in Europe that is not studying the American Republic and watching the American elections of 1898 as it never watched an American election before. Are the American people the chameleon of the nations? If so, we can easily handle them, says the diplomats of the world. Which result, say you, will have the best effect for us upon the great powers that watch us with the jealousy strength always inspires: A defeat at the hands of the American people of the administration which has conducted our foreign war to a world-embracing success, and which has in hand the most important foreign problems since the Revolution, or such an indorsement of the administration by the American people as will swell to a national acclaim? No matter what your views on the Dingley or the Wilson laws, no matter whether you favor Mexican money or the standard of this Republic, we must deal this day with nations greedy for every market we are to invade, nations with ships and guns and money and men. Will they sift out the motive for your vote, or will they consider the result of the indorsement a rebuke of the administration? I repeat, it is more than a party question. It is an American question. It is an issue in which history sleeps. It is a situation which will influence the destiny of the Republic.

Mr. President, that was the keynote speech of the Republican Party in 1898, delivered by one of the most prominent Republicans in this country, a man who stood high in those days in the councils of the Republican Party, a man who spoke for his party. Were there ever two conditions so identical as the conditions then and the conditions now, with the single exception that at that time the war was over with Spain and the negotiations were with but one little country? To-day the war is not over. The negotiations will involve the great civilized countries of the world.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Am I mistaken in saying that I read in the press of yesterday perhaps that the Senator from Nevada had said that the war is practically over?

Mr. PITTMAN. The Senator is correct. This war is practically over. It has been won while a Democratic President was the Chief Executive officer of this country and was Commander in Chief of the armies, just as the little war against Spain was won when President McKinley occupied the same position. The necessity for the support of President Wilson in the formulation of the policies that will either mean an enduring peace or early return of wars will come up to the President as after-war policies faced McKinley at the time of the campaign of 1898. The situations are practically identical. The arguments made by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. Lodge], by Theodore Roosevelt, by Albert J. Beveridge, all apply to the situation to-day. I do not desire to charge them with insincerity, but I can not understand, and I do not believe the American people will understand, how those Republican statesmen could have made the speeches they made in 1898 and make the speeches and statements that they are making to-day.

Inconsistency in an ignorant man attracts little attention; inconsistency in a statesman, who owes a duty to the people who elect him, is worthy of the gravest consideration. If the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts felt in 1898 that it was necessary to elect a Republican Senate and a Republican House of Representatives in order that the world should not consider that President McKinley had been repudiated, then it is equally as necessary to-day that the people elect a Democratic Senate and a Democratic House of Representatives so that the world shall not think that President Wilson has been repudiated. Is not that true? Is there any answer whatever to it?

The Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] answers by a nod of his head that there is an answer, and the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] the other day gave a very cute little answer to it. He said the Philippine Islands were involved; that the thing which made it so necessary to have a Republican Senate was in order that the treaty with regard to the Philippine Islands might be ratified. There is nothing in the remarks of the Senator from Massachusetts which were made in 1898 referring to the Philippine Islands. They referred to sustaining the President who won the war, so that he would not appear to be repudiated in the eyes of the world. There is nothing in Theodore Roosevelt's speeches of that date which I have quoted which deals with the Philippine Islands. Theodore Roosevelt's speeches were the same as those of the Senator from Massachusetts. They all placed the argument on the ground that the man who has won the war must be supported not only in the Senate but in both branches of Congress, in order that the world shall know that the American people first sustain the war, and, in the second place, that they do not repudiate the man who won the war.

I listened to the argument of the Senator from Indiana the other day when he tried to change the whole tenor of the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts, and Roosevelt's speech and Beveridge's speech by saying that they were worried for fear that there would be a Democratic Senate elected, and that, if so, the Senate would not ratify the treaty with regard to the Philippine Islands. If that were so, why were they appealing for the House of Representatives? The House of Representatives has nothing to do with treaties. Oh, but the Senator will say they have control of the appropriation of the money necessary to buy the islands. Congress has never violated a treaty made in accordance with the law and the Constitution of the United States, and when a treaty has been ratified by this body the money has always been appropriated by the House of Representatives, although they have nothing to do with the ratification of the treaty.

An attempt will be made to answer this contention. Politicians will be tempted to change the plain meaning of the speech of the Senator from Massachusetts in 1898; to reconstruct the speech of Theodore Roosevelt; to befool the speech of Albert J. Beveridge; and to explain the speech of Benjamin Harrison to the people of the country. No matter how skillful may be the attempt to twist these speeches their truth has reached the American people and they know if the words of the Senator from Massachusetts and those of Roosevelt and Benjamin Harrison and Beveridge were worth anything in 1898, they can not be repudiated now under the existing conditions, and they are not going to permit those men who are simply American citizens, no matter how high their position may be, to change or to misconstrue their own open and avowed position for the present purposes of partisan gain.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). Does the Senator from Nevada yield to the Senator from Indiana?

Mr. PITTMAN. I yield.

Mr. WATSON. Does the Senator from Nevada make no distinction between a private citizen making an appeal of that kind and the President of the United States making it? At the time the Senator from Massachusetts made that appeal or the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. PENROSE] made it or the then Senator Beveridge made it neither man was President of the United States; neither man was in the midst of the war as Chief Executive; neither man had had the united support of the opposition party. Does not the Senator from Nevada make any distinction at all between a private citizen making an appeal of that kind and the President of the United States making it, and especially at a time when the President has had practically the united support of the opposition party, and in his own letter admits that that party has been prowar quite as much as has his own party?

Mr. PITTMAN. Mr. President, there is no doubt that the Republican Party has been both prowar and loyal; I know of no one who attacks that proposition at all; but it is unnecessary for me to argue as to whether or not the Republican Party has been antiadministration. We do not have to go back of to-day to prove it. The RECORD to-day is full of it. That is enough. If the question is as to whether or not there is a difference between a Senator of the United States appealing to the people for the support of the President, or the President appealing for support, I say now that there is not any difference. It does not make any difference whether the one making such an appeal is a Senator of the United States, a Representative, a plain citizen, or President of the United States. If any man, no matter what position he holds, sees that a condition is arising that is dangerous to the people of the United States and they are not being told of that danger from other sources, then it is his duty to warn them.

Do you think that the people of the United States resent the fact that their President has told them of the danger? Do you think that the people of the United States resented the fact that McKinley appealed for unity in 1898? Do you think that the people of the United States have ever resented a President appealing directly to them with regard to any matter? Why should the President not do so? Does the President of the United States stand apart from the people? Is there no relation of confidence between the people and the President? Is the President too great a man to discuss matters with the people? Is the President's position so high that he may not discuss such matters with the common people? It might have been so under a Republican administration, but it is not so under a Democratic administration, and that is what we have at the present time. There was possibly a little difference between the methods pursued when we had a Republican President and those that are now pursued under a Democratic President. The Republican President wrote letters urging the support of whatever

he wanted, but the letters were not always public. The letters of the President of the United States at the present time are written to the public and are not concealed. The letters of Republican Presidents were sometimes written to politicians; the letters of the Democratic President are written to the people. As to the question of propriety, the Senator from Indiana can decide that for himself. But let me say something further. I have here a letter that possibly the Senator from Indiana remembers. I will read it and see if he recollects it. I think this letter was written by Mr. Theodore Roosevelt when he was President to Mr. JAMES E. WATSON, who was then a Member of the House of Representatives. The letter is dated "Oyster Bay, N. Y., August 18, 1906," and is as follows:

If there were only partisan issues involved in this contest, I should hesitate to say anything publicly in reference thereto. But I do not feel that such is the case. On the contrary, I feel that all good citizens who have the welfare of America at heart should appreciate the immense amount that has been accomplished by the present Congress, organized as it is, and the urgent need of keeping this organization in power. To change the leadership and organization of the House at this time means to bring confusion upon those who have been successfully engaged in the steady working out of a great and comprehensive scheme for the betterment of our social, industrial, and civic conditions. Such a change would substitute a purposeless confusion, a violent and hurtful oscillation between the positions of the extreme radical and the extreme reactionary, for the present orderly progress along the lines of a carefully thought-out policy.

This letter was written for the purpose of aiding in the election of Republicans to the Senate and the House. It was published in the Republican campaign textbook. Surely that can not be a crime in Woodrow Wilson if done by the great Republican god Roosevelt.

Again, on September 9, 1908, from Oyster Bay, N. Y., Mr. Roosevelt wrote, in part, as follows:

It is urgently necessary, from the standpoint of the public interest, to elect Mr. Taft and a Republican Congress which will support him; and they seek election on a platform which specifically pledges the party, alike in its executive and legislative branches, to continue and develop the policies which have been not merely professed but acted upon during these seven years. These policies can be successfully carried through only by the hearty cooperation of the President and the Congress in both its branches, and it is therefore particularly important that there should obtain such harmony between them. To fail to elect Mr. Taft would be a calamity to the country; and it would be folly while electing him yet at the same time to elect a Congress hostile to him, a Congress which under the influence of partisan leadership would be certain to thwart and baffle him on every possible occasion. To elect Mr. Taft and at the same time to elect a Congress pledged to support him is the only way in which to perpetuate the policy of the Government as now carried on. I feel that all the aid that can be given to this policy by every good citizen should be given, for this is far more than a merely partisan matter.

This was at a time when President Roosevelt expected to have Mr. Taft hold for four years, and in trust for Roosevelt, the presidential office. This letter was also written for political purposes, and was publicly used with President Roosevelt's knowledge and consent.

Mr. Taft, who knew of and accepted this aid of President Roosevelt, now holds up his hands in holy horror when Woodrow Wilson makes a similar plea.

I leave the question now as to whether or not the American people are going to take the advice of the Republican leaders given in 1898 or the advice given by the Republican leaders now. I leave it to the people of the country whether the Republican leaders to-day are sincere or whether they were sincere in 1898. There was argument in favor of their sincerity in 1898, but the evidence to-day is all against their sincerity. They argued in 1898 like patriots, and they quibble and debate to-day like politicians.

The Republicans have made their issue. It is an issue as to whether or not the President of the United States, who has successfully conducted this war and who has the confidence of the world, shall continue it to the end unhampered, unobstructed, uninterfered with, or whether or not it shall be taken out of his hands and placed in the hands of Senator LODGE and Senator PENROSE, of Pennsylvania. That is the issue, and the people of this country are going to decide with the President. No matter what subterfuges may be used, no matter how cunningly the arguments may be presented, they will see it. You yourselves have exposed yourselves, and further exposition is unnecessary.

Mr. POINDEXTER obtained the floor.

Mr. WADSWORTH and Mr. SMOOT addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield first to the Senator from New York.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, in order that the different pronouncements which find their appearance in the press may be contained in the RECORD, I ask permission that a letter written by the President of the United States to Mr. Hennessy, who is a candidate for the United States Senate from the State of New Jersey, which was printed in yesterday's papers, if I remember

correctly, be rec'd by the Secretary, and that I be permitted to utter about two sentences upon it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from New York? There being none, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

My DEAR MR. HENNESSY: May I not say how deeply interested I am in the contest you are conducting? I can not but feel that in ignoring my earnest appeal with regard to the suffrage amendment, made in the public interest, and because of my intimate knowledge of the issues involved, both on the other side of the water and here, Senator BAINBRIDGE has certainly not represented the true feeling and spirit of the people of New Jersey. I am sure that they must have felt that such an appeal could not and should not be ignored. It would be a very great mistake to throw into the international scale if his course of action while in the Senate could be reversed by the people of our great State.

Cordially and sincerely yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Mr. President, with the permission of the Senator from Washington—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from New York?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Senators will note that the President of the United States requests the people of the State of New Jersey to defeat Senator BAINBRIDGE at the polls solely because he voted against the Federal suffrage amendment. No other reason is given whatsoever. I shall not comment upon the merits or demerits of the Federal suffrage amendment or the accuracy of the President's definition of that measure as being vitally necessary to the winning of the war. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] has used the term "sincerity" more than once in his address. In view of this effort on the part of the President to defeat a Senator at the polls because he did not vote for the Federal suffrage amendment, I am wondering whether he will send a similar letter to the people of the State of Delaware and ask the defeat of Senator SAULSBURY, to the people of Tennessee and urge the defeat of Senator SHIELDS, and to the people of the State of Alabama and urge the defeat of Senator BANKHEAD, all three of whom have voted against the same Federal suffrage amendment and are running for reelection.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Florida?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I will have to decline further interruptions. I have been on my feet for some time; the remarks that I have to make are brief, and I would prefer if the Senator would allow me to proceed.

Mr. FLETCHER. Very well. I was simply going to ask the Senator if he would allow me to submit a report. I could have insisted on the regular order and had the report submitted at the proper time.

Mr. POINDEXTER. If the Senator merely wishes to present a report from a committee, I will yield to him for that purpose.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will wait until the Senator concludes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, it is extremely distasteful to me to discuss a political issue in the Senate. The President, however, with his great influence has projected a partisan discussion into the affairs of the Government by the letter addressed to the American people which he gave out for publication on Friday, in which he declared that he waived the scruples of good taste on account of the importance of the issues that were involved.

The Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], in discussing the recent negotiations of the President with the German Government, seemed to take the rather curious position that there was a default on the part of the American people or of the Senate for not having declared their objections to the various terms of peace which the President has set forth in his addresses to Congress and in other documents. The Senator failed to state what the statute of limitations is. My own feeling in regard to that, Mr. President, was and is now that it was not desirable at the time the President made his address of January 8, 1918, or that of December 4, 1917, or his various other addresses and letters with regard to terms of peace that they should be discussed, and I think that was the feeling of a great many citizens. I think that generally citizens in private life and men in public office felt that it was a time to concentrate the energies of the country upon the conduct of the war rather than upon discussing terms of peace. They felt that the discussion of peace before we had really gotten into the war which we had declared to exist retarded the efforts of the American people in the preparation for the conflict.

The thing which they resented most was not that the President had in his mind certain policies in regard to the readjustment of international affairs at the close of the war, but that he discussed them, that he diverted public attention and public effort from the preparation for winning the victory to what at

that time appeared, to many of them at least, to be perfectly futile discussions as to peace when there was no peace.

Now, for the Senator from Nebraska to say that because citizens of this country did not enter into a discussion with the President over terms of peace eight months after we had entered the war, before we had struck a blow, before we had landed a cannon or an aeroplane on the battle front, seems to me to be rather unsound. I think that it is perfectly fair to say to the Senator from Nebraska that, with the views which I have just stated, the people who did not express themselves in regard to the President's terms of peace occupied a very reasonable position from their standpoint and that they ought not to be charged now with having accepted the various propositions set forth by the President.

The Senator from Nebraska introduced two letters that have been written by the President in regard to one of the various peace points which he had formulated in his address of January 8, 1918, and in a colloquy on the floor stated that it was the view of the President that to the league of nations for economic freedom which the President declared himself in favor of Germany was to be admitted.

The same declaration was subsequently made by the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN]. Questions were asked of the Senator from Nebraska as to whether or not, under this term of peace of the President, the United States would be prevented from levying discriminatory duties against German goods or making discriminatory provisions as to trade with Germany. As I understood the Senator from Nebraska, he interpreted the President's speech and the President's letters to mean that that matter should be left to the league of nations which he proposed.

I have before me the letters which the Senator read; and from them I think it can not be a matter of doubt that although, I suppose as a matter of course, the question would have to be left to the ultimate determination of the league of nations, yet, so far as the views of the President of the United States are concerned, he in these letters clearly declares himself opposed to any discriminatory provisions as to trade with Germany or the importation of goods from that country. Taking this letter of October 28, addressed to the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], the President states:

Whatever tariff any nation might deem necessary for its own economic service, be that tariff high or low, it should apply equally to all foreign nations. * * * This leaves every nation free to determine for itself its own internal policies, and limits only its right to compound those policies of hostile discriminations between one nation and another.

So, in the letter of the President of October 22, 1918, addressed to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], he states:

They leave every nation free to determine its own economic policy, except in the one particular that its policy must be the same for all other nations and not be compounded of hostile discriminations between one nation and another.

I submit that there can not be any doubt as to the President's attitude upon that subject, and the country is entitled to thoroughly understand the issue. The President has been fair enough to publish to the country his partisan plea for the election of none but Democrats to Congress, and the people will have an opportunity of passing judgment upon the merits of his request. Upon this other matter, which has been set up in the speeches here to-day by the representatives of the administration as one of the central planks in the President's policy which he says Congress must support, the country is entitled to have a fair understanding of what the proposition is.

The letters which the President has written, and from which I have read, leave no doubt that the object of the President is that there shall be a league of nations formed in which Germany shall be an equal partner, and that there shall be no discrimination against her. Of course, he is entitled to advocate that. The country is entitled to understand his position, and it is for it to decide.

Mr. President, the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN]—whose declarations are stated by the newspapers in which they have recently been printed to have been made not without the assent of the administration—says that the great issue between the President and his opponents is as to whether or not there is to be a humane peace. I expect in the course of my remarks to refer briefly in detail to the issue which he describes as the program for a humane peace. I comment on it now only to say that the Senator from Nevada utterly failed to inform either the Senate or the country as to the meaning of this program for a humane peace as so expressed.

In passing I will say that there can not be any question of the intention of this country to adopt humane conditions in formulating the terms of peace so far as they affect our allies

in the war; so I assume that what the Senator from Nevada means, in speaking for the administration on this matter, is that Germany must be treated humanely. Now, there is a great deal of difference of opinion as to what humane treatment of Germany would consist of, in view of her record of the last four years.

We have here, then, these several statements, which are to be interpreted together, that the great central feature of the President's program, for which he demands unquestioning support, is that there is to be a peace based on justice which will treat Germany humanely; that in the league of nations, which is another part of the program of readjusting the affairs of the world, Germany shall enter upon an equal footing with our allies who have been fighting her and her crimes since August, 1914.

The Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] seems to be very much affronted because former President Roosevelt and other Republicans have had the temerity to criticize the President. That also illustrates one phase of the present political status of the country. There is a cult abroad that has affected newspapers, that has affected the country generally, that it is an offense of some kind—a great many people have gotten the idea that it is a criminal offense—to differ with the President of the United States. The President himself, in the letter to which I will refer in a moment, does not ask the country for the election of a Democratic Congress in support of any defined policy or of any principle of Government, nor in support of any party; but he says that a Democratic Congress should be elected in order to support him in whatever course he may choose to pursue, whatever it may be, in the conduct of the affairs of the Government. Mr. President, the mere statement of such a proposition is all that is necessary to present it for the judgment of a liberty-loving people.

A great deal of emphasis has been laid on the fact that former Senator Dick, of Ohio; former Senator Beveridge, of Indiana; and Mr. Roosevelt, at a time before he had been elected to the Presidency of the United States in 1898, made speeches arguing that the administration should be supported because the country was engaged in war, and that foreign nations would interpret the rejection of the administration as a change in our attitude and policy toward the war. Now, it is quite interesting in the first place to see the Senator from Ohio, the Senator from Nevada, and the Senator from Nebraska on the Democratic side applauding and approving and following the arguments and advice and suggestions of Republicans made in 1898, which at that time I have not the slightest doubt, if they took part in the campaign at all, each one of them denounced in unmeasured terms.

Why, Mr. President, no party has objected to public speakers, whether they are Members of the Senate or whether they are private citizens, urging the support of the administration. Nobody, I take it, would object, if he cared to go that far, if the President of the United States should issue an appeal to the American people to indorse his record or to support some policy which he announced to them. The criticism which the country has expressed, and which leads to this multiplicity of defenses of the President's action here this morning in the Senate, is not that speakers have gone out over the country and urged the support of the President. They have been doing that for months, and nothing was said about it. It is not that the President submitted his record, which was known and which could be seen of all men, or some policy which he defined and which the people would have an opportunity to judge when they knew what it was, and requested their support for it. The objection and criticism which is made of the address of the President to his fellow countrymen on Friday is that he demands the election of a Democratic Congress, not to support the principles of the Democratic Party, or to indorse his record, or to advocate any particular policy, but to maintain him as the spokesman, not of the Democratic Party, but of the American people. He asked them to elect none but Democrats to the Senate and the House of Representatives, not to enable him to conduct the war to a successful conclusion. Why does he ask it, and why do the people of this country resent it? He asks it because he says he desires to keep in his hands the policy and the conduct of the war.

Now, I want to say a few words about that, Mr. President. Here are the words that the President uses:

If you have approved of my leadership and wish me to continue to be your unembarrassed spokesman in affairs at home and abroad, I earnestly beg that you will express yourselves unmistakably to that effect.

That letter is addressed, not to the Democratic Party, but to "My fellow countrymen."

Here is what the President further says:

The leaders of the minority in the present Congress have unquestionably been prowar, but they have been antiadministration. At almost every turn since we entered the war they have sought to take the choice of policy and the conduct of the war out of my hands and put it under the control of instrumentalities of their own choosing.

I read no more from the President's message, because that is enough, and the issue rests upon that; and the scruple of good taste, which in another part of the letter the President says he waves aside, is violated, if it is violated at all, by those expressions.

Mr. President, the President of the United States is a historian and a student. I do not think he has had a great deal of experience in practical affairs until quite recently, when he came into politics, but he is serving his second term as President. He has written a history of the United States and published a book on government which I have read with a great deal of interest, and for a man of that experience, and who has presented himself as an authority on government, he expresses in the letter from which I have just quoted a strange misconception of the nature of the Government of the United States. In England the chief executive is the leader of the legislature, and if the legislature fails to follow him, under the British constitution he appeals to the people for the election of a majority in his support. The British executive administration is a committee of the House of Commons, and, of course, can not act except by the authority of the house. There the Parliament is supreme. The highest court is the House of Lords, which is ultimately also under control of the House of Commons.

Parliament exercises supreme legislative, executive, and judicial power. It is subject to no veto and to no constitution, but only to the people themselves in referendum elections. The premier, who is the chief executive of Great Britain, exercises that consolidated power of the executive, the legislature, and in the last analysis can also control the courts, because he has back of him the support of the House of Commons.

In America, under our Constitution—which the President, who is supposed to be an authority, seems utterly to misinterpret, from the appeal which he has made for the election of a Congress which will support him in every particular during the remainder of his term of office—the conditions and limitations of power are utterly different from those in Great Britain.

In this country the Executive, the President, is not under the control of Congress. He is independent, within the limits of his powers as fixed by the Constitution, and neither Congress nor the courts can interfere with those powers. On the other hand, Congress and the courts are equally independent of the Executive within the limits of their constitutional power. The President has no more authority to direct or control Congress than he has to control the Supreme Court. Perhaps the most prominent feature of the American Constitution is the separation and the independence of the legislative, executive, and judicial powers. It is the ancient and familiar bulwark of our institutions, and over all and limiting all is the fixed and written Constitution, like the pillars of a cathedral, on which all else must rest or fall.

Mr. President, strange as it may seem, Mr. Wilson misconceives—and I say this with all deliberation and with the utmost respect and sincerity—his functions in the Government. He assumes—and I am speaking upon the utterances which I have just read from him—that he is chosen as the spokesman of the people “in affairs at home and abroad,” and that the “choice of policy and conduct of the war” are “in his hands,” to use his words. In this he is mistaken. Congress, and Congress alone, is the “spokesman of the people in affairs at home and abroad,” and not the President, as he assumes in his letter. Congress, and Congress alone, has “in its hands” the “choice of the policy and the conduct of the war.” The President is an executive only. With the specific exceptions of the power to make recommendations to Congress and to veto measures his authority is limited to executing the laws. The President says that certain Members of Congress have undertaken to “take out of his hands” the fixing or choice of the policies of the country. Now, Congress could not do that; Congress has not done it; nobody has attempted to do it, because Congress could not do it. They have never been in his hands; they could not be in his hands, and so they could not be taken out.

Mr. Wilson assumes, apparently, to take under his control the choice of the policy and the conduct of the war, but he can not do so under the Constitution. In that instrument it is provided that Congress shall have the sole and exclusive power “to declare war and make rules concerning captures on land and water, to raise and support armies, to provide and maintain a navy, to make rules for the government of the land and naval forces, to make all laws which shall be necessary and

proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers and all other powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States or in any department or officer thereof, to regulate commerce with foreign nations”; and no treaty of peace can be made except with the consent and advice of the Senate, two-thirds of the Senators present concurring.

Why, Mr. President, some reference was made in the speech of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HARRISON] to the initiative of the President in readjusting the affairs of Europe at the end of the war, and the propriety of his negotiating on that subject and making a declaration to the world of his views in regard to it. In a certain way the initiative is with the President, but by the acquiescence only of Congress, and no other way. The initiative is not with the President except by permission, either express or implied, of Congress. There can be no war with an European power without a declaration of war by Congress. There can be no peace with an European power until it is provided for or acquiesced in by Congress. The powers of peace and of war are in Congress and not in the President.

The President says that the Republicans have been antiadministration. I remember very well myself that the Republicans vigorously supported the President when he stood for preferential American privileges in the Panama Canal. We had built that canal at great expense; we were proud of having accomplished a great achievement; and we felt that it was for the benefit of the American people. The President had said so in a most formal and energetic way, and the Republicans supported him in that position. It is true, however, that they opposed him when he took the other side of the question; but that was probably due merely to a lack of as quick adaptability as the Democrats. On the other hand, while the Republicans were strongly against the President when he stood in opposition to the Federal suffrage amendment, this ought not to be held against them, for they lined up strongly for him when he took the other side of the question and supported it.

As a matter of fact it was the Democrats who opposed him in this, and it seems rather unfair that the President should ask the voters of New Jersey to defeat Senator BAIRD because he voted against the suffrage amendment, and at the same time ask the country to elect all the Democratic candidates who voted against it, even though he urged their support of it as a war measure. It is true the Republicans vigorously opposed the President when he stood for national unpreparedness, but when he changed his attitude on that and stood for preparedness the Republicans supported him much more vigorously than the Democrats did. They were for him when he stood with Mr. Garrison for a National Army and against him when he stood with Mr. Hay for dependence on a National Guard. When the President occupied Vera Cruz the Republicans supported him, though they opposed him in its evacuation without securing a settlement of the Mexican question. So they supported him in his punitive expedition after Villa, to protect our citizens on the border. They regretted, however, the retirement of the expedition without accomplishing any result whatever. The loss of precious lives and the expenditure of vast funds were thrown away. When the President made his second campaign on a pacifist platform and attempted to keep us out of war by writing notes about the *Lusitania* and other outrages perpetrated against us by Germany, it is undoubtedly true that Republicans were against that policy, because Republicans believed that immediate vigorous action in protection of the rights and lives of American citizens—the immediate dismissal of the German ambassador, the seizure of German ships in our ports—would have prevented a repetition of those wrongs and would have kept us out of war.

The Republican platform declared in favor of the protection of American citizens throughout the world. And when it was proved that diplomatic notes would not keep us out of war, the Republicans were first and foremost in support of the President in every step that he has taken to vindicate the honor of the Nation. They have granted extraordinary powers and wealth without stint or limit to carry on the war. The charge that Republicans have not supported the President in carrying on the war in the most vigorous fashion can not be established by the record. With a general measure of devotion of the whole people unsurpassed even in our annals, the Nation has supported the Government in this war. To them it was not a war in which we as a Nation had no interest. It was not so much “to make the world safe for democracy” as it was to maintain the honor and the ultimate independence of the United States. They have given their sons, and what more can be said? They gave their all for their native land. And what a land it is! As the morning sun illuminates the Atlantic shore and hour by hour sends his beams toward the west until they rest again upon the waters of the sea it is yet our country. Over

coastal plain and mountain range, over prairies and the mighty rivers, freedom reigns. It was to keep it so that our country went to war. It is love of country that has given and demanded support of the Government in the conduct of the war. To attempt to make political capital out of the patriotism of a people is a sordid perversion of the holiest instinct of mankind. To attempt to pervert the people's sacrifice and devotion for a great national cause to personal or party purposes is worse than bad taste. It is something like sacrilege. It is like the crime of Alcibiades in the profanation of the mysterious, as though one entered a holy temple to commit a vulgar indecency.

The President declares that politics are adjourned, but says elect none but Democrats to office. The President not only insists that Congress should have no policies and should leave all to him; but in his statement of October 14 he requests the people themselves not to discuss the most "momentous" issues that affect them but to leave such discussion to "the Governments of the United States and of the allies," while the people occupy themselves raising the revenue. Autocracy never went any further than that.

Mr. Barney Baruch, one of the President's principal representatives, says that peace should be left to the President. He states that "peace talk is affecting our output," but still insists that the President should have a monopoly of it, and that while the President is talking peace the people should "think war, talk war, make war." Considering that the President claims that the "policy and conduct of the war are exclusively in his hands," this is asking a great deal of the people. He evidently has a high opinion of them to suppose that with Congress suppressed and under complete control, and the President talking peace, the people will be able to "think war, talk war, make war."

Furthermore the people are under other handicaps. They were advised by Mr. McAdoo, in whom they have a great deal of confidence—

This—

Referring to the German reply—

If authentic—

No one ever questioned its authenticity—

means unconditional surrender.

That statement was made October 14, and the daily reports of desperate fighting at the front may seem inconsistent. But to reassure the people, Senator PITTMAN, in the New York Times of October 27—he repeated it on the floor to-day in a statement which, it is said, "was not issued without sanction from the White House"—declared "the war has been practically won." The peace negotiations and the peace talk, which we are told must be left to the administration, it is reported in foreign dispatches, have strengthened Germany and alarmed our allies, and, repeated in headlines throughout the land, have retarded the efforts of the people to "think war, talk war, make war." In the meantime, the truth is, that as desperate fighting as the war has seen is now going on, and our men are dying by thousands at the front.

An intimation of the opinion of our allies of negotiations and talk of peace is shown by the debate in the House of Commons on Thursday night by the statement of the representative of the British Government that talk of peace was silenced by "common sense."

I have in my pocket a statement from Paris indicating the views of the French people on this subject under date of October 27:

NO AGREEMENT ON WILSON NOTES, SAYS FRENCH PRESS.

PARIS, October 27.

French press discussion of President Wilson's last note to Germany reveals the following facts:

1. That the allies have not formulated a common peace program.
2. That President Wilson's discussion with Germany was conducted without consulting the governments associated with the United States in the war, hence this discussion does not bind them.
3. President Wilson's speeches are not acceptable to the allies in every detail.

For example, the British take exception as regards the freedom of the seas, while the French demand the unconditional restitution of Alsace-Lorraine.

The Echo de Paris says: ". . . the allied European cabinets must agree upon a common attitude. They are bound by nothing President Wilson has said or typewritten."

Le Gaulois says: "Not having participated in the exchange of notes between America and Germany, the allied Governments retain complete freedom of decision and action."

L'Action Francais: "We can not accept a distinction between the various forms of German Government. We might conceive of privileges accorded certain German States, provided they agree to break away from Prussia, but we will pay no premium to a democratic Germany at the expense of our own interests and future security."

Not 18 months ago, like the United States, but a thousand years ago France opposed the German aggressions."

Several papers reiterate that Germany can not have an armistice by diplomatic negotiations, but must send the white flag.

That sounds more like statesmanship, it seems to me, Mr. President; but the humiliating thing to an American citizen is that the United States, the last in the war and consequently the freshest of the allied nations, less exhausted, instead of being an inspiration and a leader, instead of holding up the morale of our allies, exhausted by a four-year struggle, we lie on our backs, so to speak, and send these peace papers to France and Great Britain and say, "You fix it," with a pretty strong intimation that we would be glad to end the war and grant an armistice. It is humiliating to the American people. I have no doubt that France and Great Britain, as judged by these expressions, which no doubt represent public opinion and also the Government views, which are not free at all times to be openly expressed, will be equal to the emergency. I have not the slightest doubt that these great allies, after the sacrifices they have made, are not going to throw away the security of the future and play false to the sacred dead in this great cause, even though we have sent peace papers to them and left the issue to their decision.

Now, it is important to know what are the policies of this Government about which the people are warned not to talk and from which Congress is to be excluded. Senator LEWIS, another spokesman of the administration, has pending a resolution by which Congress would pledge itself in advance to support these policies without knowing what they are, or any other "course the President may take." Some light is beginning to be shed on them. Mr. Frank H. Simonds, a prominent writer in the New York Tribune, states: "We are at the present time facing the greatest danger which we have had to confront since we entered the world war. It is the danger that we may become the advocate of Germany in the peace discussions which are to come." The danger and the fear is that the President, in the policy which he says should be left in his hands, but which the Constitution vests in Congress, will endeavor to form a league of nations with Germany and save her from due punishment and retribution for the wrongs she has done to mankind. The President seeks to differentiate between the German people and the German Army, when, as a matter of fact, they are one and the same.

I read with the utmost interest a speech made a few days ago in the Senate by the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS], one of the most complete and illuminating discussions of this entire question that I have seen. I thought so much of it that I mailed a copy of it to my son and asked him to read it. Mr. MYERS spoke in that speech very clearly and unanswerably of the fact that the German Army is the German people. Who else is it? The German Nation is at war. This war is conducted by the German people and by nobody else. It could not have been otherwise conducted. There never was an hour since Germany sprang like a tiger afflicted with hydrophobia upon helpless Belgium and unsuspecting France when the German people have not been back of the Kaiser in waging this war and perpetrating their atrocities against mankind. Yet it is talked about that if they will get up some sort of a democratic-socialistic government there, we can do business with them and they need not surrender.

I should like to know what difference it makes what is said by any purported representative of any kind of a government in Germany so long as a German Army with 3,000,000 men is under military control with arms in their hands. Grant the government to-day and take it back to-morrow! The whole proposition is simply a farce, a German peace offensive into which the United States has fallen.

Mr. Lawrence, who also speaks for the administration, says quite ominously:

If the President's democratic aims are not shared by the allies, it is possible that the prestige of our cobelligerents will not be as great as it has been before, and the interest of the American people in war aims revealed in selfish terms would be considerably altered.

That is quite a distinct threat to our allies, coming from the spokesman of the administration, who knows what he is talking about. Quoting further, he says:

* * * Mr. Wilson said in his New York speech that every nation, whether it be friend or foe, must come to the peace table ready to pay the price.

There he is laying down the hard terms to our allies.

The British labor party and the French socialists have subscribed to the President's views. * * * The President has therefore to steer a middle-of-the-road course.

There is the declaration from the White House. The British Labor Party, quoting again, and the French socialists have accepted the President's views. Probably they know no more about his views than we do in this country, but they have accepted them. We know the views of the British Labor Party leaders, not the mass of British labor but of the political leaders of certain elements of it, and of certain French socialists who

are in accord with the President's views, which he wishes to have unrestricted power to put into effect by a Congress which will commit themselves in advance to support them without even having the respect of being told what they are.

We read the other day in the newspapers that Mr. Henderson, a leader of the party which it is said has accepted the President's views, came down to a port to take a ship to France to meet the French socialists and Mr. Gompers. Mr. Gompers's views are utterly different. He is an uncompromising victory man on this proposition—but he was meeting with French socialists and Henderson wanted to go to meet them. The British sailors said to Mr. Henderson, "You can not ride on our ship," and he did not. They would not take him across the channel, and he had to go back home. I do not know how he got home. The press stated that the taxicab drivers refused to allow him to ride in a taxicab because of his unpatriotic attitude toward the war. He is the man who, Mr. Lawrence says, has accepted the President's views in this great humane program toward Germany, which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] says is the chief issue of the time.

The French socialists have accepted it. How many times has Mr. Clemenceau, the great premier of France, stood in the tribune in the Chamber of Deputies and denounced the disloyalty and treason of the French socialists? When the victory and evacuation of Lille were announced, and in recognition of the escape of the citizens from enslavement the members of the Chamber of Deputies stood to receive the deputy of Lille in the Chamber of Deputies when he appeared after his release, two of these socialists refused to applaud the victory of their countrymen and the freeing of their fellow citizens. But Mr. Lawrence says the French socialists have accepted the President's program for the ending of this war on the basis of a "humane" treatment of Germany.

Mr. President, to verify the dread that was expressed by Mr. Simonds, one of the best-informed writers on the war, Senator PITTMAN, who has come forward lately as probably the most active and most prominent representative of the administration in this matter, says in his interview in the New York Times of yesterday that "there will be an armistice." Those are very few words, but they are very significant. He says "there will be an armistice." I do not think myself there will be an armistice. The reason why I do not think so is that I feel in my heart certain that France and Great Britain are not going to grant any armistice. They are not going to quit this war, after what they have suffered, until Germany is conquered. Then after that they will discuss the humanities, and "a peace based on justice," a "lasting peace," and all that sort of thing.

I think that Senator PITTMAN is wrong in stating that there is going to be an armistice, but I believe he is right in speaking for the administration that the administration is trying to bring about an armistice. These are the issues before the American people. The President has made it plain, and I do him the justice to say that by making it plain he has given the people an opportunity to decide for themselves.

Senator PITTMAN has proclaimed day after day the great divergence between the policies of Senator LODGE and the policies of the President. I do not know a great deal about the policies of Senator LODGE. I know nothing except what I have heard him say here in the Senate, and I heard him say in the Senate what I have heard a great many people say, what many people have said to me orally, by telegraph, in writing, in this country and in our allied countries in Europe. He is in favor of prosecuting this war until peace among the nations is secured by the unconditional surrender of Germany. The Senator from Nevada speaks for the administration and says that is not the policy of the administration. I know he is speaking with authority. So that is the issue before the American people. The appeal which was made by the President he has a right to make, even though, as he said, it is in bad taste. It is for the people to determine if we are to compromise the war with a weak peace, a peace which the administration says will be lasting, but which in fact would not endure beyond the generation that is now coming on.

Mr. President, no greater service could be rendered Germany than to grant her an armistice on any terms at all. Some people seem to be confused as to the effect of an armistice. An armistice by the very name and meaning of the word indicates that war has not been concluded. What it means is that although the war has not been concluded both nations will hold the battle in abeyance, retaining their arms. I am against that in the case of Germany. I have stated my reasons heretofore. I think whenever we reach that point we will end the war in effect, because we shall not be able to renew it again. We will leave Germany with her military power from that day

forth to begin to recuperate herself for another attack upon the world at some weak point when it is least suspecting.

The unknown policy that the President and his representatives say must be left to him alone is referred to by Senator PITTMAN as follows:

Unless the people give the President a Senate that will follow his leadership it will be impossible for him to accomplish the adoption of his program for a lasting world's peace.

The idea here expressed is not that the Senate in this important matter should approve a policy presented by the President after consideration, but that a Senate should be elected pledged in advance to follow the President's leadership blindly without knowing what his policies may be. This is the President's idea also. It is a peculiar view of the Senate and the Constitution; but it has the merit of audacity and of being frankly presented to the people so that they will have fair notice of the consequences of the election of a Democratic Senate.

It is furthermore somewhat startling that the demand should be made for a blind following of the President as leader in a matter with which the President, under the Constitution, has comparatively little authority, the continuance or cessation of the war being exclusively under the control of Congress, and the final terms of peace being subject to the ultimate determination of the Senate. There is a widespread feeling that if the President had devoted himself to executive duties and to the duties of Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy rather than to have immersed himself to such an extent in matters that devolve upon Congress under the Constitution, we would have gotten into the actual fighting somewhat earlier and would have avoided the shipping, ordnance, and aeroplane fiascoes of last year.

Shortly after we entered the war the President began to talk peace and to declare what the terms of peace should be. He has continued that discussion from that time to this in a series of speeches, notes, inquiries, messages, and declarations.

The Senator from Nebraska referred to that again and lays great store upon the fact that the country has not been joining the President in this discussion. I think the country by not joining the President in this discussion showed its intelligence and good judgment. I rather regret myself, as a private citizen, and express it only as an individual, that while we were getting ready to fight the President was continually speaking and writing about making peace.

In a series of speeches, letters, parleys, notes, and inquiries during that period the President has set forth some 35 or 40 different points or terms of peace. Although Congress alone can make war and peace, the conclusions reached by the President were stated by him as though they were final and conclusive. Though sometimes presented in messages to Congress, the only purpose apparently was that the occasion should serve as a medium for advising the world what the President had decided.

Another peculiarity about the peace discussion which has been keeping company with the war, and sometimes getting ahead of it, has been that there is but little suggestion that our allies would have any terms of peace to propose. The President has covered the whole field; he has laid down the terms for Bulgaria and Turkey, although we have never declared war on Bulgaria and Turkey. In fact, the President began laying down terms of peace before we were in the war. Many of those terms conflict, and Austria has found it difficult to accept them fast enough, as she was informed the other day that No. 10 was no longer in effect. It must be somewhat discouraging to her.

On January 22, 1917, before we were in the war, speaking to the Senate, the President said—and I am going to quote from what the President said on several occasions and reiterated afterwards, and which he still defends, in order to define and to illuminate the program of a "humane" peace which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] is proclaiming and a league of nations, with Germany on equal terms. I remember distinctly hearing the address from yonder rostrum:

They—

Referring to the assurances of the belligerents—

imply, first of all, that it must be a peace without victory. * * * Victory would mean peace forced upon the loser, a victor's terms imposed upon the vanquished. It would be accepted in humiliation, under duress, at an intolerable sacrifice, and would leave a sting, a resentment, a bitter memory upon which terms of peace would rest, not permanently, but only as upon a quicksand. Only a peace between equals can last. Only a peace the very principle of which is equality and a common participation in a common benefit.

That throws some light, Mr. President, on the definition of the Senator from Nevada of a "lasting" peace, which he reiterates and emphasizes. There is the "lasting peace" described by the President himself. This was uttered nearly two years after the *Lusitania* horror, after the guaranty of Belgium's neutrality had been torn up as a scrap of paper, and

after two and a half years of the atrocities that have shocked the world. That was two and a half years after the use of poison gas; after the sinking of ships without a trace; after the crucifixion of Canadian soldiers and the mutilation of Scots; after the ravishment of the women of Belgium, the enslavement of their people, and the starvation of whole populations. The President says that the nation that was guilty of those atrocities must sit at the peace table as an unconquered equal.

It is all very well to say, Mr. President, that we were not at war at that time; but the people of the world had formed their judgment about the merits of this war long before that date. By their consciences and by their sense of right, by their love of freedom and of decency, they had determined for themselves the guilt of Germany; and yet the President said that Germany was not to be condemned in the terms of peace, but was to be protected as an equal.

Not only that, but the President reaffirmed this same declaration in terms eight months after we had gone into the war. On December 4, 1917, when we had been at war with Germany for eight months, before we had struck a single blow or had a cannon or an aeroplane in France, the President appeared before a joint session of Congress. For what purpose? For the strange purpose of telling the country what we were at war for. After the war had been going on for three years; after we had been in it for eight months; after a series of note writing about the *Lusitania* and other maritime outrages, on December 4, 1917, the President, whose policies he says must be accepted without question or consultation with Congress, appeared before Congress to inform them what the war was for. The President said:

I believe that it is necessary to say plainly what we here at the seat of action consider the war to be for.

It has seemed to be my duty to speak these declarations of purpose, to add these specific interpretations to what I took the liberty of saying to the Senate in January.

On January 22, 1917, "peace without victory."

These, Mr. President, are the addresses upon which Germany is relying; these are among the addresses to which the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee [Mr. HITCHCOCK] refers, and upon which the Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN] bases his "humane," "lasting" peace, founded upon "justice" and a league with Germany. What are they? Says the President in the same address:

We owe it, however, to ourselves to say that we do not wish in any way to impair or to rearrange the Austro-Hungarian Empire.

No wonder they accept his terms of peace.

The President continues:

It is no affair of ours what they do with their own life, either industrially or politically. We do not purpose or desire to dictate to them in any way. We only desire to see that their affairs are left in their own hands in matters great or small.

So as to Austro-Hungary.

How as to Germany? Here is what the President said as to Germany; and I think myself that it represents the state of mind which is the impelling force back of this gradually, slowly developing scheme of things; this undefined program which Mr. Simonds says is creating great dread throughout the world:

And our attitude and purpose with regard to Germany herself are of a like kind. We intend no wrong against the German Empire.

Oh, no; it would be too harsh and cruel to commit any "wrong" against the German Empire—such a righteous Empire; such a humane people. We must be generous toward them. If their enemies should be harsh when the war is over, if France and England should attempt to look out for their interests—which I believe, so far as this war is concerned, are the interest and security of the world—the great Republic of the West must interpose and use its "high idealism," its "generosity" in international affairs, to protect Germany against any harshness. We will see that no punishment is inflicted upon those good hordes of the Kaiser who have left their trail in the blood and misery of the world on land and sea.

"We intend no wrong against the German Empire, no interference with her internal affairs." In the light of her crimes it would be interesting to know what the President would consider "wrong" in dealing with the German Empire, and whether or not a just compensation for the injury she has inflicted on mankind would be a "wrong against her."

Mr. President, it is essential to recall these declarations of policy, in view of the President's appeal for the election of none but Democrats who will leave the policies of the war in his hands without question.

So the President states to the country that if we elect a Congress of Democrats he will hold in his hand the policies of the country. So I suppose we shall take him at his word; but if he is correct about that it is well not to forget the President's views about this most important issue with which mankind has ever dealt.

Mr. President, while these terms of peace and this "humane" and "lasting" arrangement for the protection of the good German Empire are being promoted and propagated throughout the world, it is well to recall the terms of peace proposed by Germany, and I ask leave to print in the RECORD, without reading, the terms as defined by German statesmen.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the matter will be inserted in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Our statesmen must in the peace negotiations be men of iron and not resemble soft wood painted iron gray. The German people mean not only to hold out but to conquer. (Count Von Reventlow.)

An indemnity which would be adequate simply to cover the cost of the war would perhaps amount to thirty billions—two billions in gold, a further four or six billions in exchange, the rest in securities. (Dr. Johann Plenge.)

Peace must assure permanently the military, economic, financial, and political interests of Germany in their widest range, including extensions of territory. (Dr. Spahn, leader of Reichstag Center.)

If we win, we must utterly destroy the power of England; we must take her colonies and her fleet. We might take the French fleet, too, and make France bear the cost of the war. Belgium could be joined to Germany. (Dr. Oppenheimer.)

The security of the Empire in a future war requires the ownership of all mines of iron ore, and to defend them the fortresses of Longwy and Verdun. (Manifesto to the chancellor.)

It is necessary to impose a mercilessly high war indemnity on France, and not forget her large colonial possessions. (Petition of German intellectuals to the Government.)

Mr. POINDEXTER. In the Preussische Jahrbücher for July, 1918, Prof. Delbrück says:

The diplomatic offensive must go side by side with the Hindenburg offensive.

It did go side by side with it, and it has gotten away ahead of it now; the Hindenburg offensive has fallen behind, but the diplomatic offensive that Prof. Delbrück proclaims has been gaining strength day by day and is entering in as the chief issue in the election just about to be held.

It must aim not to an agreement with the English war party, but at making the war party impossible. * * * The growth of the peace parties can be so far promoted that Germany's enemies will be greatly hampered in the continuation of the war.

That is what all this is; that is the German peace offensive. I remember that one day one of the pacifists in the British House of Commons asked Mr. Andrew Bonar Law what he meant by a "peace offensive." I do not remember what his answer was, but here is the best definition I have ever seen of a peace offensive, by Prof. Delbrück, of the University of Berlin: A peace offensive is an offensive which will win over to the support of German aims the peace parties in the enemy countries—and that is what they are doing, and succeeding in a measure in doing, at the present time.

Mr. President, as an antidote to this, and in order that we may not forget, it would be well for everyone to look on page 31 of the Literary Digest of August 31, 1918, at the photograph of a group of German soldiers looking on in bestial gratification at the death agonies on the noble countenance of a crucified Canadian soldier.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I notice that the letter of President Wilson of October 25, 1918, addressed to the American people and asking them to stand by him by electing a Democratic House and Senate, was printed in the RECORD. I now ask unanimous consent that the answer to that letter, signed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], Congressman GILLETT, Congressman FESS, and myself, may be also printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. ASHURST in the chair). Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Utah? There being none, that order will be entered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Some time ago the President said "politics is adjourned." Now, in the closing days of the campaign—delayed by the united efforts of all parties for the liberty loan—now, when all public meetings have been given up owing to the influenza epidemic, the President sends out a direct party appeal calling upon his countrymen to vote for Democrats because they are Democrats, without any reference to whether such Democrats have been or are in favor of war measures and have a war record which deserves support.

The voters of Michigan, to take a single example, are called upon to support Mr. Henry Ford—notorious for his advocacy of peace at any price, for his contemptuous allusions to the flag, for the exemption of his son from military service—on the sole ground that he will blindly support the President. The President is quite ready to admit that Republicans are loyal enough to fight and die, as they are doing by the thousands; loyal enough to take up great loans and pay enormous taxes; loyal enough to furnish important men at no salary on some of the great war boards in Washington. But they are not loyal enough, in the President's opinion, to be trusted with any share in the government of the country or legislation for it.

SUGGESTED CHANGES.

If the Republican Party controls the House, we can point out some of the things they will do. They will replace Mr. DENT, of Alabama, at the head of the Military Affairs Committee, with Mr. JULIUS KAHN, to whom the administration was obliged to turn for assistance to take charge of and carry the first draft bill against Mr. DENT's opposition.

They will put a Republican at the head of the Ways and Means Committee, as leader of the House, instead of Mr. KIRCHIN, of North Carolina, who voted against the war. They will give the country a Speaker who did not oppose and would not oppose a draft bill and would never say, as Speaker CLARK did, that "there is precious little difference between a conscript and a convict."

Although the Republicans of the House are in the minority, they cast more actual votes on seven great war measures than the Democratic majority was made to do. What is the record of the Senate? On 51 roll calls on war measures between April 6, 1917, and the 29th of May, 1918, the votes cast by Republicans in favor of such measures were 72 per cent, while only 67 per cent of the votes cast on the Democratic side were in favor of such measures. Those were the President's own measures. Does that record look as if we had hampered him? The Republican Party in Congress has supported the administration policies since the war with a unanimity and an absence of criticism unprecedented in the party history.

DOMESTIC QUESTIONS.

There are some domestic questions where we should undoubtedly differ from the course pursued by the administration. We should not, for example, fix a price on the farmer's wheat and leave the planter's cotton untouched. Another domestic question in which the Republican Party believes thoroughly is economic preparation for the coming of peace, and they are clearly of the opinion that the Congress of the United States should not be excluded from that great task.

This is not the President's personal war. This is not the war of Congress. It is not the war of the Democratic or the Republican Party. It is the war of the American people. It is more. It is the war of the United States, of the allied powers, of the civilized world, against the barbarism of Germany. In this great burden and responsibility the Republican Party, representing more than half the citizenship of the country, demands its rightful share.

If the Republican Party is intrusted with power in either or both Houses, it will do everything possible to drive forward the war and hasten the day of victory. The President speaks of the necessity of telling the plain truth. That the Republican Party in control of Congress would do, for they have no friends to shield. And they will do more. They will give all the money to the last dollar necessary to sustain our armies and our fleets, but they will check the waste now going on of the money given by the most generous people on the face of the earth.

EFFECT OF ELECTION ABROAD.

The President speaks of the effect of the election abroad. He says that there they understand the meaning of elections. They do, and they will know that if the Republicans have a majority in Congress the war will be pressed with greater vigor than ever before. They are quite aware that the power of the Senate is equal to that of the President in the consummation of peace by treaty. They well know that the Republican Party stands for a victorious peace and the overthrow of Prussian militarism. That knowledge will not depress the spirit of our allies or encourage the Government of Germany.

The Republican Party believes that the question of surrender should be left to Marshal Foch, to the generals and to the armies in the field. When they report that Germany has laid down her arms the United States and the allies should then impose their terms. Will that knowledge cause dejection to those who are fighting with us? All the world knows that the Republican Party is opposed to negotiations and discussion carried on in diplomatic notes addressed to the German Government. The Republican Party stands for unconditional surrender. There's no Republican creed so short that there is not room in it for those two words.

HENRY CABOT LODGE,
REED SMOOT.

Chairman Republican Senatorial Committee.
FREDERICK H. GILLETT.
SIMON D. FESS.

Chairman Republican Congressional Committee.

ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY.

Mr. MARTIN of Virginia. I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 13086) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes, and it was thereupon signed by the Presiding Officer.

CONSOLIDATION OF NATIONAL BANKS.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, it has been impossible for the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] to be in the Chamber to-day. There is a bill on the Calendar which the Comptroller of the Currency is desirous of having passed at a very early date. I refer to calendar No. 344, being the bill (H. R. 10205) to provide for the consolidation of national banking associations. I told the Senator from Oklahoma that I would call up the bill to-day and ask unanimous consent for its consideration. I am authorized by the Senator from Oklahoma to say that he hopes that the Senate will disagree to the five slight amendments which were reported by the committee, so that the bill will not have to go back to the House, but may go to the President direct and be signed. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. President, for the consideration of the bill to which I have referred.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (H. R. 10205) to provide for the consolidation of national banking associations, which

had been reported from the Committee on Banking and Currency with amendments.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think the bill has already been read. I ask that the five amendments reported by the committee be disagreed to.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. What are the amendments?

Mr. SMOOT. I will tell the Senator. They are mere verbal changes. The first amendment is to insert the words "of the" on page 1, in line 6. The next amendment is on page 2, line 4, to strike out the word "paper" and insert "newspaper"; the next amendment is on page 2, line 7, after the word "meeting" to insert "and after posting such notice in at least three public places in the town"; the next amendment is to strike out the words "who has not voted for such consolidation"; and the last amendment is on page 3, line 18, to strike out the word "real." The rejection of the amendments will really make no difference, and the only reason why I ask that the amendments be disagreed to is, as I have stated, in order that the bill may not have to go back to the House, but may go direct to the President for his signature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendments.

The SECRETARY. On page 1, line 6, after the word "either," it is proposed to insert the words "of the," so as to read: "consolidate into one association under the charter of either of the existing banks."

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 4, after the words "in a," to strike out "paper" and insert "newspaper."

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 7, after the word "meeting," to insert "and after posting such notice in at least three public places in the town," so as to read: "and after sending such notice to each shareholder of record by registered mail at least 10 days prior to said meeting and after posting such notice in at least three public places in the town."

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 2, line 15, to strike out "who has not voted for such consolidation."

The amendment was rejected.

The next amendment was, on page 3, line 18, after the word "property," to strike out "real."

The amendment was rejected.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BRIDGE BILLS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably with amendments the bill (S. 4966) to authorize the Gulf Ports Terminal Railway Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Florida, to construct a bridge over and across the headwaters of Mobile Bay and such navigable channels as are between the east side of the bay and Blakeley Island, in Baldwin and Mobile Counties, Ala., and I submit a report (No. 604) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The amendments were, on page 1, line 4, before the word "bridge," to insert "construction of the"; and, on page 2, after line 13, to insert as a new section the following:

"SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc. That the time for the commencement and completion of the construction of the bridge, or bridges, and trestles, authorized by the act entitled "An act to authorize the Gulf Ports Terminal Railway Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Florida, to construct a bridge over and across the headwaters of Mobile Bay, and such navigable channels as are between the east side of the bay and Blakeley Island, in Baldwin and Mobile Counties, Ala.," approved October 5, 1917, is extended three years from and after the 5th day of October, 1917.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendments were concurred in.

The amendments were ordered to be engrossed and the bill to be read a third time.

The bill was read the third time and passed.

The title of the bill was amended so as to read: "A bill to extend the time for the construction by the Gulf Ports Terminal Railway Co., a corporation existing under the laws of the State of Florida, of a bridge or bridges and trestles over and across the headwaters of Mobile Bay, and such navigable channels as

are between the east side of the bay and Blakeley Island, in Baldwin and Mobile Counties, Ala."

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce, I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 7637) to authorize the construction and maintenance of a dike on Depot Slough, Lincoln County, Oreg., and I submit a report (No. 602) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 11709) granting the consent of Congress to the village and township of Halstad, Norman County, Minn., and the township of Herberg, Traill County, N. Dak., to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North on the boundary line between said States, and I submit a report (No. 603) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill granting the consent of Congress to Norman County, Minn., and Traill County, N. Dak., to construct a bridge across the Red River of the North on the boundary line between said States."

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 11948) granting the consent of Congress to the Great Southern Lumber Co., a corporation of the State of Pennsylvania, doing business in the State of Mississippi, to construct a bridge across Pearl River, at or near the north line of section 22, township 8 north, range 21 west, west of the basis meridian, in the land district east of Pearl River, in the State of Mississippi, and I submit a report (No. 605) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably, without amendment, the bill (H. R. 11949) to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across Pearl River between Pearl River County, Miss., and Washington Parish, La., and I submit a report (No. 600) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 12631) granting the consent of Congress to the county of Winnebago, in the State of Illinois, and the town of Rockford, in said county and State, to construct a bridge across Rock River at or near Camp Grant, and I submit a report (No. 607) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate, without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SHEPPARD. From the Committee on Commerce I report back favorably without amendment the bill (H. R. 12773) to authorize the construction of a bridge across the Little Calumet River, in Cook County, State of Illinois, at or near the village of Riverdale, in said county, and I submit a report (No. 601) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill.

The bill was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

STIMULATION OF AGRICULTURE—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia submitted the following report:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 11945) to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to carry out during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the purposes of the act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by stimulating agriculture and facilitating the distribution of agricultural products," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendment of the Senate numbered 28.

T. P. GORE,
W. S. KENYON,
HOKE SMITH,

Managers on the part of the Senate.

A. F. LEVER,
E. S. CANDLER,
G. N. HAUGEN,
J. C. McLAUGHLIN,

Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, perhaps I should state that the conferees were not only unable to agree, but the conferees on the part of the House declined to consider any kind of provision on this subject. We invited them to say what kind of legislation they wanted; to say in what way, if any, they objected to the Pomerene amendment; to give us something that they did think would meet the situation. Their attitude, however, was that they would not consider an amendment on this subject placed upon an Agricultural appropriation bill, and that the only possible way to obtain legislation would be through the District Committee. For this reason it is useless to ask for a further conference. While they asked for the conference, they declined to confer.

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. Of course, there has not been a quorum of the House back since that time, and the House has had no opportunity to express itself on the conference report.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I am intensely anxious to do something to protect especially those of smaller incomes in the city of Washington, and I am willing to take any course with reference to it that can possibly help us obtain legislation. I think there is a grievous wrong going on, especially in the charges that are being put upon the workers here in Washington with limited resources.

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. LENROOT. Does not the Senator think that if this matter should lie upon the table until a quorum does return to the House, the House might then instruct its conferees to recede?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not ask that it be acted upon to-day. I think at least it should go over until Thursday.

Mr. LENROOT. I understand; but I am asking the Senator's opinion as to whether that might not be the case.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I had hoped so.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I want to say here that from what I understand, after talking with the chairman of the House Committee on Agriculture, there is no possible chance of the House instructing its conferees to recede.

Mr. LENROOT. I have very strong hopes that that is not the case.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I shall not make any motion regarding the matter this afternoon, but I hope that the Senate will take action on Thursday.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. While the subject is up, there is just one word more that I should like to suggest. It occurs to me that if the House would name different conferees on the bills pending before the District Committee the Senate certainly would be willing to name different conferees, and we might bring about a conference in that way. I do not know how the Senator from Ohio would feel about that. I know his deep interest in the legislation.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I am very deeply interested in it, and I am very much disappointed to hear the opinion expressed that the conferees can not get together. I have shared the opinion of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. Lenroot], to the effect that if there had been a quorum in the House they might have entertained a different view from that which is entertained by the present conferees on the Agricul-

tural bill. I am willing to do anything within reason to get legislation which will be effective. If that can be done by other conferees I shall say "Amen" to it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, recognizing the Senator from Ohio as the Senator who has done such splendid work upon this subject, I am willing to follow him now in any line that he suggests. I am willing to vote for any action that he supports with regard to the present amendment or any line of conduct that he thinks is wise.

Mr. POMERENE. It is true, Mr. President, that I gave a great deal of attention to this bill, and I am keenly interested in it; but I do not believe I am any more interested in it than every other Senator in this body, because I know that they feel that a gross outrage is being perpetrated upon the temporary residents of this city and of this District by some of these landlords.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair). The conference report will lie on the table.

THE COAL SITUATION.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I have before me a statement issued by the United States Fuel Administrator bearing upon the coal situation. It is desired that it be printed in the RECORD, and without asking to have it read I ask unanimous consent that it be inserted in the RECORD for the information of the public generally.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there any objection to this question of the Senator from Ohio? The Chair hears none and permission is granted.

The statement referred to is as follows:

STATEMENT BY UNITED STATES FUEL ADMINISTRATOR HARRY A. GARFIELD.

"As winter approaches the people of the United States desire to know what they may expect from the Fuel Administration, and they have a right to know. The experiences of last winter naturally tend to make people apprehensive. While it is not likely that the coming season will be as severe as last, the Fuel Administration has proceeded on the assumption that it might be and has made its plans accordingly. The following are the facts presented in briefest form:

"First, as to domestic fuel. Anthracite (hard) coal is the domestic fuel of the East. Hard coal all comes from eastern Pennsylvania. To prevent long hauls and unnecessary use of railroad locomotives and cars for the transportation of coal, the country has been zoned. The Railroad and Fuel Administrations have united in setting up the zones. In a general way coal must be taken from the nearest fields, although certain kinds of coal necessary for special manufacturing purposes can not be thus limited. The result of this arrangement is that people nearest (radius hard to define) the anthracite coal fields and all of the distant New England points are to burn hard coal. This happens not to be regarded as a hardship. But even if it were, this rule would have to be enforced. Also, because of the possibility of transporting coal by water to upper Lake ports, a considerable part of the Northwest is supplied with anthracite, while the allotment to certain other States has been cut down to a fraction only of the normal supply, the balance being made up with bituminous (soft) coal.

"The program of distribution of domestic coal for the entire year calls for 51,258,029 tons (this includes coal for manufacturing and for gas—about 5,000,000 tons in all) of anthracite coal, which is 2,062,323 tons more than were distributed during 1916. (Nineteen hundred and sixteen was the last normal year for coal distribution. It was, therefore, taken as the basis in making the allotment for 1918.) Up to the 1st of October, 26,388,151 tons had been delivered. (In the Northwest the coal has either been delivered or is en route.) The following schedule tells the story in brief:

States.	Allotment for the year in tons.	Delivered Oct. 1.
New England.....	10,331,000	5,537,779
Middle Atlantic.....	31,314,754	15,246,331
Virginia.....	102,400	73,640
Western.....	3,481,945	1,835,398
Northwestern.....	2,374,000	1,701,561
Canada.....	3,602,000	1,963,700
Export (principally Newfoundland and Cuba).....	51,930	29,742
Total.....	51,258,029	26,388,151
Allotment for half year.....	25,629,014	

¹ The coal for the northwestern district has either been distributed or is en route.

"It will thus be seen that to October 1 the Fuel Administration had exceeded its program of deliveries by 759,136 tons.

"But some dealers have found themselves without a supply of anthracite and this has inconvenienced a great many people. This was due to the fact that some dealers had moved, others had started in business this year, while still others, some because of a break in trade relations and others because their credit was not good, had not received their usual supply. This difficulty has, however, largely been overcome, so far as communities, if not individual dealers, are concerned.

"Under the arrangement now in existence, if any domestic consumer finds himself short of coal he should apply to his local fuel administrator, giving him the name of a dealer to whom he has applied and the circumstances of his case. The local administrator will present the matter to the State fuel administrator, who will issue the necessary directions to the anthracite distribution committee.

"Second, as to bituminous coal:

"While anthracite is the domestic fuel of the East, the rest of the country depends upon bituminous coal. About 75,000,000 tons of bituminous coal are used annually by domestic consumers, including apartment houses, but not including coal used for making gas and electricity. The facts as to supply are given below in connection with the industrial use of bituminous coal. I need say here only in brief that the several parts of the country are now well supplied with bituminous coal for domestic use. It must not, however, be understood that domestic users can afford to waste either hard or soft coal. Rigid economy is necessary. If the instructions issued from time to time by the Fuel Administration for the care of furnaces and the heating and ventilation of houses are followed, we shall come through the winter without hardship.

"Again, let me call attention to the fact that more domestic coal is now in the hands of consumers and dealers than at the corresponding period in normal years.

"Industry is chiefly dependent upon soft coal. Therefore its consumption has been much more largely increased by the war than the consumption of hard coal. The following schedule tells the story of increased production of soft coal since 1913:

Production of bituminous coal in the United States.

Year.	Short tons.	Increase over previous year, tons.
1913.....	478,435,297	(1)
1914.....	422,703,970	55,731,327
1915.....	442,624,426	19,920,453
1916.....	502,519,682	59,895,256
1917.....	551,799,563	49,270,881
1918 (estimated).....	600,000,000	48,000,000

¹ Decrease.

Increase 1918 over 1916: 122,000,000 (approximate).

"The enormous increase for the present year has been made possible by cordial cooperation between the three agencies involved, namely, the mine workers and operators, the Railroad Administration, and the Fuel Administration. What is our situation to-day? The coal year begins April 1. During the first six months, to October 1, we had produced 37,000,000 tons bituminous more than we produced in the corresponding period last year. By produced I mean placed in railroad cars and delivered either as coal or coke. Coal is not produced in any commercial sense until it has been dug from the mine and delivered on board railroad cars.

"What the public wishes to know is whether this coal is being distributed in a way to meet the needs of the country and whether we have been farsighted enough to stock coal against the winter's need. The important item here is, How much coal have we managed to store up? Briefly, the answer is, More than ever before. Taking the country as a whole, we have in stock coal sufficient for eight weeks. Obviously stock piles must be greatest at points farthest from the mines.

"Never until the present year has an attempt been made to ascertain the stocks on hand. The statistical bureau of the Fuel Administration receives a weekly post-card report from each of the great and most of the small industrial plants and coal dealers of the country. Tens of thousands of small manufacturing establishments are included in the weekly returns of public utilities supplying them with power and light. Each card states the amount of coal on hand at the beginning of the week, the amount received and the amount used during the week, and the balance on hand at the end of the week. Over an average of more than 10,000 cards are received and tabulated daily. Errors and omissions are diligently followed up. Final tabulation of these reports are, at the outside, only six weeks behind. The following schedule tells the story of requirements for the

year, the deliveries for the first six months, and the stocks on hand in the several States:

	Net tons.
Total estimated requirements of bituminous coal, Apr. 1 to Sept. 30, 1918, without allowance for conservation or curtailment of industry	361,730,000
Production of bituminous coal, Apr. 1 to Sept. 30, 1918	312,282,000
Number of weeks' stock of bituminous coal on hand Oct. 1 or industrial, public utilities, and coal dealers.	

States.	Weeks.
Alabama	2
Arkansas	10
Arizona	4
California	6
Colorado	4
Connecticut	17
Delaware	10
Florida	10
Georgia	6
Idaho	5
Illinois	6
Indiana	5
Iowa	6
Kansas	5
Kentucky	3
Louisiana	7
Maine	17
Maryland	5
Massachusetts	19
Michigan (upper peninsula)	20
Michigan (lower peninsula)	12
Minnesota	20
Mississippi	8
Missouri	6
Montana	5
Nebraska	4
Nevada	15
New Hampshire	18
New Jersey	10
New Mexico	4
New York	6
North Carolina	5
North Dakota	11
Ohio	6
Oklahoma	9
Oregon	3
Pennsylvania	7
Rhode Island	8
South Carolina	7
South Dakota	3
Tennessee	4
Texas	4
Utah	15
Vermont	4
Virginia	4
Washington	4
West Virginia	4
Wisconsin	9
Wyoming	5

NOTE.—The upper peninsula of Michigan and the States of Wisconsin and Minnesota and, in part, North Dakota and South Dakota have their winter supply of coal assured through the movement of coal to the head of the Lakes, which is moving forward on schedule.

“Stocks on hand for each State are reported by industries so classified as to enable me to know whether, for example, the stocks of by-product coal are sufficiently large to meet beyond peradventure the steel requirements of the War Industries Board. In this connection, it is interesting to know that the stocks of coal for by-product coke ovens average 4 weeks, ranging from 1 week at points in the coal fields to 15 weeks supply for by-product ovens at the most distant points, such as at Duluth and Superior.

“Although accurate statistics have never been taken until this year manufacturers agree that never before have we had larger stocks of coal on hand at the beginning of winter.

“The clean-coal campaign, inaugurated to relieve users of bituminous coal from the handicap they suffered last winter in the use of improperly graded or entirely unprepared coal, is being rigidly prosecuted. During the week ending October 26, 13 mines were ordered to cease shipping. Prior to that time 86 mines had been closed; 67 because the producers would not properly prepare their coal for shipment, and 19 because the coal produced was entirely unusable. In addition to these mines closed, several hundred mines have been ordered to cease taking coal from poor veins.

“Since the advent of the Fuel Administration, inspections numbering 15,369 have been made. The inspection force now comprises 79 United States Fuel Administration inspectors and 106 State inspectors working in cooperation with them. Mines under inspection by other governmental departments, such as the Pocahontas fields under supervision by the Navy Department, do not receive a duplicate inspection by the Fuel Administration.

“The present supply of coke is slightly less than the maximum demand of blast furnaces and war industries.

“There are at present 405 blast furnaces in the United States in shape to run; their monthly requirements being 4,250,000 tons. The blast furnaces take about 95 per cent of the total production of coke, this percentage amounting to 4,100,000

tons. The real shortage at present, due to certain number of furnaces being ‘out of blast,’ is about 75,000 tons per month.

“The war program demanding that the maximum number of furnaces be kept in operation, there has been but very slight accumulation of stocks. The distribution is being handled by telephone and telegraph direct from Washington, shipments being diverted as necessary to put the coke where most imperatively demanded. The failure to meet the maximum production requirements is due not to any lack of ovens but to shortage of labor at ovens and in mines having ovens.

“The oil situation is briefly this:

“The oil and natural-gas situation for this winter will probably be somewhat acute owing to the decrease in production of natural gas as compared with last year and the expected increase in consumption, and in the case of oil to the steadily increasing domestic and overseas demands.

“The successful solution of the oil problem is largely one of transportation. Tank ships are very scarce and existing pipe lines are now running practically to capacity.

“Additional pipe-line capacity is being built into the new field at Ranger, Tex., but the transporting of this oil from Gulf ports to North Atlantic ports will involve additional tank steamers not now easily available.

“It is essential to limit additional consumption wherever possible, pending construction of additional transportation facilities either in the form of pipe lines, tank ships, or tank barges.

“Oil stocks on September 1, 1917, and September 1, 1918, were, for gasoline, kerosene, gas oil, and fuel oil, as follows:

	Stocks.	Gasoline and naphthas.	Kerosene.	Gas, oil, and fuel oil.
Sept. 1, 1917	6,025,000	11,000,000	11,375,000	
Sept. 1, 1918	6,000,000	9,400,000	19,500,000	

“As to labor. It is a remarkable fact that although 38,000,000 tons more of coal, anthracite and bituminous, have been produced in the first six months of the present coal year than in the corresponding period of 1917, there have been fewer laborers in the field; 50,000 to 60,000 mine workers have gone into the military service and 50,000 to 60,000 more have left the mines for more remunerative work in other fields. The response of those who have remained to the appeals of the President and of the Fuel Administration and their appreciation of the fact that the mine worker is vitally important to the soldier in the trenches, accounts, in large part, for the production results. The mine workers have merited the praise just received from Gen. Pershing by cable, ‘We soldiers know that we can depend upon you to do your part as we are doing ours.’ The relation of coal and steel to war is new. A hundred and fifty years ago coal and steel were relatively negligible items in war programs—that is, as compared with the soldier in the field. To bring the new relation home to the hundreds of thousands of mine workers of many nationalities and of varying degrees of familiarity with political and industrial conditions has been no small task. The Labor and Production Bureaus of the Fuel Administration deserve the greatest credit for their work in this direction.

“But labor alone can not produce coal. As stated above, coal is produced in a commercial sense only when it is dug out of the ground and loaded into cars. Coal in the mine or dumped on the ground at the mouth of the mine is of as little value as Robinson Crusoe's money. It must be transported to the bin of the consumer and to the furnace if it is to meet the need. If the Railroad Administration had not met the problem of transportation, the results achieved would not have been possible. The elimination of competitive use of tracks, terminals, and equipment—in other words, the taking over for the period of the war of the competing railroad systems and their operation under a single administrative head—has contributed more largely than any other single factor to the result obtained.

“But only of less importance was the elimination of long hauls and cross hauls, which constituted a waste of both motive power and of car tonnage. The importance of this is recognized when it is understood that more than one-third of the entire tonnage of our railroads, even in ordinary times, is used for the transportation of coal.

“From the foregoing it may be inferred that the fuel situation is so well in hand that vexing economies are no longer necessary. But this is far from true. Had less essential industries been permitted to operate without curtailment of fuel supply the stocks on hand would have been seriously reduced. We have been able to stock up because we have saved as well as because we have produced more coal than at any other time. In cooperation with other war administrations, especially with the War

Industries Board and the Food Administration, the Conservation Bureau of the Fuel Administration has made an estimated saving thus far of 12,700,000 tons of coal for the first half of the coal year, but as the saving each month is constantly increasing, there will be a much greater saving during the next six months, which includes the winter, so that it expects during the entire year to be able to report a saving of 50,000,000 tons.

"The Fuel Administration approaches the winter season well organized, with stocks of coal on hand far in excess of the stocks of other years, the report says. We are ready for an unusually severe winter, but we are still and shall continue to be dependent upon the cooperation of the people of the United States in conserving fuel and upon the several agencies concerned in the production and transportation of fuel to enable us to carry through our program to the end of the year.

"The people of the United States have demonstrated their willingness to make any sacrifice necessary, but they must be satisfied that what is asked is necessary and reasonable. The highest testimony to democracy has been furnished by the way in which the people of the United States have met the requests of the Food and Fuel Administrations, even when those requests have imported upon them personal inconvenience and sacrifice."

WHEAT AND COTTON PRICE FIXING.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, it seems that the day is to be consumed in the discussion of the address of the President and the reply of the Republican statesmen. I desire to ask the attention of the Senate to a clause in the reply of the Republican statesmen entirely sectional in its nature and not sustained by the facts.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, before the Senator proceeds, may I ask him a question outside of the matter concerning which he desires to address the Senate?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Certainly.

Mr. WATSON. I believe the Senator is a member of the Military Affairs Committee, and I ask for information. Has the Senator heard anything about the Hughes report, whether or not it has been made, or will be made, or is likely to be made, or whatever has become of that report?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I have no information upon the subject except what I have seen in the press.

Mr. WATSON. No other information?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. No other information.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, will the Senator be kind enough to state what was in the press? I have not seen it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The statement was made that the report had been handed to the Attorney General Saturday afternoon, I believe.

Mr. President, I do not delight in partisan politics. I deplore sectional strife.

On Friday the Republican congressional campaign committee gave out a statement which contained the following language:

There are some domestic questions where we should undoubtedly differ from the course pursued by the administration. We should not, for example, fix a price on the farmers' wheat and leave the planters' cotton untouched.

I deplore this appeal to sectional prejudice. I can not believe it would have been made had the facts been understood by those responsible for it.

Before giving the facts which completely answer this appeal to sectional prejudice let me protest against conceding to any branch of our Government, legislative or administrative, the right to fix the price of wheat or any other commodity and to require a producer to dispose of his property at the price fixed.

When commodities are required by the Government for public use the legislative branch of the Government can authorize, under the power of eminent domain, commodities to be taken for public use; but even then the price can not be arbitrarily fixed by the Government. If the representatives of the Government and the owners of the commodities required for public use can not agree upon the price, provision must be made for owners of the commodities to go into court and obtain an adjudication fixing the true value of the commodities and the Government must pay the amount so fixed by the court.

No power is vested in our Government, legislative and administrative combined, to fix a price at which one citizen must dispose of his property to another citizen.

The necessities of war may justify regulation of agencies engaged in handling essential commodities, but even then all care should be exercised to avoid preventing the producer from receiving the fair price which the cost of production and the law of supply and demand would fix.

It may be that regulation has borne severely upon some commodities. Such regulation should be avoided, and if already made be modified.

Wheat is the material essential to feed our armies and the armies of our allies. A large part of the crop was essential for public use. Speculators took advantage of the opportunity to corner markets and advance greatly prices after the wheat had been sold by the farmer who produced it.

Legislation was passed to regulate grain exchanges, elevator companies, and middle men. A large appropriation was made to be used by the Food Administrator with which to make purchases, and authority was given him to sell. No claim was made in this legislation of authority to fix a maximum price for wheat.

Lest this governmental control might injure the wheat grower, the legislation provided Government guaranty to the wheat grower of a price to be fixed by certain administrative agencies, but the legislation also provided that the guaranteed price should not be less than \$2 a bushel. The purpose of this guaranty was plain. Congress recognized the fact that no power existed in this Government justly to interfere with the price which the grower's wheat would bring under the law of supply and demand, taking into account also the cost of production to the wheat grower, and, as the regulations provided were required to check the speculator, it was proposed to guarantee the wheat grower from any loss as the result of these regulations.

Legislation was subsequently introduced increasing the minimum price which the Government should guarantee for wheat to two dollars and a half a bushel. Although the cotton-growing States produce but little wheat, and are large buyers of wheat, practically every Senator from those States supported the legislative provision guaranteeing two dollars and a half per bushel to the wheat growers. The fact was recognized that the wheat grower was entitled to an increased price for his wheat, due to the increased cost of production and the normal effect of the law of supply and demand upon his crop. The price guaranteed by the administration was \$2.20 per bushel, approximately two and one-half times the price at which wheat sold prior to the war.

The Government did not fix a maximum price for wheat; it guaranteed a minimum price.

If the regulations applied to the conduct of grain exchanges and middlemen have prevented the wheat growers from receiving full value for their wheat, the regulation should be modified, or the Government guarantee should be increased.

Corn is our greatest agricultural product. Hay is one of the greatest. If any effort has been made to interfere with the market price of corn or hay, I do not know it.

Now, I ask your attention to cotton.

No other crop requires so much human labor, and no other labor has so advanced in price. No other crop requires the use of so much commercial fertilizers. The crop this year was 25 per cent below the normal production for the acreage planted. The increased cost of production, compared to the prewar cost, exceed that of any other agricultural product. There have been very short crops for four years. The demand exceeds the supply.

Immediately prior to the war middling lint cotton was selling at 13 cents a pound. Approximately 2,000,000 families were engaged in planting and cultivating cotton, some as the owners of land, some as tenants, and some as croppers. The families engaged in this work consisted on an average of a man, his wife, and three children—a family of five—the children, of course, working part of the time. The average production per family, after paying rent, was about 5 bales. If the farmer owned his land, the portion going to the landowner should be credited to his land; the value of the labor of the family would still be 5 bales. At 13 cents a pound this paid the family \$325 a year.

It is true they raised other products and had the seed, but the incidental expenses of the farm consumed this surplus and the amount fairly to be classed as compensation for the labor was cotton of the value of \$325 per year.

These wages were lower than those earned by any other class of labor in the United States. They were unreasonably low, and cotton could only have been produced and sold at the low price which it brought before the war upon a basis of labor so cheap that those engaged in it did not earn a fair livelihood.

Even before the war the farmers of the cotton-growing States had begun to realize that from other products they could earn a much better return, and they had begun to give their attention to beans, to peas, to potatoes, to corn, to oats, to stock, to cattle, and to hogs. At present prices their profits from the production of these commodities are fully as great as can be earned from cotton selling at 40 cents a pound.

The demand for labor during the past year has been great. Prices have rapidly advanced. Cotton farm labor was so low

that it has been especially affected by the advance. Where labor was hired for wages those wages had to compete with wages in industries and Government plants. The tenants and croppers can not be expected to continue in cotton fields unless to them is conceded compensation approximately equal to wages earned elsewhere.

The man alone constituting a part of the family cultivating cotton could leave the farm and make in a near-by industry as much as the entire family could make at cotton selling for a figure three times as great as that at which it sold before the war.

During the present year an acreage was planted in cotton which, with a normal crop, would have produced fifteen and one-half millions of bales. All the labor was expended, up to picking time, to plant and cultivate this crop, which would have produced the number of bales named. The hot winds of July and August burned up 4,000,000 bales of cotton and reduced the crop to 11,500,000 bales. The cultivation of the increased acreage, which should have produced 4,000,000 bales additional cotton, added to the cost of the cotton actually produced, or, putting it in a different way, reduced the number of bales which the average family gathered. The cost of picking cotton this year was greater than at any time during the history of cotton cultivation. It was from one and one-half to two dollars per hundred pounds, but this means pounds of cotton, seed and all, and it requires 3 pounds of cotton in the seed to make 1 pound of lint cotton, so that the lint cotton cost from 4½ cents to 6 cents per pound for picking alone.

The best information I gather from cotton culture in my own State is that the crop of this year cost, wherever labor was employed for wages, from 30 to 37½ cents per pound. Many well-informed men in the cotton section insist that the average cost of the present crop has been between 35 and 40 cents a pound.

The labor to produce wheat was fairly well paid before the war. The demand for labor at the higher prices did not affect the wheat grower as it affected the cotton grower, for the advance in price did not increase the cost of labor on the wheat farm nearly so much as it increased the cost of labor on the cotton farm. The wheat crop was a normal crop. The cotton crop was 4,000,000 bales less than the planted acreage should have produced.

Another element has entered into the increased cost of producing cotton. It is the greatly increased cost of fertilizer and the difficulty of obtaining potash at any price. Many acres of the lands used for the production of cotton are a sandy loam, which must have potash furnished by the use of commercial fertilizers or the cotton will not properly fruit.

All these elements combined to increase the cost of producing the cotton crop of 1918, and three times the prewar price is now a fair price for cotton.

Goods manufactured from cotton are selling on an average of more than three times prewar prices. Indeed, the Government has paid for supplies of goods manufactured of cotton three times prewar prices.

One-half of our cotton is shipped abroad and handled by foreign manufacturers. That manufactured in the United States is consumed about one-half by the mills in the States where cotton is grown and one-half in the mills of the balance of the country. To force down the price of lint cotton without forcing down the price of the products manufactured from lint cotton, would be simply to make a present of the amount taken from the selling price, one-half to the manufacturers in foreign countries and one-half to the manufacturers in this country.

Our Republican friends might have suggested that the price of the products manufactured from cotton should be touched or fixed by the administration. If price fixing were legal and resorted to for the benefit of the people of this country, it is necessary that the price fixing should attach to the products manufactured from cotton. Mere price fixing on lint cotton would not help the great consuming public.

The cotton crop for four successive years has now been a short crop. There is every reason to believe that next year's crop will be much less than the crop of the present year. It certainly will be much less if farmers can not obtain a higher price than the present price for their cotton. The cost of production, the successive short crops, the reasonable application of the law of supply and demand justify a price of 40 cents per pound for middling lint cotton. This, of course, would mean that the lower grades of a spinable character would sell down between 35 and 40 cents per pound. Three times prewar prices for cotton would be 39 cents a pound. An advance of three for one of prewar prices on cotton, considering all the elements attaching to the present crop, would not relatively exceed the prices at which other agricultural products are selling. The ships carrying cotton across the ocean are charging ten times prewar prices.

Then, too, we should not forget that during the first year of the war, in 1914, the cotton crop was very large, the markets of the world were cut off by the war. Cotton was then left unsupported by Government action. It sold as low as 5 cents a pound, and many cotton farmers were financially ruined.

The Government has guaranteed the wheat grower about two and one-half times prewar prices for wheat. It has not undertaken to fix a price of corn, the greatest agricultural product of this country. It has not undertaken to fix the price of hay, one of the chief agricultural products of the country. The Republican manifesto should not have made a sectional attack upon the cotton grower.

Now, let us consider what the administration has done with reference to the selling price of cotton.

Unless prices improve above present selling figures, the administration has not only "touched" cotton but it has hammered down the market, causing a loss of \$450,000,000 to cotton growers.

During the first few days of September cotton was selling throughout the sections where it is grown at from 38 to 39 cents a pound. It was apparent that under legitimate laws of supply and demand, together with a proper recognition of the cost of raising the crop and the probable cost and size of next year's crop, cotton would easily have sold for 40 cents a pound. It has been forced down from this price 8 cents a pound. What has done it? This fall in price is clearly attributable, whether intentional or not, to the action of the administration taken through the War Industries Board.

On September 4 the War Industries Board, through the Committee on Public Information, issued a statement that—

The announcement of another short crop of cotton raises in acute form the problem of satisfying the needs of the Nation as well as those of the allies. • • • With the approval of the President the War Industries Board will appoint a committee to study the present situation, the problems of distribution, the marketing of low-grade cottons, and the desirability and feasibility of effecting a stabilization of prices.

This announcement followed a rise in the price of cotton to practically 40 cents a pound. It admitted the very short crop and stabilization of prices could have meant nothing but an effort to prevent the rise of prices.

Immediately upon this announcement the price of cotton declined in so startling a way that on September 5 the chairman of the War Industries Board, through the Committee on Public Information, announced that—

The appointment of a committee to study the conditions arising from a heavy shortage in the cotton crop must not be construed as indicating that price fixing will be a certain outcome of their efforts.

This statement indicated a purpose to let normal conditions apply to cotton and the market substantially rallied.

On September 13, through the Committee on Public Information, another publication was issued by the War Industries Board containing this statement:

The demand for high-grade cotton, which is out of proportion to the available supply, and the fact that the Government, through early agreements with the allies, must act as a common buyer for allied purchases, make it necessary to secure some basis of distribution of all grades of cotton. • • • It is believed that by this course both the producer and the consumer will be better protected than by continuation of the present chaotic conditions of the market. The plan is to create, subject to the approval of the President, a cotton committee to devise methods for broadening the channels of distribution and use of the great stock of low grades now practically unmarketable, eliminating speculation and hoarding, and apportioning the foreign orders.

There had been no chaotic conditions of the market, except that caused by the first publication from the War Industries Board. Cotton had simply been steadily increasing in market price, as the farmer realized what the crop had cost and as purchasers and farmers realized the short amount of the crop. There had been no hoarding of any character. Farmers had just begun to gather their crop. They were just beginning to sell it. Most of the cotton was still in the field.

The announcement proceeded as follows:

It may be part of this committee's duty to recommend basic prices on cotton. If, after investigation, it is found necessary, a fair price will be fixed.

This was a threat to prevent the law of supply and demand from applying to the price of cotton. It was a threat to disregard the high cost of producing the crop. It was undoubtedly a threat to interfere with the market by undertaking to fix a price lower than the price at which cotton was selling.

On September 27 the appointment of two committees was announced by the War Industries Board through the Committee on Public Information. These committees were to "control distribution, to buy cotton for the use of the United States Government and the allies, and to consider prices."

On September 25 a statement was issued by Charles J. Brand, chairman of the committee on cotton distribution, and on September 27 a statement was issued by Thomas Walker Page, chairman of the committee on cotton.

I request, Mr. President, that all of these announcements may be printed at the close of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That may be done.

[See appendix.]

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It will be observed that one of these committees had authority to buy cotton for the use of the United States Government and the allies. This would seem in effect to have consolidated the purchase for England, France, Italy, Japan, and other countries uniting with us in war against Germany in a single agency, thereby eliminating all competition among the principal foreign purchasers, while nothing was done to eliminate the competition among the unorganized 2,000,000 growers of cotton, who are the sellers.

As a result of this action by the administration, cotton has been hammered down 8 cents a pound below the price at which it was selling the 1st of September. If the present price is maintained the loss to the cotton growers, as a result of the "touching" of cotton by the administration, would be \$450,000,000 on this year's crop. I submit in all kindness that this procedure should not have taken place. Those in charge should still seek to rectify the mistake they have made.

Of course, the cotton farmer is not obliged to sell; but many cotton farmers produce their crop under circumstances where they can not hold it. They must take the price offered in September and October. Fortunately, I believe, a large number of cotton farmers are not compelled to sell except at prices which they feel bring to them fair compensation. I hope that nearly all of what is called "distress cotton" has been disposed of and that the producers from this time on will have a voice in fixing the price which they will receive for their labors.

I oppose a regulation which would prevent the cotton farmer from receiving the price which the cost of his crop and the law of demand and supply would bring to him, just as I would have any regulation producing such a result modified in the interests of the wheat grower.

But who has received the benefit of this action by the administration which reduced the market price of cotton? Not the Government, for it has bought no spinable lint cotton. It buys goods manufactured from lint cotton and has been paying in many instances three times prewar prices for these goods. The public has not benefited, for no effort has been made to control the prices which the public wearers of the manufactured cotton goods pay.

Manufacturers could pay 40 cents per pound for cotton and at present selling prices of manufactured goods make handsome profits. I am advised that foreign cotton manufacturers are selling their products based upon an estimated price of 50 cents per pound for lint cotton.

If the War Industries Board and their committees succeed in maintaining the present depression in the price of cotton they will make a present of \$225,000,000 to foreign cotton manufacturers, but they will take the present from our own farmers.

I have said our Government has no use for lint cotton. This is true, but it does use what is called linters, out of which nitrocellulose powders and other munitions are made. After the cotton is ginned the seed are carried to the oil mills, where a fine substance not removed by the gin is scraped from the seed. This substance is called linters. It is a cotton so short and so fine that it can not be used for spinning. It is normally used for bedding, quilts, mattresses, horse collars, and like purposes.

This is the material or cotton best suited for the production of munitions and used for the manufacture of explosives and nitrocellulose powders. Lint cotton is not as desirable for these purposes as linters. Where linters can be obtained in sufficient quantity for the manufacture of munitions lint cotton is not used.

Last year our Government, together with the allies, used 875,000 bales of linters for munition purposes. This year the cotton-oil mills are scraping the seed closer than ever before and will produce over a million bales of linters. They will produce all our Government and our allies will need for munitions. This is the only cotton product purchased by our Government.

Linters could have been condemned for public use, but it was not necessary. The owners of the linters met with the representatives of the Government and agreed upon the price of 4.62 cents per pound for linters. This was not more than half the price at which they would have sold on an open market. But our Government needed them, and, instead of profiteering, they were furnished to the Government at cheaper prices, relative to their value, than any commodity which the Government is buying.

The people of the cotton-growing States are contributing a full part to destroying the Prussian menace. Their boys are in France and at the front. They have bought bonds and subscribed to every activity. I think every cotton State oversub-

scribed the last liberty loan. There is no sacrifice they would not make to carry the flag to complete victory. If hammering down the price of their cotton 8 cents a pound below a legitimate market price is necessary to whip the Germans, then let it be hammered down; but it is difficult to see how taking 8 cents a pound from the selling price does help whip the Germans. If these were times of peace, a cry of protest would be heard; but our country is engaged in a terrible war, and our people, where they suffer, suffer with commendable patience. They are consoled by the reflection that the burden is simply an incident of the war and the difficulty, during war, to provide regulations intended with the best motives which do not bring some unfortunate results.

Perhaps I would express myself too strongly if I said they all suffer in silence. Texas and Georgia are the two largest cotton-growing States. In each of these States there is a Republican candidate for the United States Senate. The Texas candidate makes the leading plank of his platform the failure of the Democratic administration to properly protect the interests of the cotton raiser. The Georgia candidate puts his race squarely upon the manner in which the Democratic administration has not only "touched" the price of cotton but hammered it down. He charges the Democratic administration with having depressed the price of cotton to the loss of the cotton farmer \$450,000,000, and he urges the people to give him their support as a repudiation of this action by the Democratic administration.

I can not concede the wisdom of destroying competition in the purchase of commodities produced by our own citizens. I can not but hope that the War Industries Board will realize the injustice done to cotton owners and withdraw all methods calculated to depress the price.

The board was shown, when price fixing for cotton was under consideration, that no price below 40 cents a pound could be fixed with justice to the farmer. They should withdraw at once any action and all action which has caused the loss of 8 cents in the market price of cotton.

Few farmers, except those holding distress cotton, have sold their cotton at present prices. I hope that cotton owners will be able to hold their cotton until manufacturers and their representatives are willing to pay a price sufficient to compensate for the labor of producing the crop, and sufficient to encourage the production of a full crop in 1919.

In the meantime permit me to suggest to the representatives of the Republican congressional organization that they withdraw their recent statement with reference to the administration leaving cotton "untouched." I am sure unless they will withdraw it they will embarrass their candidates for the Senate in Texas and Georgia. They can not undertake to break into the Senate from wheat-growing States upon the ground that cotton has not been "touched" and at the same time elect Senators from the cotton-growing States upon the ground that "the administration has overburdened cotton."

I can not concede the wisdom of any system of regulation which takes from a commodity in the hands of its producer the legitimate price it would bring under the law of supply and demand; but I shall not discuss that branch of the subject further. I only wish to commend to the attention of the candidates for the Senate in Georgia and in Texas the recent statement, made under a misapprehension, that the Government had not touched cotton; and I should be gratified to supply copies of some of the speeches that are being made by these two candidates in criticism of what the Government has done.

APPENDIX.

[From the Committee on Public Information, Sept. 4, 1918.]

Bernard M. Baruch, chairman of the War Industries Board, authorizes the following:

"The announcement of another short crop of cotton raises in acute form the problem of satisfying the needs of the Nation, as well as those of the allies, and of securing an equitable distribution for the purpose of winning the war.

"Involved in the distribution is the problem of bringing about a reasonable stabilization of prices in the interest of both the producer and the consumer. With the approval of the President, the War Industries Board will appoint a committee to study the present situation, the problems of distribution, the marketing of low-grade cottons, and the desirability and feasibility of effecting a stabilization of prices. This committee will begin activities as soon as possible and will hold conferences at convenient points in the cotton-producing States and at such other places as may be found necessary in order to give parties interested an opportunity to present their views."

[From the Committee on Public Information, Sept. 5, 1918.]

Bernard M. Baruch, chairman of the War Industries Board, authorizes the following:

"The statement issued by the War Industries Board and printed in the newspapers of Thursday relative to the appointment of a committee to study the conditions arising from a heavy shortage in the cotton

crop must not be construed as indicating that price fixing will be a certain outcome of their efforts. The committee, whose personnel is now being selected, will investigate the question in all its phases and will then decide as to the advisability of going into the matter of prices. The committee will report back to the War Industries Board their findings and recommendations, upon which further action will be taken."

[From the Committee on Public Information, Sept. 13, 1918.]

To avoid misinterpretation of the statements made concerning the stabilization of the cotton industry, the President authorizes the following:

"The demand for high-grade cotton, which is out of proportion to the available supply, and the fact that the Government, through early agreements with the allies, must act as a common buyer for allied purchases, make it necessary to secure some basis of distribution of all grades of cotton. Based on the standard grades established by the Department of Agriculture, an effort will be made to provide a way by which the low-grade cotton will be brought to sale and use along with the high-grade cotton at reasonable and just prices.

"It is believed that by this course both the producer and consumer will be better protected than by continuation of the present chaotic conditions of the market.

"The plan is to create, subject to the approval of the President, a cotton committee to devise methods for (a) broadening the channels of distribution and use of the great stock of low grades now practically unmarketable, (b) eliminating speculation and hoarding, and (c) apportioning the foreign orders.

"It may be part of this committee's duty to recommend basic prices on cotton. If, after investigation, it is found necessary, a fair price will be fixed.

"During this investigation and in order to avoid stagnation a separate committee of three is being set up with authority to buy cotton for the use of the United States Government and the allies at prices to be approved by the President."

[From the Committee on Public Information, Sept. 25, 1918.]

The following statement is authorized by Charles J. Brand, chairman of the Committee on Cotton Distribution selected by the War Industries Board with the approval of the President:

"The Committee on Cotton Distribution will establish offices immediately.

"The committee plans to exercise its supervision through existing customary channels by controlling the quantity and quality of cotton used by domestic and foreign consumers. This they believe can be done without disturbing to any appreciable extent the existing facilities and organizations for marketing and distributing the crop.

"The committee will require both domestic and foreign consumers to take a fair and equitable proportion of the grades below middling."

[From the Committee on Public Information, Sept. 27, 1918.]

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE COTTON COMMITTEE.

The public and in particular the cotton interests are warned against giving credence to unauthorized reports, rumors, and information purporting to come from the Cotton Committee or the Committee on Cotton Distribution. All authentic information will be published over the signature of Thomas Walker Page, chairman of the Cotton Committee, or Charles J. Brand, chairman of the Committee on Cotton Distribution.

The Cotton Committee now makes the following announcement:

1. The committee will not recommend that a price be fixed on raw cotton at the present time, nor will it so recommend in any event before sufficient time has elapsed to test the effect as a stabilizing influence of the work assigned to the Committee on Cotton Distribution, unless in the meantime unexpected changes occur in the cotton market of such violence as to threaten the welfare of legitimate interests.

2. The Committee on Cotton Distribution has been organized and has been directed to effect as quickly as possible an equitable distribution of cotton as to quantity and also as to grade among both domestic and foreign manufacturers, with a special view to providing for the proper utilization of the surplus of grades below middling.

NOTE.—It is planned to accomplish this distribution by regulations applying to foreign and domestic manufacturers without interference with the usual trading between farmers and buyers or merchants.

3. All purchases both for foreign and for domestic consumption will continue to be made at market prices through the marketing and distributing agencies commonly used, unless and until the Cotton Committee shall determine and announce that a necessity has arisen for making a change.

In view of this announcement the Cotton Committee hopes that agencies engaged in the cotton industry will proceed in the normal transaction of business without uncertainty or hesitation.

THOMAS WALKER PAGE,
Chairman.

[From the Committee on Public Information, Oct. 10, 1918.]

ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS CONCERNING APPLICATIONS TO EXPORT RAW COTTON.

The War Trade Board announce in a new ruling (W. T. B. R. No. 265), after consultation with the Committee on Cotton Distribution of the War Industries Board, certain important changes in the regulations concerning applications to export raw cotton to all countries.

Applications to export raw cotton filed with the War Trade Board October 14, 1918, or prior thereto, which cover so-called "blanket" business and which do not relate to a specific export order will be canceled.

On and after October 14, 1918, the War Trade Board will not consider applications for licenses to export raw cotton unless the application discloses—

(a) The grade specified in terms of United States Government standards (the staple must also be stated);

(b) The existence of an actual sale contract made subject to the granting of an export license; or

(c) If no sale contract has been made, that there has been a freight allotment or engagement.

Shippers' export declarations, dated October 14, 1918, and thereafter, must show the grade and staple of cotton which is being shipped thereunder, the grades to be stated in accordance with the official standards of the United States Government.

[From the Official Bulletin of Sept. 24, 1918.]

NAME COTTON COMMITTEES TO CONTROL DISTRIBUTION, TO MAKE UNITED STATES PURCHASES, AND TO CONSIDER PRICES—SITUATION IS OUTLINED—WAR INDUSTRIES BOARD ISSUES STATEMENT INDICATING SCOPE, POWERS, AND DUTIES—THOMAS W. PAGE, OF THE TARIFF COMMISSION, CHAIRMAN—RESOLUTION IS ADOPTED FOR ALLOTMENTS TO ALL DOMESTIC AND FOREIGN CONSUMERS AS TO QUANTITY AND GRADE.

The War Industries Board in behalf of the cotton and cotton distribution committees, selected by the War Industries Board and approved by the President, authorizes the following:

On September 14 the President issued a statement in connection with the present cotton situation to the effect that a committee would be appointed to devise methods for (a) broadening the channels of distribution and use of the great stock of low grades now practically unmarketable, (b) eliminating speculation and hoarding, and (c) apportioning the foreign orders; and that it might be a part of this committee's duty to recommend basic prices on cotton, and that if after investigation it be found necessary a fair price would be fixed.

MEMBERS OF COMMITTEE.

With the approval of the President, the following have been appointed members of this committee, which has been designated the cotton committee: Thomas W. Page, vice chairman, United States Tariff Commission, Washington, D. C., chairman; from 1906 to date, professor of economics, University of Virginia; member of the United States Tariff Board, 1911 and 1912; at present member of the Tariff Commission. W. R. Beattie, Greenville, S. C., president of the Piedmont Manufacturing Co., a large cotton milling concern, and an executive officer in a group of other cotton mills. R. L. Bennett, Paris, Tex., a cotton grower and seed breeder, formerly connected with the agricultural colleges of Texas and Arkansas. Ward M. Burgess, Omaha, Nebr., a retail merchant connected with the Burgess-Nash Department Store and E. M. Smith & Co., of Omaha. Edward Farnum Greene, Boston, Mass., a cotton spinner and former president of the National Association of Cotton Manufacturers; at present treasurer of the Pacific Mills. J. C. Redmon, St. Mathews, S. C., a cotton grower and member of the State Legislature of South Carolina. M. P. Sturdivant, Glendale, Miss., an active cotton grower on a large scale, and the executive manager of a cottonseed oil mill owned and operated by planters. S. W. Weis, New Orleans, La., a cotton factor and member of the firm of Julius Weis & Co., one of the oldest in the New Orleans cotton trade. D. S. Murph, Department of Agriculture, secretary; specialist in cotton marketing and warehousing in the Bureau of Markets.

SEPARATE COMMITTEE NAMED.

The President further stated that during investigation by the cotton committee and in order to avoid stagnation a separate committee would be set up with authority to buy cotton for the use of the United States Government and the allies at prices to be approved by the President. With the approval of the President the following have been appointed members of this committee, which has been designated the committee on cotton distribution: Charles J. Brand, United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, D. C., chairman. Mr. Brand has been Chief of the Bureau of Markets of the Department of Agriculture since its establishment, and as such is in charge of all of the cotton handling and marketing activities of the Government, including the enforcement of the United States cotton-futures act. William L. Clayton, Houston, Tex., member of one of the large and well-known cotton firms of the Southwest—Anderson, Clayton & Co.—which operates extensively in Oklahoma and Texas; J. Temple Gwathmey, New York City, member of the firm of George H. McFadden & Bro., cotton merchants, engaged in the conduct of a large domestic and foreign business, with headquarters at Philadelphia and New York City and with branches at many points in the United States and at numerous points in foreign countries. Edward H. Inman, Atlanta, Ga. Mr. Inman was formerly a member of the well-known firm of cotton merchants, Inman, Howard & Inman, of Atlanta, but since the declaration of war he has severed his connection with that firm and has been active as a purchasing agent for the United States Government.

Messrs. Clayton, Gwathmey, and Inman are disassociating themselves from their business and will remain so disassociated as long as they continue in the service of the Government as members of this committee.

RESOLUTION ADOPTED.

After full discussion, the cotton committee unanimously passed the following:

"Resolved, That the committee on cotton distribution be authorized immediately to allot cotton as to quantity and grade to all domestic and foreign consumers, and that they also be authorized to buy cotton if and when necessary for the requirements of the United States and allied Governments.

"Resolved further, That the cotton committee feels that this will have an important effect in stabilizing prices, but in the meantime they will keep in close touch with the whole situation with a view of determining the effect of this action and whether price fixing or any other measure will be necessary."

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I might add a few words to what the Senator from Georgia has said with reference to the attitude of the cotton growers and the cotton situation.

According to the figures, as I gather them, it would seem that the Government has taken about 2,000,000 bales of linters at \$25 per bale less than the market price, the growers consenting thereto, thereby contributing \$50,000,000 to the Government. In addition to that, my information is that the producers sold at the call of the Government 10,000,000 tons of cotton seed at \$20 per ton less than the normal price, which would be a total contribution of \$200,000,000. Consequently, it can not be successfully charged anywhere that the cotton growers have not been patriotic by reason of anything they have said or done in connection with this movement which has so seriously affected the market price of their product.

In addition to that, there have been some other grounds of complaint. The demand for the long-staple cotton, for instance, known as the sea-island cotton, has been somewhat reduced by reason of orders limiting the manufacture of automobile tires.

There is a large quantity of last year's crop of long-staple cotton on hand, and the new crop is now coming in. Its chief competitor is the Egyptian cotton. Notwithstanding the shortage of tonnage, the Government has imported this year 80,000 bales, of 750 pounds each, of Egyptian cotton to compete with an oversupply of long-staple cotton produced in our own country, in our own markets, leaving on hand now a quantity of the long-staple cotton for which there is practically no demand at all. I merely mention this, not that I can see how the harm already done can be cured but because I hope these conditions will be corrected and this injustice to our producers avoided in future when the matter is thoroughly understood, and by way of showing that the cotton grower should not be placed in the attitude of unreasonably or unpatriotically protesting against any Government action in the direction of control or regulation of the price, or steps of that sort, in respect to a product which is of great value and importance to the whole country, the effect of which has been to cause the price to go below the cost of production. I would rather have the price determined absolutely by the Government than to have it fixed by speculators and spinners, aided in their purpose by threat or agitation of governmental interference.

Now, Mr. President, speaking further with reference to the subject that has been so extensively discussed here to-day—a large amount of the time taken perhaps being uselessly consumed, but the discussion being indulged in with considerable liberality—I would say this:

The people of this country understand that the President was right in the beginning; he has been right all the time; and he is right to-day on these great questions. The national affairs of supreme importance to this country, the most vital and momentous in all its history, have been successfully conducted up to this time, and there is no question but that the President has the unstinted, absolute confidence of the people of every portion of the country. I am going to dismiss that subject by asking to have inserted in the RECORD, without reading, a clipping from the Florida Times-Union, an editorial of October 14, entitled "Leave it to the President."

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. DREW in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[From the Florida Times-Union of Monday, Oct. 14, 1918.]

LEAVE IT TO THE PRESIDENT.

For a year we have been told to leave everything to the President, and in obedience to popular demand he has been given powers that the Constitution never contemplated as being intrusted to the Executive. Even before we went into the war the majority of the newspapers treated support of the President as loyalty to the Nation. Now is the time of all others to repeat this injunction and insist on it. Now the Constitution commands it, for we are now facing a situation in which under the Constitution the President must take the lead.

He has the treaty-making power, though the Senate must confirm his acts. This the Constitution says. He sees the whole situation and has intelligent plans embracing the whole scope of the issues fought out in the war. He alone has such plans. When he looks on this war and the results that will accrue from it he looks not as a man but as the embodiment of American sane aspirations. His position has required him to give his whole mind to the conflict and to the problems to be settled by it, and no other man in the United States has held a position that made any such requirements.

Different Senators and Representatives have given their attention to different phases of the struggle. The Ways and Means Committee had to provide money, but it had nothing to do with the military conduct of the war. The Committee on Military Affairs acted in an advisory capacity as to the conduct of the war, but it had nothing to do with financing it except as its members individually voted on measures proposed by the Ways and Means Committee of the House or passed on by the Finance Committee of the Senate.

The Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the members of the various boards have been doing important work in their respective fields, but their fields were circumscribed, and even in them they were working under the President, whose field was the whole war and all the problems growing out of it.

The President occupies a position that prompts him to decide from reason and divests him of passion. A man so situated may reasonably be expected to reach decisions that will be right for the present and beneficent for the future. It is President Wilson's move. Don't interfere with the skill of his play.

WOODEN AND CONCRETE SHIPS.

Mr. FLETCHER. On another subject of very great public interest there have been some comments in the newspapers recently in regard to the program of the Shipping Board and the Emergency Fleet Corporation, and intimations that in some respects they are about to abandon a part of that program. There have been some criticisms with reference particularly to the wooden ship. Claims have been made that it is not giving satisfaction; that the cargo space, the construction of the ship, and some details in connection with the wooden ship, are creating a situation that calls for some hesitation and halting on the part of the Emergency Fleet Corporation with respect to the further construction of wooden ships.

I am not going to take the time of the Senate at this late hour with a discussion of the wooden ship. The building of

that kind of ship has been going on for some 2,000 years. It is a perfectly well-established standard of construction, the wooden ship as well as the steel ship, and it is a very late day now to find fault with that kind of vessel which has built countries and built empires and built cities and carried the commerce of the world for all of these years. I am going to ask, however, that there may be inserted in the RECORD, without reading, an article appearing in the Emergency Fleet News of October 17, under the title of "Hurricane Tests Coyote's Mettle." The *Coyote* is one of the Ferris type of wooden ships, and this article shows the experience of that ship under most exacting conditions. I ask to have it inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it will be inserted in the RECORD.

The matter referred to is as follows:

HURRICANE TESTS "COYOTE'S" METTLE—FIRST FERRIS TYPE ON CARGO TRIP IS HANDLED ROUGHLY IN SEVERE STORM.

Weathering a hurricane which was accompanied by the highest seas known in certain North Atlantic islands since 1899 the wood steamship *Coyote*, product of the Foundation Co. Kearny yard, came from her first cargo-carrying voyage with highest honors and is given a report ranking her as an excellent seagoing vessel by Thomas W. Clarke, traveling engineer of the division of wood-ship construction, Emergency Fleet Corporation.

The *Coyote* bears several distinctions. She is the first of the fleet corporation's design of wood ships—the Ferris type—to make a voyage with cargo; she is the first wood ship turned out in an Atlantic coast shipyard; the first constructed at the Foundation Co.'s yard; she was the first equipped with machinery at the Lord Construction Co.'s yard, Providence, R. I.; she had the deepest draft ever taken into the harbor of the North Atlantic island visited—23 feet 5 inches—and carried the largest cargo that ever entered that port, 3,032 tons of Pocahontas coal, which was sent from an Atlantic port to a coaling station, where it was needed badly.

HIT BY ANOTHER SHIP.

The hurricane which broke while the *Coyote* was in the harbor was terrific in force and did considerable property damage ashore. In the severe wind and the heavy seas, which at times rose 30 feet high over the reefs encircling the islands, another vessel tied up near the *Coyote* broke its moorings and crashed into the latter. The *Coyote* stood the storm well, according to the engineer's report, and the test was regarded as an excellent one to disclose the staunchness and seaworthiness of the vessel.

At times during the storm the wind reached a force of 10 Beaufort scale and a velocity of more than 90 miles an hour, according to the captain's log book. A stone sea wall, 200 feet astern of the *Coyote*, which had withstood the tempests and hurricanes since the big storm of 1899, was washed away in places and large boulders were carried as far as 100 feet inland by the rush of the water. Houses were unroofed, windows blown in, and in several places the shore outlines were changed by the heavy erosion of sand and sea. Several small craft in the harbor were dashed to pieces in the fury of the hurricane. During the height of the hurricane two vessels fouled the *Coyote's* anchors, which fortunately held fast, enabling these vessels to ride out the storm in comparative safety instead of being swept to destruction on the reefs.

After being ashore 36 hours, the *Coyote* returned to this country under her own steam. On the return she carried no cargo. In his report, presented to James O. Heyworth, manager of the Wood Ship Division, Engineer Clarke says the *Coyote* put out to sea August 21 with 3,032 tons and 729 pounds of coal as cargo and about 275 tons of bunker coal. The crew numbered 40.

On the second day out reports were received of submarines operating about 170 miles north and the *Coyote* ran at night without lights, with a change of watches in the crow's nest every two hours. Every precaution was taken by the captain and crew. However, nothing occurred to cause uneasiness, and without any unusual experiences, except slight trouble with the pumps and steering gear, land was sighted soon after breakfast hour on the morning of August 25. At noon the vessel anchored.

Upon reporting to the signal station by wigwag, the *Coyote* was ordered to proceed into the harbor. The pilot refused to take the vessel in, saying that there was only 24 feet of water in the channel and that the vessel then drew 23 feet and 5 inches. Capt. John J. Fitzgerald refused to take the responsibility over the pilot's protest. Although the authorities threatened to have the pilot broken for his refusal, he persisted, and in the morning a new pilot was taken on and the *Coyote* entered the harbor successfully.

FIND SUFFICIENT WATER.

It was found that, due to a high tide caused by a favorable wind, the depth of the channel was more than 24 feet and no trouble was experienced.

For nine days the *Coyote* lay discharging her cargo ashore. On September 4 a heavy gale began to blow, which later turned into one of the worst hurricanes that the island had seen in years. Capt. Fitzgerald prepared for increasing bad weather by doubling his lines and running others. Late in the afternoon a schooner parted moorings and bore down on the *Coyote*. Her jib boom struck the *Coyote*, causing the schooner to swing to port and drift down alongside another vessel also ashore at this time.

In the collision with the schooner the *Coyote's* flagstaff, taffrail stanchions and rail on the gun platform were carried away, the after gun lookout station demolished, the cradle of the afterport boom carried away, and a big hawser leading to the mooring buoy off the port quarter was parted.

With support from the buoy severed the *Coyote* was driven by the heavy wind and furious sea violently against the coal jetties, which were crushed into a mass of débris and the vessel washed ashore, where at times she listed almost 40°. The other vessel had early in the storm drifted ashore about a ship's length ahead of the *Coyote* and was hard aground.

At 8 p. m. the *Coyote* was laying against the bank, pounding slightly. By midnight the wind changed to southeast by east, accompanied by a violent rain. The storm was still in full force, and shortly before day-break the schooner drifted alongside. Fenders were put out to prevent chafing, but they were unsuccessful, and the schooner chafed the bow

of the *Coyote*, tearing some splinters from the planking. During the afternoon the storm began to abate and the sky showed signs of clearing.

By noon of September 6 the storm was well over and the *Coyote* continued to discharge its cargo. Late the next night the stern was cleared and pulled into deep water, but the bow still held, and the effort was abandoned till the next tide. Early the next forenoon the vessel got clear and hauled into deeper water.

On September 12, having discharged all her cargo, the *Coyote* took her departure.

The first day out the ship encountered heavy swells, but she rolled easily and made good weather, considering that she was light and had no ballast.

The next day in the Gulf Stream, with strong head winds and rough confused sea, a good opportunity was given of judging the seaworthiness of the vessel under adverse conditions during pitching and rolling.

STANCH CONSTRUCTION SHOWN.

"We hear absolutely no sound, demonstrating that the ship is of very stanch construction," reads a paragraph from Engineer Clarke's report. "The ship seems to be a good sea boat, both loaded and light," says the captain's report.

On September 16 the *Coyote* anchored at an Atlantic port and later went into dry dock, where an examination disclosed that the damage sustained in the hurricane was superficial.

Summarizing his conclusions on the *Coyote*, Engineer Clarke says:

"From observations made on this vessel during a period of from August 20 until October 3, I am of the opinion that the vessel is an excellent design, is stanch and seaworthy. I have seen her in all kinds of weather and find her a dry vessel, i. e., not taking much water on deck. Water sweeps across the well decks, forward and aft, but this comes from the freeing ports, which are not fitted with doors. The sea did not come over the bulwark rail."

Considerable trouble was had freeing the vessel's bilges from water, but this was due to the immense amount of shavings, chips, and other refuse which was evidently left in the bilges, and can be overcome with the proper arrangement of valves and piping. Bilge pumps are of ample capacity if the bilge suctions are kept free and the water can reach the pumps.

"The engine is excellent design, operates easily and well, and at no time showed any sign of heating. The engines operated on the entire voyage without apparent thumping or noise, except when boilers were priming.

"The sanitary system is fair. Refrigerator and electric-light plants are fair.

"The vessel was very stanch, both loaded and light, as measurements taken across the deck and fore and aft for alignment and sag show.

"She is a good cargo carrier, and although she has a seemingly small storage space abaft the engines when loaded she trims very well. If her Prinsoll mark is located, as the data in the possession of the technical department shows, this vessel can easily carry 3,500 tons of coal if her holds were trimmed full. This would probably bring her down to the Prinsoll mark.

"All the faults in this vessel are matters which can be easily corrected, and when this is done in this and other Ferris type ships I feel sure we will have as fine a cargo carrier of her type as has ever been operated—a boat we can all feel proud of—and which, I am sure, is going to be a big factor in winning the war."

The following message on the *Coyote's* trip was sent to Franklin Remington, president of the Foundation Co., by Mr. Schwab, upon receiving a report of the voyage from Mr. Remington:

"The record of the *Coyote* in surviving a hurricane is certainly one to be proud of, and she has proved her stanchness. I wish to congratulate you on the good workmanship."

Mr. FLETCHER. There is another kind of construction which the Shipping Board or the Emergency Fleet Corporation has entered upon which may be regarded in some respects as experimental. No doubt the building of concrete boats up to a thousand tons or such a matter has been an experience that is quite satisfactory in many respects, highly indorsed, but when you get to the larger ship, 5,000 tons and above, I say you enter a field somewhat experimental when it comes to building ships of reinforced concrete.

I have a telegram, however, with regard to one of these ships built on the Pacific coast. Her first voyage was from San Francisco with cargo to Vancouver. She encountered rough weather on that trip, but with very few exceptions seems to have stood it quite successfully. I refer to the *Faith*—5,000-ton concrete ship. There were some matters of not much consequence which needed some correction and they were promptly attended to. Then the ship sailed from San Francisco to Chile and has recently returned from Chile with a cargo of nitrate, which she discharged at New Orleans. Regarding the experience of that ship I have a telegram from the Portland Cement Association, under date of October 21, which I will ask to have inserted in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MYERS in the chair). Without objection, it is so ordered.

The telegram referred to is as follows:

CHICAGO, ILL., October 21, 1918.

Hon. DUNCAN U. FLETCHER,

United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

A. P. Denton, our district engineer, Dallas, telegraphs: Inspected *Faith*, New Orleans, yesterday. She arrived recently. Cargo of nitrates from South America. Most noticeable feature, almost total absence of sweating. Careful examination revealed no cracks in beams or girders due to shear or diagonal tension. Officers enthusiastic over seaworthiness, ease of handling.

PORLTAND CEMENT ASSOCIATION.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have also an article entitled "Great Britain is building concrete ships," which appeared in the Engi-

neering News-Record of New York of September 26, bearing also on the question of concrete ships, which I desire to insert in the RECORD.

[From Engineering News-Record, New York, Sept. 26, 1918.]

GREAT BRITAIN IS BUILDING CONCRETE SHIPS.

The yards in which reinforced-concrete ships and barges are being built are multiplying in the British Isles. A recent issue of the Times Engineering Supplement states that in the west and south and on the northeast and northwest coasts of England, on the Clyde and Aberdeen in Scotland, and near Belfast in Ireland, yards are under way where some 220 vessels are in course of construction. These represent a total of about 200,000 tons of shipping and a capital outlay estimated at nearly £4,000,000, apart from the cost of the land and the shipyard plants. On the designs adopted the saving of steel is about 70,000 tons, as compared with the amount which would be required for steel ships of the same carrying capacity.

The British Admiralty gave every encouragement to the private firms which were undertaking this new industry. Following the announcement of Government aid, 70 or 80 ways were laid down immediately. On many places waste land and bare stretches of shore were rapidly converted into busy centers. Matters have advanced so far that at the present time several vessels of 1,000 tons dead-weight carrying capacity are on the point of completion.

The vessels at present in course of construction for the comptroller general of merchant shipbuilding comprise barges of 1,000 tons dead-weight carrying capacity and steam tugs of 750 horsepower. In addition, six cargo steamships of 1,150 tons dead-weight are being built for private ownership, and designs have been prepared for steamships of much larger size, which, it is understood, will be constructed after the pressing needs of the Government for smaller craft have been sufficiently met. All the barges and steam tugs, 187½ feet and 125 feet in length, respectively, now under construction in controlled shipyards are being built in accordance with the specifications and general drawings issued by the admiralty department of merchant shipbuilding. The details of the hull and of the reinforced-concrete construction are, however, in accordance with working drawings prepared by or for the various shipbuilding firms.

Most of the vessels are being molded on the monolithic principle embodying systems of reinforcement which have been used extensively for land structures. In some cases, however, the precast-slab method of hull building has been adopted, and novel systems of reinforcement have been designed. Again, in some instances, the bottom or the whole of the hull is being built on the cellular principle, while in others the hull consists of a single shell stiffened by transverse frames at frequent intervals.

Mr. President, there has been some discussion in the press and among shipowners with respect to the machinery going into these ships. We are turning them out now very rapidly; we are now building something like 300,000 tons a month, and there has been some question about our ability to furnish the engines and the boilers and the machinery for the ships as fast as needed.

Quite a few experts entitled to very serious consideration and respect have advocated the use of a different style of machinery, favoring the motor for ships, the Diesel engine. There is an editorial in the publication called Motorship, of October 19, 1918, under the heading of "Post-war Marine Commerce," which bears on this question of the motive power. It presents a matter which ought to be investigated and considered, and which, as the Motorship people believe, and a great many others believe, will have an important bearing on problems we must meet in connection with our new merchant marine. I ask to have that editorial inserted in the RECORD without reading.

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

The editorial referred to is as follows:

POSTWAR MARINE COMMERCE.

In a recent admirable statement Mr. Edward N. Hurley, chairman of the United States Shipping Board, outlined with clearness the future shipping policy of the Government in respect to postwar trade and the reasons for building America's huge merchant fleet. Mr. Hurley, who has a trend of thought somewhat above the average in plane, frankly emphasized that these merchant vessels will not be used after cessation of hostilities for making a trade war against our gallant allies whom we now are assisting with all our might, main, men, and money.

Such sentiment, of course, is splendid, and no doubt we all wish our merchants, traders, and shipowners will live up to it. In the same way America would not have been in this real war had Germany listened and lived up to the standard of the noble ideals outlined by our own President Wilson several years ago.

Fair competition—even if strenuous—produces business that otherwise would not exist, and without foreign business many nations would go bankrupt. Obviously, then, after the war all countries will strive for "supremacy" in international trade. Consequently, although it will not be started by the United States (provided fine men like Wilson and Hurley are in authority) after peace has been declared and affairs become settled, there is bound to be such a tremendous competition among all countries for the carrying of freight on the high seas that the resultant friendly business rivalry virtually will form something approaching a trade war, once the amount of goods to be carried is less than the capacity of ships in service. Even among the American coastwise trade alone the most economically operated and best managed ships, such as motor ships, will seriously be felt by domestic shipowners who own steamers and sailing vessels, especially if the termination of war happens to leave us with more steamships than we have products to carry several years afterwards.

Also to endeavor to make America entirely self-contained and to export only and not import would be courting disaster, apart from making it impossible to operate our steamships in foreign waters, and the international money exchanges would suffer so much that our manufacturers and traders would be unable to do any business. Incidentally it will be a hard task for America to make a postwar trade campaign with her new coal-fired and oil-fired steamships, because they will have to be used on the same routes as the economical and cheaply operated foreign motor ships now being built by all other nations, including Germany.

The very future and prosperous existence of many countries will rest with their success in securing extensive international trade, and unless a nation's ships can carry produce as cheaply as those of other countries she can not be prosperous continually. That is why America previously has been a third-rate maritime commercial power. Her laws made it impossible for her ships to operate sufficiently economically to compete with the merchant vessels of other countries, and she had no motor ships. Had America previously been a great and successful ship-owning country, some of the terrible financial and bad business years probably would not have occurred. With ships, ships, and ships rests both the immediate and future well-being of all nations, particularly America; but other countries can build and operate their ships at lower cost than America can, so it is essential that America's ships be economical motor ships.

Undoubtedly other nations, when they are free to do so, will make hitherto unknown strenuous efforts to carry the products of the markets of the world—particularly Germany, whose merchant shipping now is in a state of chaos. Already the Reichstag has passed the bill for the restoration of the German merchant marine, and grants will be made after the war to Teuton shipping companies of about \$500,000,000 in the form of subsidies. It seems that this money will be given, or loaned without interest, and the grants will continue for nine years after declaration of peace. During the first four years the subsidies may be from 50 to 70 per cent of the total cost of the ships. No wonder Germany is building a huge motor-ship yard.

Sir Joseph MacLay, the British comptroller of shipping, recently stated that the transport service maintained by Great Britain only had been accomplished by the sacrifice of important trade interests, which would have to be recovered as soon as the emergency has become less acute. Now, if other nations' ships by that time are serving such routes, how can Great Britain secure back the trade without severe competition and without using her merchant ships for such purposes? So it is not surprising that Great Britain also will build motor ships, and that, as detailed elsewhere in this issue, one great British Diesel motor-ship yard now being erected will have 16 slipways.

On the other hand, it appears to be Italy's intention to increase the quality of her ships rather than the quantity. And, as Signor Ugo Ancona recently pointed out, it is with fine ships that Italy will be able to enter into competition even with England and America. Consequently we can understand why Italy is building standardized Diesel-driven motor ships, which vessels she terms her "emergency fleet."

Obviously America must have "quality," too, and it becomes more and more apparent that it is vitally important to order additional motor ships as rapidly as slipways become vacant, for in the economical Diesel-driven motor ships we have the most suitable war-time merchant vessel, also the only type of cargo carrier for postwar trade.

Although Diesel engines at present are a little more costly than steam engines and boilers, a big steel motor ship can be built cheaper than a steamer per ton of cargo capacity, because a motor ship of 10,000 tons displacement will carry overseas about 1,000 tons more actual cargo in her holds than will a steamer of the same dimensions and with the same amount of structural steel in her hull.

The same motor ship will require less men to run her (although carrying 10 per cent more cargo) because of the absence of stokers. Her fuel bill at sea will be reduced to between one-third and one-fifth and her port stand-by charges will be reduced 90 per cent, also she will not be dependent upon foreign fuel stations for her return bunkering. Furthermore, when Diesel engines are built in larger quantities the cost will be less than steam machinery, because the oil motor lends itself so excellently to standardization.

Thus there is every reason why we should build hundreds of motor ships as quickly as is feasible—but no more steamships, except big liners—and there is no sound reason why motor ships should not be built now. Only two arguments yet have been offered against motor ships, and the same are excuses rather than reasons. One is that the marine Diesel engine is not reliable, and the second is that there are insufficient trained engineers to operate such vessels. The first, of course, is totally incorrect, as the Diesel engine when properly designed, constructed, installed, and operated gives far less trouble than the average marine boiler. Even supposing it was not reliable, then its merits and advantages are so remarkable that the Nation's best engineers should at once set to and make it reliable. As regards operating engineers, these can be trained in the shops and on training ships while the engines are being built. What other countries can do America can do. So let us do.

MUNITION PLANTS AND SHIP CONSTRUCTION.

Mr. FLETCHER. I am directed by the Committee on Commerce to report the joint resolution which I send to the desk:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 181) to authorize and empower the War Industries Board to aid in equipping and expanding power plants to carry on the manufacture of war munitions and the construction of ships during the war, advance moneys for that purpose to owners and operators of private plants upon terms and conditions to be prescribed by the War Finance Corporation, and making appropriation therefor, was read twice by its title.

Mr. FLETCHER. I will state in connection with this joint resolution, Mr. President, that what is known as the emergency power bill, which passed the House and came to the Senate, was referred to the Commerce Committee, and we have been holding hearings upon that bill. We have considered it as fully as we could in the circumstances, but the committee feels that we ought to give that very important measure, containing far-reaching provisions, further consideration. We have had some difficulties to labor under, such as the absence of some members of the committee, the illness of others, and the crowded condition of matters before Congress, and we felt that we ought to hold that bill for the present in order that we may go into it more carefully and more fully before making a report regarding it.

In the meantime, the committee felt that we ought to report to the Senate a measure which would meet the immediate necessity of the situation, and therefore we have prepared and now submit this joint resolution, which provides for the appro-

priation of \$50,000,000, in order that power plants may be created or extended where they are needed for the purpose of manufacturing munitions and building ships. That situation can be taken care of under this joint resolution, and this general power bill or the emergency bill we can reach at a later time.

I would ask now for the consideration of the joint resolution, because it is an important one and ought to be acted upon as speedily as possible; but in view of the agreement in the House I presume no final action could be reached there, and therefore I simply ask that the joint resolution shall go to the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The joint resolution will be placed on the calendar.

THE TARIFF.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] is absent to-day and will probably be absent for the remainder of the week. His absence, I regret to say, has been occasioned by the very serious illness of his daughter. Just before leaving he received a letter from Hon. Leslie M. Shaw, sometime a member of President Roosevelt's Cabinet. The letter the Senator received from Mr. Shaw made such a severe stricture on Senator THOMAS and was in tone so offensive that Senator Thomas was prompted to reply, in view of the distinguished source from which the letter comes, namely, from a man who has had a very long public career as has Mr. Shaw. I have been requested, therefore, to read the letter to the Senate and also the reply of Senator THOMAS. The letter of Mr. Shaw is dated Washington, October 26, 1918, and is as follows:

WASHINGTON, October 26, 1918.

Senator CHARLES S. THOMAS,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I read with great interest your reply to Senator New's assertion that the President's third condition of peace, being interpreted, means international free trade and spells the industrial ruin of America, in which you evidenced recognition of the fatal character of the charge, if substantiated, and sought to explain that the President did not, in fact, mean what his words imply.

You will certainly pardon me, my dear Mr. Senator, if I suggest that when one of a sheriff's posse assumes to speak for all and conducts a megaphone conversation with a fleeing band of highwaymen, gloating over their crimes infinitely worse than any which barbaric savagery ever stood charged, and announces the terms on which these bandits may be admitted to fellowship with the members of the posse, and to social equality with those whom they have robbed and ravaged, he ought to do so in such clearness of tone and certainty of diction as to need no Senatorial apologist.

Inasmuch as you have volunteered to speak for the President and to seek to explain away the fair import of his words in one instance, I ask that you extend your labors, and for these services I am willing to pay.

In his speech of September 27, the President says: "Special alliances and economic rivalries and hostilities have been the prolific curse in the modern world of the plans and passions that produce war. It would be an insincere as well as an insecure peace that did not exclude them in definite and binding terms."

Reading the foregoing in conjunction with his third condition of peace wherein he says, "The removal as far as possible of all economic barriers and the establishment of a neutrality of trade conditions," I am willing to pay you a lawyer's fee for a well-considered and comprehensive draft of a treaty provision that will "exclude in definite and binding terms all economic rivalries" between the United States and Canada or Japan, for instance, short of allowing the Chinese and Japanese people freedom of domicile in this country and the right to sell the products of their labor in our markets without encountering a protective tariff.

Second, how can "special alliances be excluded in definite and binding terms" and still preserve to the United States the right to conclude reciprocity arrangements insuring to our people advantages in certain market that are not to be enjoyed by other peoples?

Unless within a reasonable time I shall be favored with a reply containing actual drafts of provisions that will justify the President's language and will not warrant Senator New's interpretations—in which I most unreservedly join—I shall continue to teach that the President's peace purposes, as distinguished from his war policies, are not only dangerous but absolutely ruinous.

Need I remind you, my dear Mr. Senator, that the Commander in Chief of the Armies and Navies of the United States is not ex officio dictator of the economic policies of the American people?

Cordially yours,

LESLIE M. SHAW.

To this letter, which I presume was an attempt to be funny—but like many men the former Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. Shaw, is funny only when he is serious—Senator THOMAS made the following reply:

OCTOBER 27, 1918.

Hon. LESLIE M. SHAW,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR GOVERNOR: I am in receipt of your letter of the 26th instant regarding a recent discussion of the President's third condition of peace, which I have read with much interest. I think you have confounded Senator New with his colleague, who intruded the free-trade question in the shape of an interrogatory. You will pardon me also for saying, with the greatest respect, that in addressing me you assume the existence of some conditions which I can not concede. I neither spoke for the President on that occasion nor sought to make any explanation of the President's words. I assumed to answer questions of my colleagues; not to have done so would have been discourteous and uncalled for. If you will do me the honor to reread my remarks, I think you will agree with me. I presume that if I, upon reading your letter, should assume that you spoke for the Republican Party it would amuse you and be hotly resented by Col. Roosevelt.

Not being the administration interpreter, as you imagine, I could not if I would accept your gratuitous offer of compensation for assuming to act in that rôle. Were the fact otherwise I could scarcely feel complimented by your offer, as I have not yet reached the point where it is necessary to voice my convictions for pay.

I am not at all surprised that the Republican Party in their desperate efforts to find an issue for the campaign are struggling so hard to lift their old cry of protection from the oblivion to which the people consigned it in 1912. It must have something to distract public sentiment from the administration's magnificent prosecution of the war, and the good old tariff becomes a natural resort. However, the President's announcement of terms of peace on January 8 last, having before and since then been accepted by our allies as a basis for an enduring peace, I am constrained to believe that it will not get very far in a crusade beginning nine months after its announcement and on the eve of a general election. I expressed my own opinions and those alone to the Senate last Thursday, and I do not hesitate to say that an enduring and permanent peace between the nations is wholly irreconcilable with the Republican doctrine of a high protective tariff. If the announcement of such a view has subjected me to a charge of being a free trader, I am content. The war has not changed my convictions of a lifetime that all tariffs should be for revenue purposes only and become robbery when they transcend that point.

It is quite true, my dear sir, that the Commander in Chief is not a dictator of the economic policies of the American people. It is also true that those who would place a controverted economic question above world interest in this great crisis are not the dictators of this administration.

I am, my dear sir, very cordially, yours,

C. S. THOMAS.

Mr. President, I have simply read the correspondence as I would do for any other friend of mine in the Senate or elsewhere. I have no comment to make, of course, upon the letters. They speak for themselves.

THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, apropos of the discussion which has occupied most of the afternoon, I desire to say that I have here an editorial from the New York Times under date of October 26, and under the title "The President and Congress," which I ask unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There being no objection, the editorial will be inserted in the RECORD.

The editorial referred to is as follows:

THE PRESIDENT AND CONGRESS.

Mr. Roosevelt's ill-advised and most untimely attempt to stir up a partisan strife against the President lends justification to Mr. Wilson's appeal to the country to express its confidence in the administration by returning a Democratic majority in both Houses of the next Congress. The President's appeal is unusual. It has its obvious risks. To say that the election of a Democratic Congress would be a vote of confidence in the administration connotes the opposite theory that by electing a majority of Republican Senators and Representatives the country would vote want of confidence. The President's action is bold, for the event is uncertain. But his boldness is the measure of the importance he attaches to securing in the next Congress a majority control in sympathy with his policies and purposes. Should the House and Senate pass into Republican control as the result of the election, he feels, and the behavior of Republican leaders, like Mr. Roosevelt and Senator Lodge, justifies him in that feeling, that thenceforth legislation and all action would be "taken amid contest and obstruction."

The President candidly gives credit to the Republicans in Congress for support in the prosecution of the war; they "have unquestionably been prowar." We think he lays too much stress upon the, after all, not very frequent occasions when they have shown themselves to be "antiadministration." He feels that they have sought to take the conduct of the war out of his hands and "put it under the control of instrumentalities of their own choosing." Their efforts to do that have not been very determined; they have never had any chance of success. It must be remembered that the Republican Party is very well organized; that in its membership partisan feeling runs high. Was it not to be expected that the Republicans would now and then bestir themselves to estop the Democrats from getting all the credit accruing from the successful prosecution of the war?

That is not the sole question; it may not be the most important. A Republican majority in both Houses might at times be obstructive; perhaps unpleasantly so. But we doubt that they would let partisanship betray them into failure of duty. Upon the great issues, the questions upon which the vigorous carrying on of the war will vitally depend, their patriotism and American spirit would guide them against the unpardonable blunder of carrying obstruction to the point of danger. Both the great parties are made up of patriots.

It is the construction which our friends abroad, and particularly our enemies abroad, would almost inevitably put upon a defeat of the administration party in the coming congressional elections that is chiefly to be feared. Here in the United States we know that the election of a majority in the Senate and the House would not be an expression of want of confidence in the administration in the parliamentary sense. It would not have the implications which attach to a vote that causes the fall of ministry. The country is very evenly divided between the two leading parties, and local interest or local pride in a favorite candidate might easily prevail in a sufficient number of districts to give the majority to the Republicans which there would be no warrant whatever for viewing as an expression of the country as a whole against the administration. We could not hope that this opinion of such a result would obtain abroad; certainly not in enemy countries, where they would take great comfort from their belief that the war policies of the present administration had been repudiated by the country. We might be put to great cost and effort to overcome that impression.

Of some shortcomings in Democratic congressional leadership, notably in the House, the country is not unaware. There are corrections and compensations, for the good sense of the membership in both branches of Congress averts the more serious consequences of error. But those are matters which concern ourselves; the election of the congressional majority in sympathy with the President's purposes is a matter of con-

cern, not to ourselves alone, but to the brave people of those nations to whose aid we have sent 2,000,000 soldiers and many billions of money for their financial support. That is a very grave matter, one on which the President lays much stress. It bulks enormously larger than any petty occasions for criticism of those responsible for war legislation in the present Congress. This is the great issue of the election which the people should keep steadily in view, that support should be given to the President, that his appeal for a House and Senate, sympathetic, not obstructive, should have a loyal response.

The President has declared that "politics is adjourned." If his earnest request that the country give him needed support in Congress is considered to be a reentry of politics, let the blame rest upon the Republicans who have forced him to take that course. In 1898, not the President, to be sure, but the responsible leaders of the Republican Party, made such an appeal on the ground that, although the Spanish War was ended before the elections, the country must show an undivided front against the enemy. Mr. Wilson has tenfold the justification for his appeal that the Republicans had in that year. And Mr. Roosevelt's exhortation "to the representatives of the American people from one ocean to the other" to bestir themselves against the acceptance of principles of peace already approved by our people, by the nations united with us in the war, which the enemy powers have already pledged themselves to accept, the good faith of that pledge having been put to the test by the President, is reason enough in all conscience for Mr. Wilson's outspoken presentation of grounds for asking the country to assure him of the support during the next two years of a Congress "in sympathy with the attitude and action of the administration."

EXECUTIVE SESSION.

Mr. FLETCHER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The motion was agreed to, and the Senate proceeded to the consideration of executive business. After five minutes spent in executive session the doors were reopened; and (at 5 o'clock and 30 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, October 31, 1918, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 28, 1918.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE.

John W. Hanan, of LaGrange, Ind., to be United States district judge, district of the Canal Zone, vice William H. Jackson, whose term has expired.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

Charles F. Clyne, of Chicago, Ill., to be United States attorney, northern district of Illinois. A reappointment, his term having expired.

COAST AND GEODETIC SURVEY.

Harry Leypoldt, of Pennsylvania, to be junior hydrographic and geodetic engineer in the United States Coast and Geodetic Survey, Department of Commerce. (Vice himself by reinstatement.)

COAST GUARD.

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Coast Guard, for temporary service, from the 21st day of September, 1918:

William P. Kain,
Floyd J. Sexton,
Clement J. Todd,
Gustavus U. Stewart,
Joseph F. Farley, jr.,
David P. Marvin,
Carl H. Abel, and
Edward M. Webster.

First lieutenants of Engineers to be captains of Engineers in the Coast Guard, for temporary service, from the 21st day of September, 1918:

Benjamin C. Thorn,
Milton R. Daniels,
Ellis Reed-Hill,
Francis C. Allen,
Mayson W. Torbet, and
Gustavus R. O'Connor.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be first lieutenants.

First Lieut. Charles Augustus Short, Medical Corps, United States Army, from October 14, 1918.

First Lieut. William Calvert Chaney, Medical Corps, United States Army, from October 15, 1918.

First Lieut. Olaf Kittelson, Medical Corps, United States Army, from October 16, 1918.

First Lieut. Lawrence Frederick Fisher, Medical Corps, United States Army, from October 17, 1918.

First Lieut. Young Cleveland Lott, Medical Corps, United States Army, from October 18, 1918.

First Lieut. Earl Edward Van Derwerker, Medical Corps, United States Army, from October 19, 1918.

First Lieut. Albert Barnett Ferguson, Medical Corps, United States Army, from October 20, 1918.

First Lieut. Julius Benjamin Boehm, Medical Corps, United States Army, from October 21, 1918.

First Lieut. John Daniel Gillis, Medical Corps, United States Army, from October 22, 1918.

First Lieut. Ralph Waldo Turner, Medical Corps, United States Army, from October 23, 1918.

First Lieut. Francis John Robinson, Medical Corps, United States Army, from October 24, 1918.

First Lieut. Fowler Burdette Roberts, Medical Corps, United States Army, from October 25, 1918.

PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of August, 1918:

Harry D. McHenry,
Harry R. Bogusch,
George C. Fuller, and
William M. Quigley.

Lieut. Albert R. Mack to be a lieutenant commander in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 18th day of August, 1918.

The following-named lieutenants to be lieutenant commanders in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 21st day of September, 1918:

James A. Saunders and
John H. Culin.

The following-named acting pay clerks to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of October, 1918:

Clarence E. Kastenbein,
James H. Stevens,
Ellsworth F. Sparks,
Trigg M. Smith,
William G. Conrad,
Orville F. Byrd,
Ellory F. Carr,
James D. G. Wognum,
Edgar C. Hartup,
Robert Von Ritter,
David A. Bachman,
Daniel L. McCarthy,
John E. Wood,
Harry A. Miller,
Harvey R. Dye,
Norris D. Whitehill,
Verney Carroll,
Louis A. Puckett,
George Scratchley,
Charles B. Forrest,
John P. Killeen,
Karl S. Farnum,
Lester B. Karelle,
Harold E. Walker,
Willard B. Hinckley,
Charles H. Gillilan,
Jacob K. Ziesel,
Hunter J. Norton,
Leon Dancer,
Charles H. Ritt,
Joseph W. Cavanagh,
Harry E. Wickham, Jr.,
William O. Wood, and
Samuel E. Thompson.

The following-named acting pay clerks to be assistant paymasters in the Navy, for temporary service, from the 15th day of September, 1918:

James E. Brennan,
Joseph M. Devine,
George L. Thomas,
Theodore M. Stock, and
Chester B. Peake.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 28, 1918.

CLERK OF THE UNITED STATES COURT FOR CHINA.

James P. Connolly to be clerk of the United States Court for China.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEYS.

John E. Laskey to be United States attorney, District of Columbia.

Edward C. Day to be United States attorney, district of Montana.

Myron H. Walker to be United States attorney, western district of Michigan.

Harvey A. Baker to be United States attorney, district of Rhode Island.

COAST GUARD.

First Lieut. Philip H. Scott to be a captain in the Coast Guard.

The following-named second lieutenants to be first lieutenants in the Coast Guard:

Wales A. Benham and
Raymond L. Jack.

The following-named cadet engineers to be third lieutenants of engineers in the Coast Guard:

Louis B. Olsen,
Joseph H. Seymour,
Roger C. Heimer,
Laurence G. Bean,
William J. Kossler,
Joseph S. Walker,
Lester E. Wells,
Ulysses V. Henderson, and
Henry G. Kunz.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

To be lieutenant generals.

Maj. Gen. Hunter Liggett, United States Army.

Maj. Gen. Robert L. Bullard, United States Army.

PROMOTIONS IN THE ARMY.

MEDICAL CORPS.

To be majors.

Capt. Herbert L. Quickel.
Capt. Chester D. Allen.
Capt. David E. Smith.
Capt. Leon A. Fox.
Capt. Charles M. Hunter.
Capt. Rossner E. Graham.
Capt. Joseph H. Francis.
Capt. Charles K. Berle.
Capt. George C. H. Franklin.
Capt. William T. Weissinger.
Capt. Samuel M. Browne.
Capt. Frank L. Cole.
Capt. Gerald D. France.
Capt. Miner F. Felch.
Capt. Rowland D. Wolfe.
Capt. Bascom F. Morris.
Capt. Clarke Blance.
Capt. William A. Foertmeyer.
Capt. Cornelius O. Bailey.
Capt. Max R. Stockton.
Capt. Frank C. Griffis.
Capt. Frederick H. Mills.
Capt. Henry C. Bierbower.
Capt. Val E. Miltenberger.
Capt. Edgar F. Haines.
Capt. John P. Kelly.
Capt. Edgar J. Farrow.
Capt. Herbert L. Freeland.

To be captains.

First Lieut. Herbert L. Quickel.
First Lieut. Chester D. Allen.
First Lieut. David E. Smith.
First Lieut. Leon A. Fox.
First Lieut. Charles M. Hunter.
First Lieut. Rossner E. Graham.
First Lieut. Joseph H. Francis.
First Lieut. Charles K. Berle.
First Lieut. George C. H. Franklin.
First Lieut. William T. Weissinger.
First Lieut. Samuel M. Browne.
First Lieut. Frank L. Cole.
First Lieut. Gerald D. France.
First Lieut. Miner F. Felch.
First Lieut. Rowland D. Wolfe.
First Lieut. Bascom F. Morris.
First Lieut. Clarke Blance.
First Lieut. William A. Foertmeyer.
First Lieut. Cornelius O. Bailey.
First Lieut. Max R. Stockton.

First Lieut. Frank C. Griffis.
 First Lieut. Frederick H. Mills.
 First Lieut. Henry C. Bierbower.
 First Lieut. Val E. Miltenberger.
 First Lieut. Edgar F. Haines.
 First Lieut. John P. Kelly.
 First Lieut. Edgar J. Farrow.
 First Lieut. Herbert L. Freeland.

POSTMASTERS.

SOUTH CAROLINA.

Jacob M. Bedenbaugh, Prosperity.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, October 28, 1918.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou, who art supreme in all Thine attributes, our God and our Father, a heavy hand has been laid upon us; thousands have died and thousands are dying through the malady which is sweeping the land and through the terrible toll on land and sea in a world-wide war.

But where faith abounds, hope inspires confidence. Where love abounds, the heart reflects Thy image; and Thy promises shall not fail if we live to the highest conception of right, and truth, and duty.

Help us, therefore, to hold to Thee and press forward at the command of the still, small voice and rest assured that Thy will, which is good will, shall be at last fulfilled in right, truth, justice, and every heart be satisfied, through Him who taught us the way and the truth and the life. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, October 26, 1918, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT.

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD on the recognition by the present administration of women in public office in connection with the administration, and also the attitude of the present administration on woman suffrage.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to say, while that is a perfectly legitimate matter to go into the RECORD, I will have to object on account of our unanimous-consent agreement. I think it would be a violation of that agreement.

Mr. RAKER. May I ask the gentleman from North Carolina if that includes all unanimous consents?

Mr. KITCHIN. Of course it does. A great many consents could be asked, and personally I would not object, but under our agreement I will have to object, and I do object, Mr. Speaker.

ZENG TZE WONG (H. DOC. NO. 1334).

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States:

To the Senate and House of Representatives:

I transmit herewith a report from the Secretary of State inclosing a draft of a joint resolution authorizing the Secretary of War to permit Mr. Zeng Tze Wong, a citizen of China, to receive instruction at the United States Military Academy at West Point at the expense of the Government of China.

The Secretary of State points out that the passage of the resolution would be regarded as an act of courtesy by the Government of China, and that it would follow established precedents.

WOODROW WILSON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, 28 October, 1918.

The SPEAKER. Ordered printed and referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

RECESS OF CONGRESS.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a resolution, which I ask the House to consider at the present time.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 56.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That when the two Houses of Congress adjourn on Monday, the 28th day of October, 1918, they stand adjourned until 12 o'clock meridian on Tuesday, the 12th day of November, 1918.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the resolution.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Is it the thought of the gentleman that we shall remain in session until the Senate has acted on this resolution to-day?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; we will remain in session until we try to get through these matters which are to come up after the passage of this resolution. The Senate expect to pass this immediately, but if they are hung up at all they will amend it, and we could not pass this resolution as amended until Thursday, as we shall not meet to-morrow. That is the reason we had it to begin to-day. I had a talk with Senators MARTIN of Virginia and SIMMONS this morning, and they both said there would be no difficulty in passing the resolution immediately this morning. Then the discussion of other matters which the Senate may take up to-day will go on after that, and they will stay in session until those matters are concluded.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Does not the gentleman think it might be a good idea for us to recess for an hour or two, in order to give the Senate time to act upon this, so we may know to-day what the fate of the resolution will be?

Mr. KITCHIN. That would be all right.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. After the conclusion of the business of to-day?

Mr. KITCHIN. I shall ask unanimous consent then to recess until such time as we think—

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. After the passage of the other business.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. CANNON. Have the Senate agreed to the conference report on the deficiency bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. They have agreed to it; yes.

Mr. CANNON. Has it been signed by the Speaker?

Mr. KITCHIN. No; Senator MARTIN of Virginia has taken it up now, I understand. He said he would take it up in a few minutes and dispose of it.

Mr. CANNON. This is that when we adjourn to-day we adjourn till November 12?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes. I said if necessary, as the gentleman from Tennessee suggests, we can take a recess to await the action of the Senate. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire to ask a question?

Mr. GILLETT. The gentleman has already answered the question which I had in mind to ask.

Mr. MCARTHUR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I do.

Mr. MCARTHUR. I wish to ask the majority leader what plan is in mind as to the legislative program when we reconvene on the 12th of November, if there is any?

Mr. KITCHIN. The Senate Finance Committee hope by that time to report out the revenue bill, and the Senate hope to finish that bill by the 25th or 26th of November, and then that Congress may take an adjournment sine die, and while Congress is away the conferees on the revenue bill will remain in Washington and try to get together by the time we reconvene.

Mr. MCARTHUR. As a matter of fact, there is no legislative program for the House, except to meet every three days.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is correct.

Mr. MCARTHUR. Members living at a distance will be at perfect liberty to remain at home?

Mr. KITCHIN. Unless called here by some emergency.

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. QUIN. From the 12th day of November until the 26th the House will not meet, and Members can go home?

Mr. KITCHIN. As I answered the gentleman from Oregon, it will not be necessary for Members of the House, after reconvening on the 12th, to come back to Washington. There will be enough Members here to attend to matters, and we will adjourn for three days at a time, unless some emergency occurs in the meantime making it necessary to call Members to Washington.

Mr. QUIN. And telegrams would be sent out. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. ANDERSON. If the gentleman will permit, I was wondering if the gentleman would not think it wise to delay the