

Also, a bill (H. R. 9099) granting an increase of pension to William A. Morton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky: A bill (H. R. 9100) granting a pension to Lucien Isaacs; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KING: A bill (H. R. 9101) granting a pension to Pauline Ette; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9102) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William A. Tozer; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9103) to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of James F. Cole; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9104) granting a pension to Edmund W. Roderick; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. REBER: A bill (H. R. 9105) granting an increase of pension to Tyrus Fidler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON of Oklahoma: A bill (H. R. 9106) for the relief of Arthur Frost; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 9107) granting an increase of pension to William Ramage; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of W. H. Rader and Mrs. D. H. Gregory, favoring American Indians having full rights of American citizenship; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BEE: Petition of sundry citizens of San Antonio and other places in the fourteenth congressional district of Texas, asking the passage of the Kenyon bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. CHINDBLOM: Petition of Chicago Postal Workers' Association, of Chicago, Ill., for an immediate increase in pay; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. DYER: Petition of Central Trades and Labor Union of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of the Sims bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of S. Pfeiffer Manufacturing Co., of St. Louis, Mo., protesting against the passage of House bill 5123; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Standard Tilton Milling Co., of St. Louis, Mo., favoring the passage of Senate bill 641, known as the Cummins bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of American citizens and voters, members of the Czecho-Slovak Chamber of Commerce, of St. Louis, Mo., relating to newspapers printed in foreign language; to the Committee on Printing.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of board of directors of the American Association of Woolen and Worsted Manufacturers, favoring the enactment of liberal protective tariff rates upon imported dyes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of John R. Carr, of Baltimore, Md., favoring the one-year payment plan as a bonus for soldiers, sailors, and marines; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of John E. McCusker, of Annapolis, Md., protesting against the passage of House bill 5941; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAKER: Petition of Hon. John S. Chambers, State controller, Sacramento, Calif., in behalf of legislation providing for an increase in salary for postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Pacific American Steamship Co., San Francisco, Calif., indorsing House bill 8069; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of Miss M. B. Conrad, San Diego, indorsing the bill giving rank to Army nurses; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of H. E. Pearson, secretary Railway Mail Association, Los Angeles branch, indorsing House bill 8376 and requesting support of it; to the Committee on Expenditures in the Post Office Department.

Also, petition of the Shipowners' Association of the Pacific Coast, indorsing House bill 5516, providing for the transfer of the Coast Guard from the Treasury Department to the Navy Department, and urging early action on the same; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of C. Parker Holt, Stockton, Calif., urging attention to the abnormal foreign exchange situation and requesting that some remedy be applied; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROWAN: Petition of American Gear Manufacturers' Association of Philadelphia, Pa., opposing Government owner-

ship or Government operation of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Hudson Navigation Co. of New York, protesting against the passage of House bill 4378, known as the Esch-Pomerene bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Railway Mail Association of Washington, D. C., favoring an increase in salaries of railway mail clerks; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Seward Prosser, of New York, favoring the passage of Senate bill 2856; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Henry Stewart, past supreme grand master, of New York, N. Y., protesting against any action favorable to the representatives of the Sinn Fein; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of the Plumb Plan League of Washington, D. C., favoring Government control of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of National Council World War Veterans of Aurora, Ill., protesting against the Mondell soldier settlement bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of National Cloak & Suit Co., of New York, protesting against the passage of the so-called Plumb measure for control of the railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Associated Industries of Massachusetts, favoring the Mondell and Smoot bills; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of Associated Manufacturers and Merchants of Buffalo, N. Y., protesting against the Plumb plan for tripartite control of the railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Eastern States Agricultural and Industrial Exposition (Inc.), Springfield, Mass., favoring the Mondell soldier settlement bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York, N. Y., favoring the passage of Senate joint resolution 84, to increase salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York, favoring a 12 months' Federal cold-storage law; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. SUMMERS of Washington: Petition signed by W. H. Roder, chairman official board, and Mrs. D. H. Gregory, clerk of the church, on behalf of the First Christian Church of Ellensburg, Wash., 250 persons present, asking Congress to grant to all American Indians full rights of American citizenship; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition signed by W. H. Roder, chairman official board, and Mrs. D. H. Gregory, clerk of the church, on behalf of First Christian Church of Ellensburg, Wash., recommending passage of House bill 7702, providing for an additional bonus of \$360 to all members of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, and Coast Guard who served honorably between April 6, 1917, and November 11, 1918; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. WOODYARD: Petition of sundry citizens of Sistersville, W. Va., favoring the passage of Senate joint resolution 84, to increase salaries of postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of citizens of Mason and Jackson Counties, W. Va., favoring the passage of the Gronna-Baer bill; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

MONDAY, September 8, 1919.

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

Almighty God, from our earliest beginnings of national life we have committed our way to Thee. We still seek Thy guidance in all that we do as a people. We pray not only for prosperity or even for peace but we pray that we may have the spirit of Him who, though He was rich, for our sake became poor and took upon Himself the burdens of the world that He might lead us to God and the life eternal. We pray that we may in the spirit of Christ address ourselves to the tasks of this day. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of the proceedings of the legislative day of Friday, September 5, 1919, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 7417) to amend an act of Congress approved March 12, 1914, authorizing the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

The message also announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 100) making Tuesday, September 16, 1919, a legal holiday in the District of Columbia, with amendments, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled bill (H. R. 6808) to incorporate the American Legion, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. NELSON presented a petition of sundry citizens of Chisholm, Mich., praying for the repeal of the tax on ice cream, sodas, and soft drinks, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented memorials of sundry citizens of Spring Hill, Cold Spring, and St. Martin, all in the State of Minnesota, remonstrating against the establishment of a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of sundry postal employees of Saginaw, Hillsdale, and Negaunee, all in the State of Michigan; of sundry postal employees of Chicago, Ill.; and of sundry postal employees of Yankton, Aberdeen, Mission Hill, Reville, and Madison, all in the State of South Dakota, praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which were referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Grand Haven, Newaygo, Sturgis, Mount Clemens, East Lansing, Lake Linden, Hubbell, and Escanaba, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of sundry Greek citizens of Bath, Me., praying for the annexation of Thrace to Greece, which was referred to the Committee of Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry rural letter carriers in convention at Waterville, Me., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees and rural letter carriers, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. PAGE, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 154) providing for the establishment of a radio station at Unga Island, Alaska, submitted an adverse report thereon (No. 175), which was agreed to, and the bill was postponed indefinitely.

Mr. CAPPER, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (S. 2858) permitting certain employees of the Government to purchase supplies from the commissary stores of the Army and Navy, asked to be discharged from its further consideration and that it be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs, which was agreed to.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 2962) for the relief of Nick Sitch and Billie H. Evashanks;

A bill (S. 2963) to amend the act approved July 28, 1917, providing for the relief of homestead entrymen or settlers who enter the military or naval service of the United States in time of war; and

A bill (S. 2964) providing additional time for the payment of purchase money under homestead entries of lands within the former Fort Assiniboine Military Reservation, in Montana; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 2965) for the relief of Capt. Thomas R. Clark; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. NELSON:

A bill (S. 2966) granting the consent of the Congress to the county of Hennepin, State of Minnesota, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Minnesota River; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 2967) granting an increase of pension to Swen Dahlberg; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. NEW:

A bill (S. 2968) granting a pension to Aymer E. Hendryx (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 2969) granting a pension to Sarah M. Brown (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TOWNSEND:

A bill (S. 2970) granting an increase of pension to Emma F. Clark (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WALSH of Montana:

A bill (S. 2971) for the relief of William O. Mallahan; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KELLOGG:

A bill (S. 2972) to extend the cancellation stamp privilege to the Roosevelt Memorial Association; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

THE DISTRICT POLICE AND LABOR UNIONS.

Mr. MYERS. I introduce a joint resolution, which I ask to have read at length.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 105) with reference to payment of compensation to the Metropolitan police force of the District of Columbia was read the first time by its title and the second time at length, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That no money now, heretofore, or hereafter appropriated by the Congress for the pay, salaries, or maintenance of the Metropolitan police department or the Metropolitan police force of the District of Columbia shall be paid to any member, officer, policeman, or patrolman of such force or such department or of the District of Columbia who shall be a member of any organization of policemen or patrolmen which is affiliated, directly or indirectly, with any other labor organization or any branch or body of organized labor; and that the auditor of the District of Columbia and the Auditor for the Treasury Department and all other auditors and auditing officials of the United States Government be, and are hereby ordered, directed, and commanded not to audit or approve any claims, warrants, or vouchers for services by any such member, officer, policeman, or patrolman under such circumstances; and that the Treasurer of the United States and all other officials are hereby ordered, directed, and commanded not to pay or cash any claim, warrant, or voucher of any such member, officer, policeman, or patrolman under such circumstances.

Sec. 2. That all auditing and disbursing officials of the District of Columbia and of the United States Government shall be governed in the matters and orders herein set forth, made, and provided by such action in the premises as may be taken and such notice as may be given by the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia, and it shall be the duty of such board to notify and keep informed all necessary auditing and disbursing officials of the District of Columbia and of the United States from time to time of the names of all such members, officers, policemen, and patrolmen of such police department or such police force as may be members of any such organization of policemen as is herein described and prescribed.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I desire to make a few remarks about the joint resolution which I have just introduced. First, I ask that it be referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be so referred.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, there has been considerable said in the Senate in the last few days about the inadvisability, the impropriety, and the unwisdom of permitting the police force of the District of Columbia to associate or affiliate itself with any superior body of organized labor. It has been pointed out very clearly that to allow such to be done would put the police department in a position where the Government could not always expect and might not always get from the police force undivided allegiance and unswerving attention to the Government's business.

I agree with very much that has been said in the Senate on that subject in the last few days, but it will take more than words to accomplish anything. It has been stated here very pertinently that Congress should intervene and exercise the power it has by virtue of being in control of appropriations made for the police force and prohibit any such action. With that I agree; but it will take more than mere words to accomplish it. It will require more than deprecation or denunciation to have any effect. It will take action to have effect and, as no one else has seen fit to do so, being in accord with most of the sentiments that have been expressed in the Senate on the subject, I have decided to take it upon myself to start action in this matter.

I do not believe the police officers of the country, those who hold in their hands the preservation of the peace and the enforcement of the laws of the country, should have any allegiance or owe any duty to any authority whatsoever other than that of the Government which they serve. I believe that allegiance, that duty, should be supreme, exclusive and undivided, and to permit anything else I think would be very unwise and improper.

and would be detrimental to the preservation of American liberty and the perpetuation of American institutions.

Organized labor has been treated very liberally by this administration. Its rights to organize and act collectively have been recognized and confirmed. Its right to be exempt from the provisions of the Clayton antitrust law has been decreed by legislation. Its right to picket by peaceful means and to indulge in picketing by moral suasion has been upheld and confirmed by the courts. I think that is going quite far enough. I do not believe it should be permitted to get control of the police forces of the country. I think that would be going entirely too far. I think a police force should recognize but one authority, one duty, one allegiance, one master, without anything to detract therefrom.

Police officers are supposed to execute the law against all alike, against all classes alike, and to have no more affiliation, sympathy, or allegiance with one class of citizens, in the discharge of their duty, than with another class; and I think it is absolutely necessary to the preservation of the Government and enforcement of law that that status should be preserved.

Police officers are supposed to execute the law and to know no body and no class of people in doing it. That is quite as necessary to the end of good government in executive as in judicial officers. Suppose an action were brought in court before a judge who is a member of the American Federation of Labor and people belonging to the American Federation of Labor were parties to the litigation; that judge would not be allowed to try the case. Would it be right that he be allowed to try the case? It would not be right. It would not be tolerated. Suppose a controversy were litigated between striking members of a labor union and a street railway company and the judge upon the bench were a stockholder in the railway company; would he be permitted to sit on that case? Would it be right for him to be permitted to sit on that case? It is unthinkable. He should not be permitted to do so and would not be. There is an element of fairness and justice in these things that must be patent.

Therefore, police officers who have in their hands the enforcement of the law and the enforcement of the decisions of the courts should have no affiliation with one class of people more than another. They are paid by all the people and they should keep themselves in a position to serve all the people alike, with equal impartiality and fairness. They are paid at the expense of all the taxpayers, and the whole people have a right to expect that they will discharge their duties at all times and under all circumstances without having any more affiliation or connection with one class of people than with another class of people, without being under obligation to one class more than another. That always has been the theory of this Government and that status should be preserved. It is necessary to good government and a fair administration of the law. I have no prejudice against organized labor. My record in this body shows that I have no prejudice against it. Organized labor can find no fault, I apprehend, with the most of my record in this body; but, while I believe organized labor should have its rights, I do not believe it should have at the hands of the Government anything which could interfere with the just, fair, and impartial administration of the law as to all classes of the people alike. I assert that to be good American doctrine.

I believe that troublous times are confronting this country. I believe that a crisis is confronting this country which is fully as grave as any that confronted it during the existence of the war with Germany. I believe there is a well-planned determination in certain quarters to sovietize the industries of this country. The railroad brotherhoods have demanded that the railroads of the country be nationalized, as they call it, which is nothing more than sovietized. They have threatened to starve the people into submission to their demands. There is evidence that the coal miners' unions of the country have determined to sovietize the coal mines of the country, and they have accompanied their determination with threats to freeze the people into submission. I read in the newspapers of 1,500 armed union miners in West Virginia marching into a neighboring county to compel the unionization of the coal mines of that section. I read of a large band of coal miners in Illinois marching over the country and demanding that their fellow coal miners suspend work and stop the production of coal, on the eve of winter, and freeze the people of the country into submission to their demands.

We have almost daily socialist conventions and communist conventions and pacifist conventions, and whatnot conventions—nondescript conventions—in the country, demanding that Tom Mooney, Eugene Debs, Alexander Berkman, Emma Goldman, and other so-called political prisoners be pardoned and

forthwith released from prison. We have reports of some labor unions meeting here and there and demanding that a nationwide strike be put in force to procure the discharge from prison of Tom Mooney. We have conventions demanding that the industries of this country be sovietized and lauding to the skies the soviet government of Russia. Strikes occur almost daily, and the country is rife with threats of more strikes, and more serious ones.

Now, at this time comes a movement of the American Federation of Labor to control the police forces of the country. I think it very significant, and I, for one, am willing to say to labor, "Thus far shalt thou go, and no further." I think the time has come to say it, and I think Congress is the body to say it. It may involve the destruction of some political lives; and if so, I am willing to offer my political life as the first victim on the altar of my country. I would far rather retire to private life than to serve in public life under any other conditions than being governed solely by my own conscientious convictions of duty and an undivided allegiance to the flag of my country and to the Government which I have sworn to uphold and defend.

I believe the unionization of Government employees has gone too far, as it is, without further extension. Already the employees of all the executive departments of the Government are thoroughly unionized and whenever they want anything they demand it of Congress and have back of their demands the entire force and power of all organized labor in the country; and we know what a tremendous power and influence that brings to bear upon Congress.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President—

Mr. MYERS. I yield, with pleasure, to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I suppose the Senator from Montana knows from personal experience that the associations of the national employees have their legislative committees and delegates, and I have no doubt the Senator, like others, has been called out upon the carpet in the lobbies and received instructions from these gentlemen as to how he should vote concerning increases of compensation and other matters affecting not so much the public service as the means and desires of the organizations themselves.

Mr. MYERS. I can not say that I have received "instructions," but I have received some very earnest requests and have had some very serious interviews on the subject.

Mr. THOMAS. Has not the Senator also received in that connection communications from Federal employees in his own district—

Mr. MYERS. Oh, yes; I have received many of them.

Mr. THOMAS. Containing veiled threats or assurances as to what will be or what will not be done according as his action shall be one way or the other here?

Mr. MYERS. I have received some very pointed communications.

Mr. THOMAS. So have I.

Mr. MYERS. The employees of the Post Office Department furnish an example of the extent to which the unionization of Government employees has been carried. There is a very active and vigilant union of the postal employees of the country. They have been holding conventions of their organization in different sections of the country in the last few days, and some of the proceedings of some of those conventions, as I read them, I think are improper, unseemly, and out of place.

At one of those conventions it was very seriously suggested that, unless certain demands upon Congress for increase of wages and other concessions be granted, the employees of the Post Office Department all go out on a strike—absolutely go out and walk away from the Government business and leave it unattended to, with nobody to carry it on. If they should go out on a strike, I suppose the next thing would be for them to resort to picketing, to keep other people from being put in their places. Then, if the police forces of the country were unionized and affiliated with a superior body of organized labor and if any disturbance ensued, as a result of the strike and the picketing, the union policemen would be called out to preserve the peace as between those who were doing the picketing and those whom the Government had called to take the places of striking employees; which, I think, would be a most deplorable condition of affairs and one which should not be permitted under any circumstances to arise.

At one of those conventions of post-office employees it is reported that one of the delegates—I think an official of the organization—made a most denunciatory and abusive speech about the head of the department, the Postmaster General. I do not know what grounds post-office employees may have for thinking they have grievances against the head of that

department, but, so far as I know, the Postmaster General has discharged the duties of his department in a very fair and efficient way. I think he has tried to do so. Others may feel that they have grounds for holding a different opinion; but I think it is scandalous, unseemly, and improper for a delegate to a convention of organized post-office employees to arise in convention and make a public speech and in it denounce and abuse the head of the department for which he is working. I think it is productive of insubordination and is not compatible with the good of the department. It is a reflection on the President of the United States. It is an insinuation that the President is willfully keeping in his Cabinet an official whom he knows to be incompetent and who is not doing his duty. I do not think it ought to be permitted; but it will be permitted; it has been done, it is being done, and will continue to be done. This is a result of unionization and affiliation with superior labor bodies of Government employees. It produces insubordination. I presume if such an employee were removed from office it would raise a great disturbance, and would probably bring on a strike of the other employees of the department.

We have had here in Congress some instances of the power of employees of the Government when unionized and affiliated with superior labor organizations, and backed by the force and power of the allied union organizations of the country. During the war with Germany, when some of us thought that Government employees, who received from \$90 to \$200 a month, should work eight hours a day for the period of the war, while our soldiers in France were fighting in the trenches 24 hours a day for \$30 a month, the entire power of organized labor with which the employees of the Government were affiliated was brought to bear upon Congress to defeat that measure. Congress, however, enacted the measure, but it was vetoed, and the author of the measure, the late Representative Borland, of Missouri, was defeated for another term. It was openly announced at the time, by some of the leaders of labor with whom the employees of the Government were affiliated, that Representative Borland would be defeated, as a warning and an example, I suppose, to other Members of Congress.

I believe the time has come for Congress to act. It is now proposed and demanded that a more serious and ominous step be taken in the unionization of Government employees than any yet. It is demanded that the police forces of the country unionize and be allowed to affiliate with and put themselves under the jurisdiction of the American Federation of Labor. Few Members of this body have voted for more measures than I for the alleviation of the conditions of labor; few Members of this body are willing to go further to protect all legitimate rights of organized labor than I; but I am willing to go so far and no further. I do not believe it would be a wise or prudent thing for Congress to sit idly by and permit the American Federation of Labor, or any other labor organization, to get control of the police forces of the country. I think that is going too far and demanding too much. I think the time has come for Congress to assert itself in the premises. We have a duty to perform. We should be true to it and firm in its discharge. We should not hesitate, flinch, or shirk. We represent the whole people—all of them, not a part of them. We should look well to the interest of the whole people.

We should act without partiality, without fear or favor of any. Therefore, I want to see this resolution referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia, and I want prompt action on it by the committee. I hope for prompt action; I want a report on the resolution; I do not want it delayed or pigeon-holed or sidetracked or overlooked. If it can not have a favorable report, I want it to have an unfavorable report, so it may come before this body in some form, so that this body may go on record as to its attitude in relation thereto. When reported, I want the Senate to go on record about it. The Senate owes a duty to the country upon this issue. It confronts us. It should not be avoided.

I think the time has come for Members of Congress to stand up and be counted. Every Member of this body knows whether or not he is in favor of the police forces of the country being affiliated with a superior body of organized labor; there is no middle ground; there is no neutral position; and I think the time has come when each of us ought to say whether or not he is in favor of it. I think the country expects it of us and has a right to expect it of us. If a majority of the Members of Congress shall say they are in favor of it, I would be willing to submit, as a good citizen, to the rule of the majority; the minority would have to submit; but I think the country is entitled to an expression of opinion from Congress on the subject and ought to have it.

If the police department of the District of Columbia is permitted to affiliate with a superior body of organized labor, you may be sure that the police forces all over the country will follow suit and do the same thing. In every city and town in the United States of more than 5,000 population you will find that the police forces of the country will be speedily unionized and affiliated with a superior body of organized labor.

I do not believe the people of this country are in favor of that; nor do I believe that it would meet with their approval; but they can only act through their duly accredited and delegated representatives, whom they have vested with authority to represent them and act in such matters. If it is permitted in the District of Columbia, it will be taken as an example for the remainder of the country.

It is true this matter is in the courts and the hands of the District Commissioners are temporarily tied, but it may be in the courts a long time. There is no telling how long it will be in the courts; very likely either side, if it may lose the decision in the trial court, will appeal, and it is likely to be in the courts for six months or more.

I notice in a morning paper of this city that some of the officials of organized labor in the city are complaining that the District Commissioners are coercing members of the police force into resigning from their police union. There are criminalizations and recriminations. I think the squabble that is going on in the District of Columbia between organized labor and the District Commissioners, involving the courts, is unseemly and detrimental and out of place; and I believe Congress ought to register its will in the premises and put a stop to it in one way or another. While this matter is now in the courts, the introduction or passage of this joint resolution should not be taken by the courts or any other authority or by any body at all as in any manner indicating a belief on the part of Congress, or any Member of Congress, that there is not sufficient law now to enable the District Commissioners to forbid and prevent policemen of the District from affiliating themselves with a superior body of organized labor. If this were a bill to prevent it, the courts might say that Congress, having under consideration a bill to prevent it, perhaps felt that the existing law did not prevent it, and that Congress was undertaking to remedy a defect in the existing law; but this is not a bill. It is merely a joint resolution of Congress addressed to certain administrative officers of the Government directing them not to do certain things, no matter what the law may be. It simply undertakes to direct certain administrative officers as to the manner of the discharge of certain of their duties, and can in no wise affect the substantive law that is now on the statute books in one way or another.

It is not untimely nor inopportune. I think it entirely proper and appropriate. It is intended to end summarily an unseemly contention of uncertain duration.

I know that a presidential election is coming on next year, and I am aware that there has been much disposition on both sides of this Congress to jockey and play for advantageous position in the approaching presidential election; but in matters of this kind I think we should put our country above party. In matters pertaining to the welfare of my country I put my country above my party and above any party, and I think all of us should do so. In party matters I am as much of a Democrat as I ever was; but in nonpartisan matters, in matters which are not properly party matters there never was a time in my life when party ties rested more lightly on me than they do now. I think there are arising many things of the most vital and momentous importance to this country which should have nothing to do with party and in which we should put America first and forget political parties and party advantages; and I think this is one of them, and I hope for speedy action on this joint resolution. If it should be attended with any political fatalities, and if I should be one to go down under it, I will go down with undivided allegiance to my country, with unfaltering devotion to its welfare, with unswerving loyalty to my Government—a Government established by Washington, for which Jackson fought, for which Lincoln died, and for which any of us ought to be willing, if necessary, to give up our political lives and to make any sacrifice, however great, that may be required. I put the welfare of my country first and foremost.

THE COMMITTEE ON TERRITORIES.

Mr. NEW submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 180), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Territories, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Sixty-sixth Congress, to send for persons, books, and papers; to administer oaths; and to employ a stenographer, at a cost not exceeding \$1 per printed page,

to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be pending before said committee, the expenses thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate, and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during the sessions or recess of the Senate.

AMERICAN TROOPS IN EUROPE AND SIBERIA.

Mr. McCORMICK submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 181), which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations:

Whereas American troops have been engaged in military operations in Russia and in Siberia, although under the Constitution and the laws the United States is not at war with the Russian people or with any government of the Russian people;

Whereas other American troops now have been ordered to Siberia and to Silesia;

Whereas the treaty with Germany provides that American military forces shall be maintained in Europe for 15 years; Therefore be it

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that no additional troops be sent overseas except by the express authority of Congress; and be it further

Resolved, That it is the sense of the Senate that all troops serving in Europe and Siberia should be brought home with the utmost dispatch.

PARADE OF THE FIRST DIVISION.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 100) making Tuesday, September 16, 1919, a legal holiday in the District of Columbia, which were, on page 2, line 1, to strike out "Tuesday, September 16" and insert "Wednesday, September 17"; strike out the preamble, and amend the title to read as follows: "Joint resolution making Wednesday, September 17, 1919, a legal holiday in the District of Columbia."

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate concur in the amendments of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 7417. An act to amend an act of Congress approved March 12, 1914, authorizing the President of the United States to locate, construct, and operate railroads in the Territory of Alaska, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Territories.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have inserted in the RECORD certain speeches made by the President of the United States on the tour which he is now making through the country in defense of the league of nations and the ratification of the pending treaty with Germany. I ask that there be placed above them the heading, "Speeches Made by the President in Defense of the League of Nations and the Ratification of the Treaty of Peace up to September 6."

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Mississippi if these are authorized versions?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. There is no question about their accuracy?

Mr. WILLIAMS. None that I know of. They are not the newspaper reports, if that is what the Senator means.

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

SPEECHES MADE BY THE PRESIDENT IN DEFENSE OF THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS AND THE RATIFICATION OF THE TREATY OF PEACE UP TO SEPTEMBER 6.

THE PRESIDENT AT COLUMBUS, OHIO, SEPTEMBER 4, 1919.

"Mr. Chairman, Gov. Campbell, my fellow citizens, it is with very profound pleasure that I find myself face to face with you. I have for a long time chafed at the confinement of Washington. I have for a long time wished to fulfill the purposes with which my heart was full when I returned to our beloved country, namely, to go out and report to my fellow countrymen concerning those affairs of the world which now need to be settled. The only people I owe any report to are to you and the other citizens of the United States.

"And it has become increasingly necessary apparently that I should report to you. After all the various angles at which you have heard the treaty held up, perhaps you would like to know what is in the treaty. I find it very difficult in reading some of the speeches that I have read to form any conception of that great document. It is a document unique in the history of the world for many reasons, and I think I can not do you a better service or the peace of the world a better service than by pointing out to you just what this treaty contains and what it seeks to do.

"In the first place, my fellow countrymen, it seeks to punish one of the greatest wrongs ever done in history, the wrong which Germany sought to do to the world and to civilization. And there ought to be no weak purpose with regard to the appli-

cation of the punishment. She attempted an intolerable thing, and she must be made to pay for the attempt. The terms of the treaty are severe, but they are not unjust. I can testify that the men associated with me in the peace conference in Paris had it in their hearts to do justice and not wrong. But they knew, perhaps with a more vivid sense of what had happened than we could possibly know on this side of the water, the many solemn covenants which Germany had disregarded, the long preparation she had made to overwhelm her neighbors, the utter disregard which she had shown for human rights, for the rights of women, of children, and of those who were helpless. They had seen their lands devastated by an enemy that devoted himself not only to the effort at victory but to the effort at terror, seeking to terrify the people whom he fought. And I wish to testify that they exercised restraint in the terms of this treaty. They did not wish to overwhelm any great nation. They acknowledged that Germany was a great nation, and they had no purpose of overwhelming the German people, but they did think that it ought to be burned into the consciousness of men forever that no people ought to permit its government to do what the German Government did.

"In the last analysis, my fellow countrymen, as we in America would be the first to claim, a people are responsible for the acts of their government. If their government purposes things that are wrong, they ought to take measures to see to it that that purpose is not executed. Germany was self-governed; her rulers had not concealed the purposes that they had in mind, but they had deceived their people as to the character of the methods they were going to use, and I believe, from what I can learn, that there is an awakened consciousness in Germany itself of the deep iniquity of the thing that was attempted. When the Austrian delegates came before the peace conference they, in so many words, spoke of the origination of the war as a crime and admitted in our presence that it was a thing intolerable to contemplate. They knew in their hearts that it had done them the deepest conceivable wrong, that it had put their people and the people of Germany at the judgment seat of mankind, and throughout this treaty every term that was applied to Germany was meant not to humiliate Germany, but to rectify the wrong that she had done.

"Look even into the severe terms of reparation, for there was no indemnity. No indemnity of any sort was claimed, merely reparation, merely paying for the destruction done, merely making good the losses so far as such losses could be made good which she had unjustly inflicted, not upon the Governments, for the reparation is not to go to the Governments, but upon the people whose rights she had trodden upon with absolute absence of everything that even resembled pity. There was no indemnity in this treaty, but there is reparation, and even in the terms of reparation a method is devised by which the reparation shall be adjusted to Germany's ability to pay it.

"I am astonished at some of the statements I hear made about this treaty, and the truth is that they are made by persons who have not read the treaty or who, if they have read it, have not comprehended its meaning. There is a method of adjustment in that treaty by which the reparation shall not be pressed beyond the point which Germany can pay, but which will be pressed to the utmost point that Germany can pay, which is just, which is righteous. It would have been intolerable if there had been anything else. For, my fellow citizens, this treaty is not meant merely to end this single war. It is meant as a notice to every Government who in the future will attempt this thing that mankind will unite to inflict the same punishment. There is no national triumph sought to be recorded in this treaty. There is no glory sought for any particular nation. The thought of the statesmen collected around that table was of their people, of the sufferings that they had gone through, of the losses they had incurred—that great throbbing heart which was so depressed, so forlorn, so sad in every memory that it had had of the five tragical years that have gone by. Let us never forget those years, my fellow countrymen. Let us never forget the purpose, the high purpose, the disinterested purpose, with which America lent its strength, not for its own glory but for the defense of mankind.

"As I said, this treaty was not intended merely to end this war. It was intended to prevent any similar war. I wonder if some of the opponents of the league of nations have forgotten the promises we made our people before we went to that peace table. We had taken by processes of law the flower of our youth from every countryside, from every household, and we told those mothers and fathers and sisters and wives and sweethearts that we were taking those men to fight a war which would end business of that sort; and if we do not end it, if we do not do the best that human concert of action can do to end it, we are of all men the most unfaithful, the most un-

faithful to the loving hearts who suffered in this war, the most unfaithful to those households bowed in grief and yet lifted with the feeling that the lad laid down his life for a great thing and, among other things, in order that other lads might never have to do the same thing. That is what the league of nations is for—to end this war justly and then not merely to serve notice on Governments which would contemplate the same things that Germany contemplated that they will do it at their peril, but also concerning the combination of power which will prove to them that they will do it at their peril. It is idle to say the world will combine against you, because it may not, but it is persuasive to say the world is combined against you and will remain combined against the things that Germany attempted. The league of nations is the only thing that can prevent the recurrence of this dreadful catastrophe and redeem our promises.

"The character of the league is based upon the experience of this very war. I did not meet a single public man who did not admit these things, that Germany would not have gone into this war if she had thought Great Britain was going into it, and that she most certainly would never have gone into this war if she dreamed America was going into it. And they all admitted that a notice beforehand that the greatest powers of the world would combine to prevent this sort of thing would prevent it absolutely. When gentlemen tell you, therefore, that the league of nations is intended for some other purpose than this, merely reply this to them: 'If we do not do this thing, we have neglected the central covenant that we made to our people, and there will be no statesman of any country who can thereafter promise his people alleviation from the perils of war.' The passions of this world are not dead. The rivalries of this world have not cooled. They have been rendered hotter than ever. The harness that is to unite nations is more necessary now than it ever was before, and unless there is this assurance of combined action before wrong is attempted, wrong will be attempted just so soon as the most ambitious nations can recover from the financial stress of this war.

"Now, look what else is in the treaty. This treaty is unique in the history of mankind, because the center of it is the redemption of weak nations. There never was a congress of nations before that considered the rights of those who could not enforce their rights. There never was a congress of nations before that did not seek to effect some balance of power brought about by means of serving the strength and interest of the strongest powers concerned; whereas, this treaty builds up nations that never could have won their freedom in any other way, builds them up by gift, by largess, not by obligations; builds them up because of the conviction of the men who wrote the treaty that the rights of people transcend the rights of governments, because of the conviction of the men who wrote that treaty that the fertile source of war is wrong. The Austro-Hungarian Empire, for example, was held together by military force, and consisted of peoples who did not want to live together, who did not have the spirit of nationality as toward each other, who were constantly chafing at the bands that held them. Hungary, though a willing partner of Austria, was willing to be a partner because she could share Austria's strength to accomplish her own ambitions, and her own ambitions were to hold under her the Jugo-Slavic peoples that lay to the south of her; Bohemia, an unhappy partner, a partner by duress, beating in all her veins the strongest national impulse that was to be found anywhere in Europe; and north of that, pitiful Poland, a great nation divided up among the great powers of Europe, torn asunder, kinship disregarded, natural ties treated with contempt, and an obligatory division among sovereigns imposed upon her—a part of her given to Russia, a part of her given to Austria, a part of her given to Germany—great bodies of Polish people never permitted to have the normal intercourse with their kinsmen for fear that fine instinct of the heart should assert itself which binds families together. Poland could never have won her independence. Bohemia never could have broken away from the Austro-Hungarian combination. The Slavic peoples to the south, running down into the great Balkan Peninsula, had again and again tried to assert their nationality and independence and had as often been crushed, not by the immediate power they were fighting but by the combined power of Europe. The old alliances, the old balances of power, were meant to see to it that no little nation asserted its right to the disturbance of the peace of Europe, and every time an assertion of rights was attempted they were suppressed by combined influence and force.

"This treaty tears away all that; says these people have a right to live their own lives under the governments which they themselves choose to set up. That is the American principle, and I was glad to fight for it. And when strategic considerations were urged it was matter of common counsel that such considera-

tions were not in our thought. We were not now arranging for future wars. We were giving people what belonged to them. My fellow citizens, I do not think there is any man alive who has a more tender sympathy for the great people of Italy than I have, and a very stern duty was presented to us when we had to consider some of the claims of Italy on the Adriatic, because strategically, from the point of view of future wars, Italy needed a military foothold on the other side of the Adriatic, but her people did not live there, except in little spots. It was a Slavic people, and I had to say to my Italian friends, 'Everywhere else in this treaty we have given territory to the people who lived on it, and I do not think that it is for the advantage of Italy, and I am sure it is not for the advantage of the world, to give Italy territory where other people live.' I felt the force of the argument for what they wanted, and it was the old argument that had always prevailed, namely, that they needed it from a military point of view, and I have no doubt that if there is no league of nations they will need it from a military point of view; but if there is a league of nations, they will not need it from a military point of view.

"If there is no league of nations, the military point of view will prevail in every instance, and peace will be brought into contempt; but if there is a league of nations, Italy need not fear the fact that the shores on the other side of the Adriatic tower above her lower and sandy shores on her side of the sea, because there will be no threatening guns there, and the nations of the world will have concerted not merely to see that the Slavic peoples have their rights, but that the Italian people have their rights as well. I had rather have everybody on my side than be armed to the teeth. Every settlement that is right, every settlement that is based on the principles I have alluded to, is a safe settlement, because the sympathy of mankind will be behind it.

"Some gentlemen have feared with regard to the league of nations that we will be obliged to do things we do not want to do. If the treaty were wrong, that might be so; but if the treaty is right, we will wish to preserve right. I think I know the heart of this great people, whom I for the time being have the high honor to represent, better than some other men that I hear talk. I have been bred, and am proud to have been bred, in the old Revolutionary school which set this Government up, when America was set up as the friend of mankind, and I know, if they do not, that America has never lost that vision or that purpose. But I have not the slightest fear that arms will be necessary if the purpose is there. If I know that my adversary is armed and I am not, I do not press the controversy; and if any nation entertains selfish purposes set against the principles established in this treaty and is told by the rest of the world that it must withdraw its claims, it will not press them.

"The heart of this treaty, then, my fellow citizens, is not even that it punishes Germany. That is a temporary thing. It is that it rectifies the age-long wrongs which characterized the history of Europe. There were some of us who wished that the scope of the treaty would reach some other age-long wrongs. It was a big job, and I do not say that we wished that it were bigger; but there were other wrongs elsewhere than in Europe, and of the same kind, which no doubt ought to be righted and some day will be righted, but which we could not draw into the treaty, because we could deal only with the countries whom the war had engulfed and affected. But, so far as the scope of our authority went, we rectified the wrongs which have been the fertile source of war in Europe.

"Have you ever reflected, my fellow countrymen, on the real source of revolution? Men do not start revolutions in a sudden passion. Do you remember what Thomas Carlyle said about the French Revolution? He was speaking of the so-called hundred days' terror, which reigned not only in Paris but throughout France, in the days of the French Revolution, and he reminded his readers that back of that hundred days of terror lay several hundred years of agony and of wrong. The French people had been deeply and consistently wronged by their Government, robbed, their human rights disregarded, and the slow agony of those hundreds of years had after a while gathered into a hot anger that could not be suppressed. Revolutions do not spring up overnight. Revolutions come from the long suppression of the human spirit. Revolutions come because men know that they have rights and that they are disregarded, and when we think of the future of the world in connection with this treaty we must remember that one of the chief efforts of those who made this treaty was to remove that anger from the heart of great peoples, great peoples who had always been suppressed and who had always been used, and who had always been the tools in the hands of governments, generally alien governments, not their own. The makers of the treaty knew that if these wrongs were not removed there could be no peace

in the world, because, after all, my fellow citizens, war comes from the seed of wrong and not from the seed of right. This treaty is an attempt to right the history of Europe, and, in my humble judgment it is a measurable success. I say 'measurable,' my fellow citizens, because you will realize the difficulty of this. Here are two neighboring peoples. The one people have not stopped at a sharp line and the settlements of the other people or their migrations have not begun at a sharp line. They have intermingled. There were regions where you can not draw a national line and say there are Slavs on this side [illustrating] and Italians on that [illustrating]. It can not be done. You have to approximate the line. You have to come as near to it as you can and then trust to the processes of history to redistribute, it may be, the people that are on the wrong side of the line. There are many such lines drawn in this treaty and to be drawn in the Austrian treaty, where there are, perhaps, more lines of that sort than in the German treaty. When we came to draw the line between the Polish people and the German people, not the line between Germany and Poland—there was no Poland, strictly speaking—but the line between the German and the Polish people, there were districts, like the eastern part of Silesia, which is called Upper Silesia, because it is mountainous and the other part is not. High Silesia is chiefly Polish, and when we came to draw the line of what should be Poland it was necessary to include high Silesia if we were really going to play fair and make Poland up of the Polish peoples wherever we found them in sufficiently close neighborhood to one another, but it was not perfectly clear that high Silesia wanted to be part of Poland. At any rate, there were Germans in high Silesia who said that it did not; and therefore we did there what we did in many other places. We said, 'Very well, then, we will let the people that live there decide. We will have a referendum. Within a certain length of time after the war, under the supervision of an international commission which will have a sufficient armed force behind it to preserve order and see that nobody interferes with the elections, we will have an absolutely free vote, and high Silesia shall go either to Germany or to Poland, as the people in high Silesia prefer.' And that illustrates many other cases where we provided for a referendum, or a plebiscite, as they chose to call it, and are going to leave it to the people themselves, as we should have done, what Government they shall live under. It is none of my prerogative to allot peoples to this Government or the other. It is nobody's right to do that allotting, except the people themselves, and I want to testify that this treaty is shot through with the American principle of the choice of the governed.

"Of course, at times it went further than we could make a practical policy of, because various peoples were keen upon getting back portions of their population which were separated from them by many miles of territory, and we could not spot the map over with little pieces of separated States. I reminded my Italian colleagues that if they were going to claim every place where there was a large Italian population, we would have to cede New York to them, because there are more Italians in New York than in any Italian city. But I believe—I hope—that the Italians in New York City are as glad to stay there as we are to have them. And I would not have you suppose that I am intimating that my Italian colleagues entered any claim for New York City.

"We, of all peoples in the world, my fellow-citizens, ought to be able to understand the questions of this treaty without anybody explaining them to us, for we are made up out of all the peoples of the world. I dare say that in this audience there are representatives of practically all the people dealt with in this treaty. You do not have to have me explain national ambitions to you, national aspirations. You have been brought up on them. You have learned of them since you were children, and it is those national aspirations which we sought to release and give an outlet to in this great treaty. But we did much more than that. This treaty contains among other things a Magna Charta of labor—a thing unheard of until this interesting year of grace. There is a whole section of the treaty devoted to arrangements by which the interests of those who labor with their hands all over the world, whether they be men or women or children, are sought to be safeguarded; and next month there is to meet the first assembly under this section of the league. Let me tell you, it will meet whether the treaty is ratified by that time or not. There is to meet an assembly which represents the interests of laboring men throughout the world, not their political interests; there is nothing political about it. It is the interests of men concerning the conditions of their labor, concerning the character of labor which women shall engage in, the character of labor which children shall be permitted to engage in, the hours of labor, and, incidentally, of course, the remuneration of labor;

that labor shall be remunerated in proportion, of course, to the maintenance of the standard of living, which is proper for the man who is expected to give his whole brain and intelligence and energy to a particular task.

"I hear very little said about this Magna Charta of labor which is embodied in this treaty. It forecasts the day which ought to have come long ago, when statesmen will realize that no nation is fortunate which is not happy, and that no nation can be happy whose people are not contented; contented in their lives and fortunate in the circumstances of their lives. If I were to state what seems to me the central idea of this treaty, it would be this: It is almost a discovery in international conventions, that nations do not consist of their governments but consist of their people. That is a rudimentary idea. It seems to us in America to go without saying, but, my fellow-citizens, it was never the leading idea in any other international congress that I ever heard of, that is to say, any international congress made up of the representatives of Governments. They were always thinking of national policy, of national advantage, of the rivalries of trade, of the advantages of territorial conquest. There is nothing of that in this treaty, and you will notice that even the territories which are taken away from Germany, like her colonies, are not given to anybody. There is not a single act of annexation in this treaty. Territories inhabited by people not yet able to govern themselves, either because of economical or other circumstances, or the stage of their development, are put under the care of powers, who are to act as trustees—trustees responsible in the forum of the world at the bar of the league of nations, and the terms upon which they are to exercise their trusteeship are outlined. They are not to use those people by way of draft to fight their wars for them. They are not to permit any form of slavery among them, or of enforced labor. They are to see to it that there are humane conditions of labor with regard, not only to the women and children, but to the men too. They are to establish no fortifications. They are to regulate the liquor and the opium traffic. They are to see to it, in other words, that the lives of the people whose care they assume—not sovereignty over whom they assume—are kept clean and safe and wholesome. There again the principle of the treaty comes out, that the object of the arrangement is the welfare of the people who live there, and not the advantage of the trustee.

"It goes beyond that. It seeks to gather under the common supervision of the league of nations the various instrumentalities by which the world has been trying to check the evils that were in some places debasing men, like the opium traffic, like the traffic—for it was a traffic—in women and children, like the traffic in other dangerous drugs, like the traffic in arms among uncivilized people who could use arms only for their own detriment. It provides for sanitation, for the work of the Red Cross. Why, those clauses, my fellow citizens, draw the hearts of the world into league, draw the noble impulses of the world together and make a team of them.

"I used to be told that this was an age in which mind was monarch, and my comment was that if that was true the mind was one of those modern monarchs that reigns and does not govern, and that as a matter of fact we were governed by a great representative assembly made up of the human passions, and that the best we could manage was that the high and fine passions should be in a majority, so that they could control the baser passions, so that they could check the things that were wrong. This treaty seeks something like that. In drawing the human endeavors of the world together, it makes a league of the fine passions of the world, of its philanthropic passions, of its passion of pity, of its passion of human sympathy, of its passion of human friendliness and helpfulness, for there is such a passion; it is the passion which has lifted us along the slow road of civilization. It is the passion which has made ordered government possible. It is the passion which has made justice and established it in the world.

"That is the treaty. Did you ever hear of it before? Did you ever know before what was in this treaty? Did anybody before ever tell you what the treaty was intended to do? I beg, my fellow citizens, that you and the rest of those Americans with whom we are happy to be associated all over this broad land will read the treaty yourselves, or, if you will not take the time to do that—for it is a technical document—that you will accept the interpretation of those who made it and know what the intentions were in the making of it. I hear a great deal, my fellow citizens, about the selfishness and the selfish ambitions of other governments, but I would not be doing justice to the gifted men with whom I was associated on the other side of the water if I did not testify that the purposes that I have outlined were their purposes. We differed as to the method very often. We had discussions as to the details, but we never had any

serious discussion as to the principle, and while we all acknowledged that the principles might perhaps in detail have been better realized, we are all back of those principles. There is a concert of mind and of purpose and of policy in the world that was never in existence before. I am not saying that by way of credit to myself or to those colleagues to whom I have alluded, because what happened to us was that we got messages from our people. We were under instructions, whether they were written down or not, and we did not dare come home without fulfilling those instructions. If I could not have brought back the kind of treaty that I brought back, I never would have come back, because I would have been an unfaithful servant, and you would have had the right to condemn me in any way that you chose to use. So that I testify that this is an American treaty not only, but it is a treaty that expresses the heart of the great peoples who were associated together in the war against Germany.

"I said at the opening of this informal address, my fellow citizens, that I had come to make a report to you. I want to add to that a little bit. I have not come to debate the treaty. It speaks for itself, if you will let it. The arguments directed against it are directed against it with a radical misunderstanding of the instrument itself. Therefore, I am not going anywhere to debate the treaty. I am going to expound it, and I am going, as I do here now to-day, to urge you in every vocal method that you can use to assert the spirit of the American people in support of it. Do not let men pull it down. Do not let them misrepresent it. Do not let them lead this Nation away from the high purposes with which this war was inaugurated and fought. As I came through that line of youngsters in khaki a few minutes ago, I felt that I could salute them, because I had done the job in the way I promised them I would do it, and when this treaty is accepted men in khaki will not have to cross the seas again. That is the reason I believe in it.

"I say when it is accepted, for it will be accepted. I have never entertained a moment's doubt of that, and the only thing I have been impatient of has been the delay. It is not dangerous delay except for the temper of the peoples scattered throughout the world who are waiting. Do you realize, my fellow citizens, that the whole world is waiting on America? The only country in the world that is trusted at this moment is the United States, and they are waiting to see whether their trust is justified or not. That has been the ground of my impatience. I knew their trust was justified, but I begrudged the time that certain gentlemen wish to take in telling them so. We shall tell them so in a voice as authentic as any voice in history, and in the years to come men will be glad to remember that they had some part in the great struggle which brought this incomparable consummation of the hopes of mankind."

THE PRESIDENT, FROM REAR PLATFORM, RICHMOND, IND., SEPTEMBER 4, 1919.

"I am trying to tell the people what is in the treaty. You would not know what was in it to read some of the speeches I read, and if you will be generous enough to me to read some of the things I say, I hope it will help to clarify a great many matters which have been very much obscured by some of the things which have been said. Because, really, we have now to make the most critical choice we ever made as a Nation, and it ought to be made in all soberness and without the slightest tinge of party feeling in it. I would be ashamed of myself if I discussed this great matter as a Democrat and not as an American. I am sure that every man who looks at it without party prejudice and as an American will find in that treaty more things that are genuinely American than were ever put into any similar document before.

"The chief thing to notice about it, my fellow citizens, is that it is the first treaty ever made by great powers that was not made in their own favor. It is made for the protection of the weak peoples of the world and not for the aggrandizement of the strong. That is a noble achievement, and it is largely due to the influence of such great peoples as the people of America, who hold at their heart this principle that nobody has the right to impose sovereignty upon anybody else; that in disposing of the affairs of a nation that nation or people must be its own master and make its own choice. The extraordinary achievement of this treaty is that it gives a free choice to people who never could have won it for themselves. It is for the first time in the history of international transactions an act of systematic justice and not an act of grabbing and seizing.

"If you will just regard that as the heart of the treaty, for it is the heart of the treaty, then everything else about it is put in a different light. If we want to stand by that principle, then we can justify the history of America as we can in no other way, for that is the history and principle of America. That is

the heart of it. I beg that whenever you consider this great matter you will look at it from this point of view: Shall we or shall we not sustain the first great act of international justice? The thing wears a very big aspect when you look at it that way, and all little matters seem to fall away and one seems ashamed to bring in special interests, particularly party interests. What difference does party make when mankind is involved? Parties are intended, if they are intended for any legitimate purpose, to serve mankind, and they are based upon legitimate differences of opinion, not as to whether mankind shall be served or not, but as to the way in which it shall be served; and so far as those differences are legitimate differences they justify the differences between parties."

THE PRESIDENT AT COLISEUM, INDIANAPOLIS, IND., SEPTEMBER 4, 1919.

"Gov. Goodrich, my fellow citizens, so great a company as this tempts me to make a speech, and yet I want to say to you in all seriousness and soberness that I have not come here to make a speech in the ordinary sense of that term. I have come upon a very sober errand, indeed. I have come to report to you upon the work which the representatives of the United States attempted to do at the conference of peace on the other side of the sea, because, my fellow citizens, I realize that my colleagues and I in the task we attempted over there were your servants. We went there upon a distinct errand, which it was our duty to perform in the spirit which you had displayed in the prosecution of the war and in conserving the purposes and objects of that war.

"I was in the city of Columbus this forenoon. I was endeavoring to explain to a body of our fellow citizens there just what it was that the treaty of peace contained, for I must frankly admit that in most of the speeches that I have heard in debate upon the treaty of peace it would be impossible to form a definite conception of what that instrument means. I want to recall to you for the purposes of this evening the circumstances of the war and the purposes for which our men spent their lives on the other side of the sea. You will remember that a prince of the House of Austria was slain in one of the cities of Serbia. Serbia was one of the little kingdoms of Europe. She had no strength which any of the great powers needed to fear, and as we see the war now, Germany and those who conspired with her made a pretext of that assassination in order to make unconscionable demands of the weak and helpless Kingdom of Serbia. Not with a view to bringing about an acquiescence in those demands, but with a view to bringing about a conflict in which other purposes quite separate from the purposes connected with these demands could be achieved. Just so soon as these demands were made on Serbia the other Governments of Europe sent telegraphic messages to Berlin and Vienna asking that the matter be brought into conference, and the significant circumstance of the beginning of this war is that the Austrian and German Governments did not dare to discuss the demands of Serbia or the purposes which they had in view. It is universally admitted on the other side of the water that if they had ever gone into international conference on the Austrian demands the war never would have been begun. There was an insistent demand from London, for example, by the British foreign minister that the cabinets of Europe should be allowed time to confer with the Governments at Vienna and Berlin, and the Governments at Vienna and Berlin did not dare to admit time for discussion.

"I am recalling those circumstances, my fellow citizens, because I want to point out to you what apparently has escaped the attention of some of the critics of the league of nations, that the heart of the league of nations covenant does not lie in any of the portions which have been discussed in public debate. The great bulk of the provisions of that covenant contain these engagements and promises on the part of the States which undertake to become members of it. That in no circumstances will they go to war without first having done one or other of two things, without first having either submitted the question to arbitration, in which case they agree to abide by the results, or having submitted the question to discussion by the council of the league of nations, in which case they will allow six months for the discussion and engage not to go to war until three months after the council has announced its opinion upon the subject under dispute. So that the heart of the covenant of the league is that the nations solemnly covenant not to go to war for nine months after a controversy becomes acute.

"If there had been nine days of discussion, Germany would not have gone to war. If there had been nine days upon which to bring to bear the opinion of the world, the judgment of mankind upon the purposes of those Governments, they never would have dared to execute those purposes. So that what it

is important for us to remember is that when we sent those boys in khaki across the sea we promised them, we promised the world, that we would not conclude this conflict with a mere treaty of peace. We entered into solemn engagements with all the nations with whom we associated ourselves that we would bring about such a kind of settlement and such a concert of the purpose of nations that wars like this could not occur again. If this war has to be fought over again, then all our high ideals and purposes have been disappointed, for we did not go into this war merely to beat Germany. We went into this war to beat all purposes such as Germany entertained.

"You will remember how the conscience of mankind was shocked by what Germany did; not merely by the circumstance to which I have already adverted, that unconscionable demands were made upon a little nation which could not resist, but that immediately upon the beginning of the war the solemn engagements of treaty were cast on one side, and the chief representative of the Imperial Government of Germany said that when national purposes were under consideration treaties were mere scraps of paper; and immediately upon that declaration the German armies invaded the territories of Belgium which they had engaged should be inviolate, invaded those territories with the half avowed purpose that Belgium was necessary to be permanently retained by Germany in order that she should have the proper frontage on the sea and the proper advantage in her contest with the other nations of the world. So that the act which was characteristic of the beginning of this war was the violation of the territorial integrity of the Kingdom of Belgium. We are presently, my fellow countrymen, to have the very great pleasure of welcoming on this side of the sea the King and the Queen of the Belgians, and I for one am perfectly sure that we are going to make it clear to them that we have not forgotten the violation of Belgium; that we have not forgotten the intolerable wrongs which were put upon that suffering people. I have seen their devastated country. Where it was not actually laid in ruins, every factory was gutted of its contents. All the machinery by which it would be possible for men to go to work again was taken away, and those parts of the machinery that they could not take away were destroyed by experts who knew how to destroy them. Belgium was a very successful competitor of Germany in some lines of manufacture, and the German armies went there to see to it that that competition was put a stop to. Their purpose was to crush the independent action of that little Kingdom, not merely to use it as a gateway through which to attack France; and when they got into France, they not only fought the armies of France, but they put the coal mines of France out of commission, so that it will be a decade or more before France can supply herself with coal from her accustomed sources.

"You have heard a great deal about article 10 of the covenant of the league of nations. Article 10 speaks the conscience of the world. Article 10 is the article which goes to the heart of this whole bad business, for that article says that the members of this league, that is intended to be all the great nations of the world, engage to respect and to preserve against all external aggression the territorial integrity and political independence of the nations concerned. That promise is necessary in order to prevent this sort of war from recurring, and we are absolutely discredited if we fought this war and then neglect the essential safeguard against it. You have heard it said, my fellow citizens, that we are robbed of some degree of our sovereign independent choice by articles of that sort. Every man who makes a choice to respect the rights of his neighbors deprives himself of absolute sovereignty, but he does it by promising never to do wrong, and I can not for one see anything that robs me of any inherent right that I ought to retain when I promise that I will do right, when I promise that I will respect the thing which, being disregarded and violated, brought on a war in which millions of men lost their lives, in which the civilization of mankind was in the balance, in which there was the most outrageous exhibition ever witnessed in the history of mankind of the rapacity and disregard for right of a great armed people. We engage in the first sentence of article 10 to respect and preserve from external aggression the territorial integrity and the existing political independence not only of the other member States, but of all States, and if any member of the league of nations disregards that promise, then what happens? The council of the league advises what should be done to enforce the respect for that covenant on the part of the nation attempting to violate it, and there is no compulsion upon us to take that advice except the compulsion of our good conscience and judgment. So that it is perfectly evident that if in the judgment of the people of the United States the council adjudged wrong and that this was not a case of the use of force, there would be no necessity on the part of the

Congress of the United States to vote the use of force. But there could be no advice of the council on any such subject without a unanimous vote, and the unanimous vote includes our own, and if we accepted the advice we would be accepting our own advice, for I need not tell you that the representatives of the Government of the United States would not vote without instructions from their Government at home, and that what we united in advising we could be certain that the American people would desire to do. There is in that covenant not only not a surrender of the independent judgment of the Government of the United States, but an expression of it, because that independent judgment would have to join with the judgment of the rest.

"But when is that judgment going to be expressed, my fellow citizens? Only after it is evident that every other resource has failed, and I want to call your attention to the central machinery of the league of nations. If any member of that league or any nation not a member refuses to submit the question at issue either to arbitration or to discussion by the council, there ensues automatically, by the engagements of this covenant, an absolute economic boycott. There will be no trade with that nation by any member of the league. There will be no interchange of communication by post or telegraph. There will be no travel to or from that nation. Its borders will be closed. No citizen of any other State will be allowed to enter it and no one of its citizens will be allowed to leave it. It will be hermetically sealed by the united action of the most powerful nations in the world. And if this economic boycott bears with unequal weight, the members of the league agree to support one another and to relieve one another in any exceptional disadvantages that may arise out of it.

"I want you to realize that this war was won not only by the armies of the world. It was won by economic means as well. Without the economic means the war would have been much longer continued. What happened was that Germany was shut off from the economic resources of the rest of the globe and she could not stand it. A nation that is boycotted is a nation that is in sight of surrender. Apply this economic, peaceful, silent, deadly remedy and there will be no need for force. It is a terrible remedy. It does not cost a life outside the nation boycotted, but it brings a pressure upon that nation which, in my judgment, no modern nation could resist. I dare say that some of these ideas are new to you, because while it is true, as I said this forenoon in Columbus, that apparently nobody has taken the pains to see what is in this treaty, very few have taken the pains to see what is in the covenant of the league of nations. They have discussed 3, chiefly 3, out of 26 articles, and the other articles contain this heart of the matter, that instead of war there shall be arbitration, instead of war there shall be discussion, instead of war there shall be the closure of intercourse, instead of war there shall be the irresistible pressure of the opinion of mankind. If I had done wrong, I would a great deal rather a man would shoot at me than stand me up for the judgment of my fellow men. I would a great deal rather see the muzzle of a gun than the look in their eyes. I would a great deal rather be put out of the world than live in the world boycotted and deserted. The most terrible thing is outlawry. The most formidable thing is to be absolutely isolated. And that is the kernel of this engagement. War is on the outskirts. War is a remote and secondary threat. War is a last resort. Nobody in his senses claims for the covenant of the league of nations that it is certain to stop war, but I confidently assert that it makes war violently improbable, and that even if we can not guarantee that it will stop war, we are bound in conscience to do our utmost in order to avoid it and prevent it. I was pointing out, my fellow citizens, this forenoon that this covenant is part of a great document. I wish I had brought a copy with me to show you its bulk. It is an enormous volume, and most of the things you hear talked about in that treaty are not the essential things. This is the first treaty in the history of civilization in which great powers have associated themselves together in order to protect the weak. I need not tell you that I speak with knowledge in this matter, knowledge of the purpose of the men with whom the American delegates were associated at the peace table. They came there, everyone that I consulted with, with the same idea that wars had arisen in the past because the strong took advantage of the weak, and that the only way to stop wars was to bind ourselves together to protect the weak; that the example of this war was the example which gave us the finger which pointed to the way of escape, that as Austria and Germany had tried to put upon Serbia, so we must see to it that Serbia and the Slavic peoples associated with her, and the peoples of Roumania and the peoples of Bohemia and the peoples of Hungary and Austria, for that matter, should feel assured in the future that the strength of the great powers was

behind their liberty and their independence, and was not intended to be used and never should be used for aggression against them.

"So when you read the covenant, read the treaty with it. I have no doubt that in this audience there are many men which come from that ancient stock of Poland, for example, men in whose blood there is the warmth of old affections connected with that betrayed and ruined country, men whose memories run back to insufferable wrongs suffered by those they love in that country, and I call them to witness that Poland never could have won unity and independence for herself, and those gentlemen sitting at Paris presented Poland with a unity which she could not have won and an independence which she can not defend unless the world guarantees it to her. There is one of the most noble chapters in the history of the world, that this war was concluded in order to remedy the wrongs which had bitten so deep into the experience of the weaker peoples of that great continent. The object of the war was to see to it that there was no more of that sort of wrong done. Now, when you have that picture in your mind, that this treaty was meant to protect those who could not protect themselves, turn the picture and look at it this way.

"Those very weak nations are situated through the very tract of country, between Germany and Persia, which Germany had meant to conquer and dominate, and if the nations of the world do not maintain their concert to sustain the independence and freedom of those peoples, Germany will yet have her will upon them, and we shall witness the very interesting spectacle of having spent millions upon millions of American treasure and, what is much more precious, hundreds of thousands of American lives, to do a futile thing, to do a thing which we will then leave to be undone at the leisure of those who are masters of intrigue, at the leisure of those who are masters in combining wrong influences to overcome right influences, of those who are the masters of the very things that we hate and mean always to fight; for, my fellow citizens, if Germany should ever attempt that again, whether we are in the league of nations or not, we will join to prevent it. We do not stand off and see murder done. We do not profess to be the champions of liberty and then consent to see liberty destroyed. We are not the friends and advocates of free government and then willing to stand by and see free government die before our eyes. For if a power such as Germany was, but thank God no longer is, were to do this thing upon the fields of Europe, then America would have to look to it that she did not do them also upon the fields of the Western Hemisphere, and we should at last be face to face with a power which at the outset we could have crushed, and which now it is within our choice to keep within the harness of civilization.

"I am discussing this thing with you, my fellow citizens, as if I had any doubt of what the verdict of the American people would be. I have not the slightest doubt. I just wanted to have the pleasure of pointing out to you how absolutely ignorant of the treaty and of the covenant some of the men are who have been opposing them. If they do read the English language, they do not understand the English language as I understand it. If they have really read this treaty and this covenant, they only amaze me by their inability to understand what is plainly expressed. So that my errand upon this journey is not to argue these matters, but to recall you to the real issues which are involved. And one of the things that I have most at heart in this report to my fellow citizens is that they should forget what party I belong to and what party they belong to. I am making this journey as a democrat, but I am spelling it with a little "d," and I do not want anybody to remember, so far as this errand is concerned, that it is ever spelt with a big "D." I am making this journey as an American and as a champion of rights which America believes in, and I need not tell you that as compared with the importance of America the importance of the Democratic Party and the importance of the Republican Party and the importance of every other party is absolutely negligible. Parties, my fellow citizens, are intended to embody in action different policies of government. They are not when properly used intended to traverse the principles which underlie government, and the principles which underlie the Government of the United States have been familiar to us ever since we were children. You have been bred, I have no doubt, as I have been bred in the revolutionary school of American thought. I mean that school of American thought which takes its inspiration from the days of the American Revolution. There were only 3,000,000 of us then, but we were ready to stand out against the world for liberty. There are more than a hundred million of us now, and we are ready to insist that everywhere men shall be champions of liberty.

"I want you to notice another interesting point that is never dilated upon in connection with the league of nations. I am treading now upon delicate ground, and I must express myself with caution. There were a good many delegations that visited Paris who wanted to be heard by the peace conference who had real causes to present which ought to be presented to the view of the world, but we had to point out to them that they did not happen, unfortunately, to come within the area of settlement; that their questions were not questions which were necessarily drawn into the things that we were deciding. We were sitting there with the pieces of the Austro-Hungarian Empire in our hands. It had fallen apart. It never was naturally cohesive. We were sitting there with various disbursed assets of the German Empire in our hands, and with regard to every one of them we had to determine what we were going to do with them, but we did not have our own disbursed assets in our hands. We did not have the assets of the nations which constituted the body of nations associated against Germany to dispose of, and therefore we had often, with whatever regret, to turn away from questions that ought some day to be discussed and settled, and upon which the opinion of the world ought to be brought to bear.

"Therefore, I want to call your attention, if you will turn it up when you go home, to article 11, following article 10 of the covenant of the league of nations. That article, let me say, is the favorite article in the treaty, so far as I am concerned. It says that every matter which is likely to affect the peace of the world is everybody's business; that it shall be the friendly right of any nation to call attention in the league to anything that is likely to affect the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations, upon which the peace of the world depends, whether that matter immediately concerns the nation drawing attention to it or not. In other words, at present we have to mind our own business. Under the covenant of the league of nations we can mind other people's business, and anything that affects the peace of the world, whether we are parties to it or not, can by our delegates be brought to the attention of mankind. We can force a nation on the other side of the globe to bring to that bar of mankind any wrong that is afoot in that part of the world which is likely to affect good understanding between nations, and we can oblige them to show cause why it should not be remedied. There is not an oppressed people in the world which can not henceforth get a hearing at that forum, and you know, my fellow citizens, what a hearing will mean if the cause of those people is just. The one thing that those who are doing injustice have most reason to dread is publicity and discussion, because if you are challenged to give a reason why you are doing a wrong thing, it has to be an exceedingly good reason, and if you give a bad reason you confess judgment, and the opinion of mankind goes against you. At present what is the state of international law and understanding? No nation has the right to call attention to anything that does not directly affect its own affairs. If it does, it can not only be told to mind its own business but it risks the cordial relationship between itself and the nation whose affairs it draws under discussion; whereas under article 11 the very sensible provision is made that the peace of the world transcends all the susceptibilities of nations and governments, and that they are obliged to consent to discuss and explain anything which does affect the understanding between nations.

"Not only that, but there is another thing in this covenant which cures one of the principal difficulties we encountered at Paris. I need not tell you that at every turn in those discussions we came across some secret treaty, some understanding that had never been made public before, some understanding which embarrassed the whole settlement. I think it will not be improper for me to refer to one of them. When we came to the settlement of the Shantung matter with regard to China we found that Great Britain and France were under explicit treaty obligation to Japan that she should get exactly what she got in the treaty with Germany, and the most that the United States could do was to urge upon the representatives of Japan the policy which was involved in such a settlement and obtain from her the promise which she gave, that she would not take advantage of those portions of the treaty, but would return without qualification the sovereignty which Germany had enjoyed in Shantung Province to the Republic of China. We have had repeated assurances since then that Japan means to fulfill those promises in absolute good faith. But my present point is that there stood at the very gate of that settlement a secret treaty between Japan and two of the great powers engaged in this war on our side. We could not ask them to disregard those promises. This war had been fought in part because of the

refusal to observe the fidelity which is involved in a promise, because of the failure to regard the sacredness of treaties, and this covenant of the league of nations provides that no secret treaty shall have any validity. It provides in explicit terms that every treaty, every international understanding, shall be registered with the secretary of the league; that it shall be published as soon as possible after it is there registered; and that no treaty that is not there registered will be regarded by any of the nations engaged in the covenant. So that we not only have the right to discuss anything, but we make everything open for discussion. If this covenant accomplished little more than the abolition of private arrangements between great powers, it would have gone far toward stabilizing the peace of the world and securing justice, which it has been so difficult to secure so long as nations could come to secret understandings with one another.

"When you look at the covenant of the league of nations thus, in the large, you wonder why it is a bogey to anybody. You wonder what influences have made gentlemen afraid of it. You wonder why it is not obvious to everybody, as it is to those who study it with disinterested thought, that this is the central and essential covenant of the whole peace. As I was saying this forenoon, I can come through a double row of men in khaki and acknowledge their salute with a free heart, because I kept my promise to them. I told them when they went to this war that it was a war not only to beat Germany but to prevent any subsequent wars of this kind. I can look all the mothers of this country in the face and all the sisters and the wives and the sweethearts and say, 'The boys will not have to do this again.' You would think to hear some of the men who discuss this covenant that it is an arrangement for sending our men abroad again just as soon as possible. It is the only conceivable arrangement which will prevent our sending our men abroad again very soon, and, if I may use a very common expression, I would say if it is not to be this arrangement, what arrangement do you suggest to secure the peace of the world? It is a case of 'put up or shut up.' Opposition is not going to save the world. Negotiations are not going to construct the policies of mankind. A great plan is the only thing that can defeat a great plan. The only triumphant ideas in this world are the ideas that are organized for battle. The only thing that wins against a program is a better program. If this is not the way to secure peace, I beg that the way will be pointed out. If we must reject this way, then I beg that before I am sent to ask Germany to make a new kind of peace with us I should be given specific instructions what kind of peace it is to be. If the gentlemen who do not like what was done at Paris think they can do something better, I beg that they will hold their convention soon and do it now. They can not in conscience or good faith deprive us of this great work of peace without substituting some other that is better.

"So, my fellow citizens, I look forward with profound gratifications to the time, which I believe will now not much longer be delayed, when the American people can say to their fellows in all parts of the world, 'We are the friends of liberty; we have joined with the rest of mankind in securing the guaranties of liberty; we stand here with you the eternal champions of what is right, and may God keep us in the covenant that we have formed.'"

THE PRESIDENT AT LUNCHEON AT HOTEL STATLER, ST. LOUIS, MO., SEPTEMBER 5, 1919.

"Mr. Johnson, your honor Mr. Mayor, ladies, and gentlemen, it is with great pleasure that I find myself in St. Louis again, because I have always found it possible in St. Louis to discuss serious questions in a way that gets mind in contact with mind, instead of that other very less desirable thing, passion in contact with passion. I am glad to hear the mayor say, and I believe that it is true, that politics is adjourned. Party politics has no place, my fellow citizens, in the subject we are now obliged to discuss and to decide. Politics in the wider sense has a great deal to do with them. The politics of the world, the policy of mankind, the concert of the methods by which the world is to be bettered, that concert of will and of action which will make every nation a nobler instrument of Divine Providence—that is world politics.

"I have sometimes heard gentlemen discussing the questions that are now before us with a distinction drawn between nationalism and internationalism in these matters. It is very difficult for me to follow their distinction. The greatest nationalist is the man who wants his nation to be the greatest nation, and the greatest nation is the nation which penetrates to the heart of its duty and mission among the nations of the world. With every flash of insight into the great politics of mankind the nation that has that vision is elevated to a place

of influence and power which it can not get by arms, which it can not get by commercial rivalry, which it can get by no other way than by that spiritual leadership which comes from a profound understanding of the problems of humanity. It is in the light of ideas of this sort that I conceive it a privilege to discuss the matters that I have come away from Washington to discuss.

"I have come away from Washington to discuss them because apparently it is difficult to discuss them in Washington. The whole subject is surrounded with a mist which it is difficult to penetrate. I brought home with me from the other side of the water a great document, a great human document, but after you hear it talked about in Washington for a while you think that it has just about three or four clauses in it. You fancy that it has a certain article 10 in it, that it has something about Shantung in it, that it has something about the Monroe doctrine in it, that it has something about quitting, withdrawing from the league, showing that you do not want to play the game; and I do not hear about anything else in it. Why, my fellow citizens, those are mere details and incidents of a great human enterprise, and I have sought the privilege of telling you what I conceive that human enterprise to be.

"The war that has just been finished was no accident. Any man who had followed the politics of the world up to that critical break must have known that that was the logical outcome of the processes that had preceded it, must have known that the nations of the world were preparing for that very thing and were expecting it. One of the most interesting things that I realized after I got to the other side of the water was that the mental attitude of the French people with regard to the settlement of this war was largely determined by the fact that for nearly 50 years they had expected it, that for nearly 50 years they had dreaded by the exercise of German force the very thing that had happened, and their constant theme was, 'We must devise means by which this intolerable fear will be lifted from our hearts. We can not, we will not, live another 50 years under the cloud of that terror.' The terror had been there all the time and the war was its flame and consummation. And it had been expected, because the politics of Europe were based upon a definite conception. That conception was that the strong had all the rights and that all that the weak could enjoy was what the strong permitted them to enjoy; that no nation had any right that could not be asserted by the exercise of force; and that the real politics of Europe consisted in determining how many of the weak elements in the European combination of families and of nations should be under the influence and control of one set of nations, and how many of those elements should be under the influence and control of another set of nations.

"One of the centers of all the bad business was in that town of Constantinople. I do not suppose that intrigue was ever anywhere else reduced to such a consummate art or practiced with such ardor and subtlety as in Constantinople. That was because Constantinople was the key to the weak part of Europe. That was where the pawns were; not the kings and the queens and the castles and the bishops and the rest of the chess game of politics, but the little pawns. They made the opening for the heavier pieces. Their maneuvers determined the arrangement of the board, and those who controlled the pawns controlled the outcome of the whole effort to checkmate and to match and to capture and to take advantage. The shrewdest politicians in the diplomatic service of the several nations were put at Constantinople to run the game, which consisted in maneuvering the weak for the advantage of the strong, and every international conference that preceded the conference at Paris, which is still in process, has been intended to complete and consummate the arrangements for that game. For the first time in the history of mankind the recent conference at Paris was convened to destroy that system and substitute another. I take it, my fellow-citizens, that when you look at that volume, for it is a thick volume, that contains the treaty of peace with Germany, in the light of what I have been saying to you, you will read it with greater interest than you have hitherto attached to it. It is the chart and constitution of a new system for the world, and that new system is based upon an absolute reversal of the principles of the old system. The central object of that treaty is to establish the independence and protect the integrity of the weak peoples of the world.

"I hear some gentlemen who are themselves incapable of altruistic purposes say, 'Ah, but that is altruistic. It is not our business to take care of the weak nations of the world.' No, but it is our business to prevent war, and if we do not take care of the weak nations of the world there will be war. These gentlemen assume the rôle of being very practical men, and they say, 'We do not want to get into war to protect every little nation in the

world.' Very well then, let them show me how they will keep out of war by not protecting them, and let them show me how they will prove that having gone into an enterprise they are not absolute contemptible quitters if they do not see the game through. They joined with the rest of us in the profession of fine purpose when we went into the war, and what was the fine purpose that they professed? It was not merely to defeat Germany. It is not a handsome enterprise for any great nation to go into a war merely to reduce another nation to obedience. They went in and they professed to go in to see to it that nobody after Germany's defeat should repeat the experiment which Germany had tried. And how do they propose to do that? To leave the material that Germany was going to make her dominating empire out of helpless and at her mercy. What was the old formula of Pan-Germanism? From Bremen to Bagdad, wasn't it? Well, look at the map. What lies between Bremen and Bagdad? After you get past the German territory, there is Poland. There is Bohemia, which we have made into Czechoslovakia. There is Hungary, which is divided from Austria and does not share Austria's strength. There is Roumania. There is Jugo-Slavia. There is broken Turkey; and then Persia and Bagdad. The route is open. The route is wide open, and we have undertaken to say, 'This route is closed!' If you do not close it, you have no choice but some day or other to enter into exactly the same sort of war that we have just gone through. Those gentlemen are dreaming. They are living in a past age, which is gone and all but forgotten, when they say that we can mind our own business.

"What is our own business? Is there any merchant present here or any manufacturer or any banker that can say that our interests are separate from the interest of the rest of the world commercially, industrially, financially? There is not a man in any one of those professions who does not admit that our industrial fortunes are tied up with the industrial fortunes of the rest of the world. He knows that, and when he draws a picture to himself, if he is frank, of what some gentlemen propose, this is what he sees: America minding her own business and having no other—despised, suspected, distrusted, and on the other side of the water the treaty and its operation—interrupted? Not at all! We are a great Nation, my fellow citizens, but the treaty is going to be applied just the same whether we take part in it or not, and part of its application—at the center of its application—stands that great problem of the rehabilitation of Germany industrially. I say the problem of her rehabilitation, because unless she is rehabilitated she can not pay the reparation, and the reparation commission created by the treaty is created for the purpose of seeing that Germany pays the reparation; and it was admitted in all our conferences that in order to do that steps must be taken to enable Germany to pay the reparation, which means her industrial and commercial rehabilitation. Not only that, but some of you gentlemen know we used to have a trade with Germany. All of that trade is going to be in the hands and under the control of the reparation commission. I humbly asked leave to appoint a member to look after our interests, and I was rebuked for it. I am looking after the industrial interests of the United States. I would like to see the other men who are. They are forgetting the industrial interests of the United States, and they are doing things that will cut us off and our trade off from the normal channels, because the reparation commission can determine where Germany buys, what Germany buys, how much Germany buys; the reparation commission can determine in what instruments of credit she temporarily expresses her debt. They can determine how those instruments of credit shall be used for the basis of the credit which must underlie international exchanges. They are going to stand at the center of the financial operations of the world. Now, is it minding our business to keep out of that? On the contrary, it is handing our business over to people who are not particularly interested in seeing that it prospers. These are facts which I can appropriately address to a chamber of commerce because they are facts which nobody can controvert and which yet seem often to be forgotten. The broad aspects of this subject are seldom brought to your attention. It is the little picayune details here and there.

"Now, that brings me, my fellow citizens, to the guaranty of this whole thing. We said that we were going to fight this war for the purpose of seeing to it that the mothers and sisters and fathers of this land, and the sweethearts and wives, did not have to send their lads over on the other side of the sea to fight any more, and so we took part in an arrangement by which justice was to be secured throughout the world. The rest of the world, partly at our suggestion, said 'Yes,' and said it gladly; said 'Yes; we will go into the partnership to see that justice is maintained,' and then I come home and hear some gentlemen say, 'But will we?' Are we interested in

justice? The treaty of peace, as I have just said to you, is based upon the protection of the weak against the strong, and there is only one force that can protect the weak against the strong, and that is the universal concert of the strength of mankind. That is the league of nations.

"But I beg that you will not conceive of the league of nations as a combination of the world for war, for that is exactly what it is not. It is a combination of the world for arbitration and discussion. I was taking the pains the other day to make a sort of table of contents of the covenant of the league of nations, and I found that practically the whole heart of it, that two-thirds of its provisions were devoted to setting up a system of arbitration and discussion in the world. Why, these are the facts, my fellow citizens. The members of the league agree that no one of them will ever go to war about anything without first doing one or other of two things—without either submitting the question to arbitration, in which case they agree to abide by the decision of the arbitrators absolutely, or submitting it to discussion by the council of the league of nations, in which case they agree that no matter what the opinion expressed by the council may be they will allow six months for the discussion, and whether they are satisfied with the conclusion or not will not go to war in less than three months after the rendering of the opinion. I think we can take it for granted that the preliminaries would take two or three months, in which case you have a whole year of discussion, even when you do not get arbitration, and I want to call you to witness that in almost every international controversy which has been submitted to thorough canvass by the opinion of the world it has become impossible for the result to be war. War is a process of heat. Exposure is a process of cooling, and what is proposed in this is that every hot thing shall be spread out in the cooling air of the opinion of the world, and, after it is thoroughly cooled off, then let the nations concerned determine whether they are going to fight about it or not.

"And notice the sanction. Any member of the league which breaks these promises with regard to arbitration or discussion is to be deemed thereby to have committed an act of war against the other members of the league; not merely to have done an immoral thing but, by refusing to obey those processes, to have committed an act of war and put itself out of court. And you know what then happens. You say, 'Yes; we form an army and go and fight them.' Not at all. We shut their doors and lock them in. We boycott them. Just so soon as that is done they can not ship cargoes out or receive them shipped in. They can not send a telegraphic message. They can not send or receive a letter. Nobody can leave their territory and nobody can enter their territory. They are absolutely boycotted by the rest of mankind. I do not think that after that remedy it will be necessary to do any fighting at all. What brought Germany to her knees was not only the splendid fighting of the incomparable men who met her armies, but it was that her doors were locked and she could not get supplies from any part of the world. There were a few doors open, doors to some Swedish ore, for example, that she needed for making munitions, and that kept her going for a time; but the Swedish door would be shut this time. There would not be any door open, and that brings a nation to its senses just as suffocation removes from the individual all inclination to fight.

"Now, that is the league of nations, an agreement to arbitrate or discuss, and an agreement that if you do not arbitrate or discuss, you shall be absolutely boycotted and starved out. There is hardly a European nation, my fellow citizens, that is of a fighting inclination that has enough food to eat without importing food, and it will be a very persuasive argument that it has nothing to eat, because you can not fight on an empty stomach any more than you can worship God on an empty stomach. When we add to that some other very interesting particulars, I think the league of nations becomes a very interesting thing indeed. You have heard of article 10—and I am going to speak about that in a minute—but read article 11, because really there are other articles in the covenant. Article 11 says—I am not quoting its language, but its substance—that anything that is likely to affect the peace of the world or the good understanding upon which the peace of the world depends shall be everybody's business; that any nation, the littlest nation at the table, can stand up and challenge the right of the strongest nation there to keep on in a course of action or policy which is likely to disturb the peace of the world, and that it shall be its 'friendly right' to do so. Those are the words. It can not be regarded as a hostile or unfriendly act. It is its friendly right to do that, and if you will not give the secret away, I wrote those words myself, because, with the usual inclination of a talkative man I did not want there to be anything in the world that I could not talk about, and yet I did

not want to give offense. I wanted it to be our friendly right and everybody's friendly right to discuss everything that was likely to affect the peace of the world, because that is everybody's business, and it is everybody's business to see that nothing happens that does disturb the peace of the world.

"And there is added to this particular this very interesting thing: There can hereafter be no secret treaties. There were nations represented around that board—I mean the board at which the commission on the league of nations sat, where 14 nations were represented—there were nations represented around that board who had entered into many a secret treaty and understanding, and they made not the least objection to promising that hereafter no secret treaty should have any validity whatever. The provision of the covenant is that every treaty or international understanding shall be registered, I believe the word is, with the general secretary of the league, that the general secretary shall publish it in full just so soon as it is possible for him to publish it, and that no treaty shall be valid which is not thus registered. It is like our arrangements with regard to mortgages on real estate, that until they are registered nobody else need pay any attention to them. And so with the treaties; until they are registered in this office of the league nobody, not even the parties themselves, can insist upon their execution. You have cleared the deck thereby of the most dangerous thing and the most embarrassing thing that has hitherto existed in international politics. It was very embarrassing, my fellow citizens, when you thought you were approaching an ideal solution of a particular question to find that some of your principal colleagues had given the whole thing away. And that leads me to speak just in passing of what has given a great many people natural distress. I mean the Shantung settlement, the settlement with regard to a portion of the Province of Shantung in China.

"Great Britain and France, as everybody now knows, in order to make it more certain that Japan would come into the war and so assist to clear the Pacific of the German fleets, had promised that any rights that Germany had in China should, in the case of the victory of the Allies, pass to Japan. There was no qualification in the promise. She was to get exactly what Germany had, and so the only thing that was possible was to induce Japan to promise—and I want to say in fairness, for it would not be fair if I did not say it, that Japan did very handsomely make the promise which was requested of her—that she would retain in Shantung none of the sovereign rights which Germany had enjoyed there, but would return the sovereignty without qualification to China and retain in Shantung Province only what other nationalities had already had elsewhere, economic rights with regard to the development and administration of the railway and of certain mines which had become attached to the railway. That is her promise, and personally I have not the slightest doubt that she will fulfill that promise. She can not fulfill it right now because the thing does not go into operation until three months after the treaty is ratified, so that we must not be too impatient about it. But she will fulfill those promises. Suppose that we said that we would not assent. England and France must assent, and if we are going to get Shantung Province back for China and these gentlemen do not want to engage in foreign wars, how are they going to get it back? Their idea of not getting into trouble seems to be to stand for the largest possible number of unworkable propositions. It is all very well to talk about standing by China, but how are you standing by China when you withdraw from the only arrangement by which China can be assisted? If you are China's friend, then do not go into the council where you can act as China's friend! If you are China's friend, then put her in a position where even the concessions which have been made need not be carried out! If you are China's friend, scuttle and run! That is not the kind of American I am.

"Now, just a word about article 10. Permit me, if you will, to recur to what I said at the opening of these somewhat disjointed remarks. I said that the treaty was intended to destroy one system and substitute another. That other system was based upon the principle that no strong power need respect the territorial integrity or the political independence of any weak power. I need not confine the phraseology to that. It was based upon the principle that no power is obliged to respect the territorial integrity or the political independence of any other power if it has the force necessary to disregard it. So that article 10 cuts at the very heart and is the only instrument that will cut to the very heart of the old system. Remember that if this covenant is adopted by the number of nations which it probably will be adopted by, it means every nation except Germany and Turkey, because we have already said we would let Austria come in—Germany has to undergo a certain period of probation to see whether she has really experienced a change of heart and

effected a genuine change of constitutional provision—all the nations of the world except one strong one and one negligible one agree that they will respect and preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the other nations of the world.

"You would think from some of the discussions that the emphasis is on the word 'preserve.' We are partners with the rest of the world in respecting the territorial integrity and political independence of others. They are all under solemn bonds themselves to respect and to preserve those things, and if they do not preserve them, if they do not respect them or preserve them, what happens? The council of the league then advises the several members of the league what it is necessary to do. I can testify from having sat at the board where the instrument was drawn that advice means advice. I supposed it did before I returned home, but I found some gentlemen doubted it. Advice means advice, and the advice can not be given without the concurrent vote of the representative of the United States. Ah, but somebody says, 'Suppose we are a party to the quarrel!' I can not suppose that, because I know that the United States is not going to disregard the territorial integrity or the political independence of any other nation; but for the sake of the argument suppose that we are party. Very well, then, the scrap is ours anyway. For what these gentlemen are afraid of is that we are going to get into trouble. If we are a party, we are in trouble already, and if we are not a party we can control the advice of the council by our own vote. To my mind that is a little like an open and shut game, and I am not afraid of advice which we give ourselves. And yet that is the whole of the bugaboo which these gentlemen have been parading before you. The solemn thing about article 10 is the first sentence, not the second sentence. The first sentence says that we will respect and preserve against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of other nations; and let me stop a moment on the words 'external aggression.' Why were they put in? Because every man who sat at that board held that the right of revolution was sacred and must not be interfered with. Any kind of a row can happen inside and it is nobody's right to interfere. The only thing that there is any right to object to or interfere with is external aggression by some outside power undertaking to take a piece of territory or to interfere with the internal political arrangements of the country which is suffering from the aggression, because territorial integrity does not mean that you can not invade another country; it means that you can not invade it and stay here. I have not impaired the territorial integrity of your backyard if I walk into it, but I very much impair it if I insist upon staying there and will not get out, and the impairment of the integrity contemplated in this article is the kind of integrity which is violated if there is a seizure of territory, if there is an attempted annexation, if there is an attempted continuing domination either of the territory itself or of the methods of government inside that territory. When you read article 10, therefore, you will see that it is nothing but the inevitable, logical center of the whole system of the covenant of the league of nations, and I stand for it absolutely. If it should ever in any important respect be impaired, I would feel like asking the Secretary of War to get the boys who went across the water to fight on some field where I could go and see them, and I would stand up before them and say, 'Boys, I told you before you went across the seas that this was a war against wars, and I did my best to fulfill the promise, but I am obliged to come to you in mortification and shame and say I have not been able to fulfill the promise. You are betrayed. You fought for something that you did not get, and the glory of the Armies and the Navy of the United States is gone like a dream in the night, and there ensues upon it in the suitable darkness of the night the nightmare of dread which lay upon the nations before this war came, and there will come some time in the vengeful Providence of God another struggle in which not a few hundred thousand fine men from America will have to die but as many millions as are necessary to accomplish the final freedom of the peoples of the world.'

THE PRESIDENT AT COLISEUM, ST. LOUIS, MO., SEPTEMBER 5, 1919.

"Mr Chairman, Gov. Gardner, my fellow countrymen, this is much too solemn an occasion to care how we look; we ought to care how we think. [The photographer had just asked the audience to sit still for the picture.] I have come here to-night to ask permission to discuss with you some of the very curious aberrations of thinking that have taken place in this country of late. I have sought—I think I have sought without prejudice—to understand the point of view of the men who have been opposing the treaty and the covenant of the league of nations. Many of them are men whose judgment, whose patriotic feeling, I have

been accustomed to admire and respect, and yet I must admit to you, my fellow countrymen, that it is very hard for me to believe that they have followed their line of thinking to its logical and necessary conclusion, because when you reflect upon their position, it is either that we ought to reject this treaty altogether or that we ought to change it in such a way as will make it necessary to reopen negotiations with Germany and reconsider the settlements of the peace in many essential particulars. We can not do the latter alone, and other nations will not join us in doing it. The only alternative is to reject the peace and to do what some of our fellow countrymen have been advising us to do—stand alone in the world.

"I am going to take the liberty to-night of pointing out to you what this alternative means. I know the course of reasoning which is either uttered or implicit in this advice when it is given us by some of the men who propose this course. They believe that the United States is so strong, so financially strong, so industrially strong, if necessary so physically strong, that it can impose its will upon the world, if it is necessary for it to stand out against the world, and they believe that the processes of peace can be processes of domination and antagonism instead of processes of cooperation and good feeling. I therefore want to point out to you that only those who are ignorant of the world can believe that any nation, even so great a nation as the United States, can stand alone and play a single part in the history of mankind.

"Begin with a single circumstance, for I have not come here to-night to indulge in any kind of oratory. I have come here to-night to present to you certain hard facts which I want you to take home with you and think about. I suppose that most of you realize that it is going to be very difficult for the other nations that were engaged in this war to get financially on their feet again. I dare say you read the other day the statement of Mr. Herbert Hoover's opinion—an opinion which I always greatly respect—that it will be necessary for the United States immediately to advance four or five billion dollars for the rehabilitation of credit and industry on the other side of the water; and I must say to you that I learned nothing in Paris which would lead me to doubt that conclusion, and I think the statement of the sum is a reasonable and conservative statement.

"If the world is going bankrupt, if credit is going to be destroyed, if the industry of the rest of the world is going to be interrupted, our market is confined to the United States. Trade will be impossible, except within our own borders. If we are to save our own markets and rehabilitate our own industries, we must save the financial situation of the world and rehabilitate the markets of the world. Very well, what do these gentlemen propose? That we should do that, for we can not escape doing it. Face to face with a situation of this kind, we are not, let us assume, partners in the execution of this treaty. What is one of the central features of the execution of this treaty? It is the application of the reparation clauses. Germany can not pay for this war unless her industries are revived, and the treaty of peace sets up a great commission known as the 'reparation commission,' in which it was intended that there should be a member from the United States as well as from other countries, and the business of this commission will be in part to see that the industries of Germany are revived, in order that Germany may pay this great debt which she owes to civilization. That reparation commission can determine the currents of trade, the conditions of international credit; it can determine how much Germany is going to buy, where it is going to buy, how it is going to pay for it; and if we must, to save ourselves, contribute to the financial rehabilitation of the world then, without being members of this partnership, we must put our money in the hands of those who want to get the markets that belong to us. That is what these gentlemen call playing a lone hand. It is indeed playing a lone hand. It is playing a hand that is frozen out. We must contribute the money which other nations are to use in order to rehabilitate their industry and credit, and we must make them our antagonists and rivals and not our partners. I put that proposition to any business man, young or old, in the United States and ask him how he likes it and whether he considers that a useful way for the United States to stand alone. We have got to carry this burden of reconstruction whether we will or not or be ruined, and the question is, Shall we carry it and be ruined anyhow? For that is what these gentlemen propose—that at every point we shall be embarrassed by the whole financial affairs of the world being in the hands of other nations.

"As I was saying at the luncheon that I had the pleasure of eating with the chamber of commerce to-day, the whole aspect of the matter is an aspect of ignorance. The men who propose these things do not understand the selfish interests of the United States, because here is the rest of the picture: Hot

rivalries; burning suspicions; jealousies; arrangements made everywhere, if possible, to shut us out, because if we will not come in as equals we ought to be shut out. If we are going to keep out of this thing in order to prey upon the rest of the world, then I think we ought to be frozen out of it. That is not the temper of the United States, and it is not like the United States to be ignorant enough to think any such thoughts, because we know that partners profit and enemies lose the game. But that is not all of the picture, my fellow citizens. If every nation is going to be our rival, if every nation is going to dislike and distrust us—and that will be the case, because having trusted us beyond measure, the reaction will occur beyond measure—as it stands now they trust us, they look to us, they long that we shall undertake anything for their assistance rather than that any other nations should undertake it—if we say no, we are in this world to live by ourselves and get what we can out of it by any selfish processes—then the reaction will change the whole heart and attitude of the world toward this great, free, justice-loving people, and after you have changed the attitude of the world what have you produced? Peace? Why, my fellow citizens, is there any man here or any women—let me say is there any child here—who does not know that the seed of war in the modern world is industrial and commercial rivalry? The real reason that the war that we have just finished took place was that Germany was afraid her commercial rivals were going to get the better of her, and the reason why some nations went into the war against Germany was that they thought Germany would get the commercial advantage of them. The seed of the jealousy, the seed of the deep-seated hatred, was hot successful commercial and industrial rivalry.

"Why, what did the Germans do when they got into Belgium? I have just seen that suffering country. Most of the Belgian factories are standing. You do not witness in Belgium what you witness in France, except upon certain battle fields—factories destroyed, whole towns wiped out. No; the factories are there, the streets are clear, the people are there; but go in the factories. Every piece of machinery that could be taken away has been taken away. If it was too big to take away, experts directed the way in which it should be injured so it could never be used again; and that was because there were textural industries and iron industries in Belgium which the Germans hated Belgium for having, because they were better than the German and outdid them in the markets of the world. This war was a commercial and industrial war. It was not a political war.

"Very well, then, if we must stand apart and be the hostile rivals of the rest of the world, then we must do something else. We must be physically ready for anything that comes. We must have a great standing Army. We must see to it that every man in America is trained to arms. We must see to it that there are munitions and guns enough for an Army that means a mobilized Nation; that they are not only laid up in store but that they are kept up to date; that they are ready to use to-morrow; that we are a Nation in arms. Because you can not be unfriendly to everybody without being ready that everybody shall be unfriendly to you. And what does that mean? Reduction of taxes? No. Not only the continuation of the present taxes but the increase of the present taxes; and it means something very much more serious than that. We can stand that, so far as the expense is concerned, if we care to keep up the high cost of living and enjoy the other luxuries that we have recently enjoyed; but what is much more serious than that, we have got to have the sort of organization which is the only kind of organization that can handle armies of that sort. We may say what we please of the German Government that has been destroyed, my fellow citizens, but it was the only sort of government that could handle an armed nation. You can not handle an armed nation by vote. You can not handle an armed nation if it is democratic, because democracies do not go to war that way. You have got to have a concentrated militaristic organization of government to run a nation of that sort. You have got to think of the President of the United States not as the chief counsellor of the Nation, elected for a little while, but as the man meant constantly and every day to be the commander in chief of the Army and Navy of the United States, ready to order them to any part of the world where the threat of war is a menace to his own people. And you can not do that under free debate. You can not do that under public counsel. Plans must be kept secret. Knowledge must be accumulated by a system which we have condemned, because we have called it a spying system. The more polite call it a system of intelligence. You can not watch other nations with your unassisted eye. You have got to watch them by secret agencies, planted everywhere. Let me testify to this, my fellow citizens: I not only did not know it until we got into this war

but I did not believe it when I was told that it was true that Germany was not the only country that maintained a secret service. Every country in Europe maintained it, because they had to be ready for Germany's spring upon them, and the only difference between the German secret service and the other secret services was that the German secret service found out more than the others did, and therefore Germany sprang upon the other nations unawares and they were not ready for it.

"And you know what the effect of a military nation is upon social questions. You know how impossible it is to effect social reform if everybody must be under orders from the Government. You know how impossible it is, in short, to have a free nation if it is a military nation and under military order. You may say, 'You have been on the other side of the water and got bad dreams.' I have got no dreams at all. I am telling you the things, the evidence of which I have seen with awakened eyes, and not with sleeping eyes, and I know that this country if it wishes to stand alone must stand alone as part of a world in arms. Because, ladies and gentlemen, I do not say it because I am an American and my heart is full of the same pride that fills yours with regard to the power and spirit of this great Nation, but merely because it is a fact which I think everybody would admit outside of America as well as inside of America—the organization contemplated by the league of nations without the United States would merely be an alliance and not a league of nations. It would be an alliance in which the partnership would be between the more powerful European nations and Japan, and the other party to the world arrangement, the antagonist, the disassociated party, the party standing off to be watched by the alliance, would be the United States of America. There can be no league of nations in the true sense without the partnership of this great people.

"Now, let us mix the selfish with the unselfish. If you do not want me to be too altruistic, let me be very practical. If we are partners, let me predict we will be the senior partner. The financial leadership will be ours. The industrial primacy will be ours. The commercial advantage will be ours. The other countries of the world will look to us, do I say?—are looking to us for leadership and direction. Very well, then, if I am to compete with the critics of this league and of this treaty as a selfish American, I say I want to get in and get in as quick as I can. I want to be inside and know how the thing is run and help to run it. So that you have the alternative, armed isolation or peaceful partnership. Can any sane man hesitate as to the choice, and can any sane man ask the question which is the way of peace? I have heard some men say with an amazing ignorance that the covenant of the league of nations was an arrangement for war. Very well, then, the other arrangement—what would it be? An arrangement for peace? For kindness? For cooperation? Would everybody beckon us to their markets? Would everybody say, Come and tell us how to use your money? Would everybody come and say, Tell us how much of your goods you want us to take; tell us how much of what Germany is producing you would like when we want it? I can not bring my credulity up to that point. I have reached years of discretion, and I have met some very young men who knew a great deal more than some very old men.

"I want you, therefore, after seeing this very ugly picture that I have painted, for it is an ugly picture, it is a picture from which one turns away with distaste and disgust and says, That is not America, it is not like anything that we have ever conceived—I want you to look at the other side. I wonder if some of the gentlemen who are commenting upon this treaty ever read it? If anybody will tell me which of them has not, I will send him a copy. It is written in two languages. On this side is the English and on that side is the French, and since it is evident that some men do not understand English, I hope that they understand French. There are excellent French dictionaries by which they can dig out the meaning if they can not understand English. It is the plainest English that you should desire, particularly the covenant of the league of nations. There is not a phrase of doubtful meaning in the whole document.

"And what is the meaning? It is that the covenant of the league of nations is a covenant of arbitration and discussion. Had anybody ever told you that before? I dare say that everybody you have heard talk about this discusses article 10. Well, there are 25 other articles in it, and all of them are about something else. They discuss how soon and how quick we can get out of it. Well, I am not a quitter for one. We can get out just so soon as we want to, but we do not want to get out as soon as we get in. And they talk about the Monroe doctrine, when it expressly says that nothing in that document shall be construed as affecting in any way the validity of the Monroe

doctrine. It says so in so many words. And there are all the other things they talk about to draw your attention away from the essential matter. The essential matter, my fellow citizens, is this: Every member of that league—and it will include all the fighting nations of the world except Germany; the only nations that will not be admitted into it promptly are Germany and Turkey—we can, at any rate, postpone Turkey until Thanksgiving—all the fighting nations of the world are in it, and what do they promise? This is the center of the document. They promise that they never will go to war without first either submitting the question at issue to arbitration and absolutely abiding by the decision of the arbitrators, or, if they are not willing to submit it to arbitration, they will submit it to discussion by the council of the league, that they will give the council of the league six months in which to consider it, and that if they do not like the opinion of the council they will wait three months after the opinion is rendered before going to war. And I tell you, my fellow citizens, that any nation that is in the wrong and waits nine months before it goes to war never will go to war.

"Ah, but somebody says, Suppose they do not abide by that? Because all the arguments you hear are based upon the assumption that we are all going to break the covenant, that bad faith is the accepted rule. There has not been any such bad faith among nations in recent times except the flagrant bad faith of the nation we have just been fighting, and that bad faith is not likely to be repeated in the immediate future. Suppose somebody does not abide by those engagements, then what happens? War? No; not war. Something more terrible than war—absolute boycott of the nation in question. The doors are closed upon her, so that she can not ship anything out or receive anything in. She can not send a letter out or receive one in. No telegraphic message can cross her borders. No person can cross her borders. She is absolutely closed, and all the fighting nations of the world agree to join in the boycott. My own judgment is that war will not be necessary after that. If it is necessary, then it is perfectly evident that the case is one of a nation that wants to run amuck, and if any nation wants to run amuck in modern civilization we must all see that the outlaw is captured.

"I was saying in one of the first speeches I made upon this little expedition of mine that I was very happy in the circumstance that there were no politics in this business. I meant no party politics, and I invited that audience, as I invite you, to forget all about parties; forget that I am a Democrat; forget that some of you are Republicans; forget all about that. That has nothing to do with it. And this afternoon a book I had forgotten all about, one of the campaign books of the last political campaign, was put in my hands, and I found in that book the platforms of the two parties, and in both of those platforms they advocate just such an arrangement as the league of nations. When I was on the other side of the water I did not know that I was obeying orders from both parties, but I was, and I am very happy in that circumstance, because I can testify to you that I did not think anything about parties when I was on the other side of the water. I am just as much, my fellow citizens, in my present office the servant of my Republican fellow citizens as I am the servant of my Democratic fellow citizens. I am trying to be what some gentlemen do not know how to be—just a simple, plain-thinking, plain-speaking, out-and-out American.

"Now, I want you to understand, my fellow citizens, that I did not leave Washington and come out on this trip because I doubted what was going to happen. I did not. For one thing, I wanted to have the pleasure of leaving Washington; and, for another thing, I wanted to have the very much greater pleasure of feeling the inspiration that I would get from you. Things get very lonely in Washington sometimes. The real voices of the great people of America sometimes sound faint and distant in that strange city. You hear politics until you wish that both parties were smothered in their own gas. And I wanted to come out and hear some plain American, hear the kind of talk that I am accustomed to talk, the only kind of talk that I can understand, get the only kind of atmosphere with which I can fill my lungs wholesomely, and then, incidentally, convey a hint in some quarters that the American people had not forgotten how to think.

"There are certain places where talk does not count for anything. I am inclined to think that one of those places is the fashionable dinner table. I have never heard so many things that were not so anywhere else. In the little circles of fashion and wealth information circulates the more freely the less true it is. For some reason there is a preference for the things that are incredible. I admit there is a certain intellectual excitement in believing the things that are incredible. It is very

much duller to believe only the things that you know are so, but the spicy thing, the unusual thing, the thing that runs athwart the normal and wholesome currents of society, that is the thing that one can talk about with an unusual vocabulary and have a lot of fun in expounding. But they are not the things that make up the daily substance of thinking on the part of a wholesome Nation like this.

"This Nation went into this war to see it through to the end, and the end has not come yet. This is the beginning, not of the war, but of the processes which are going to render a war like this impossible. There are no other processes than these that are proposed in this great treaty. It is a great treaty, it is a treaty of justice, of rigorous and severe justice, but do not forget that there are many other parties to this treaty than Germany and her opponents. There is rehabilitated Poland. There is rescued Bohemia, there is redeemed Jugo-Slavia. There is the rehabilitated Roumania. All the nations that Germany meant to crush and reduce to the status of tools in her own hands, have been redeemed by this war and given the guarantee of the strongest nations of the world that nobody shall invade their liberty again. If you do not want to give them that guaranty, then you make it certain that without your guarantee the attempt will be made again, and if another war starts like this one, are you going to keep out of it? If you keep out of this arrangement, that sort of war will come soon. If you go into it, it never will come. We are in the presence, therefore, of the most solemn choice that this people was ever called upon to make. That choice is nothing less than this: Shall America redeem her pledges to the world? America is made up of the peoples of the world. All the best bloods of the world flow in her veins, all the old affections, all the old and sacred traditions of peoples of every sort throughout the wide world circulate in her veins, and she has said to mankind at her birth, 'We have come to redeem the world by giving it liberty and justice.' Now, we are called upon before the tribunal of mankind to redeem that immortal pledge."

THE PRESIDENT AT CONVENTION HALL, KANSAS CITY, MO., SEPTEMBER 6, 1919.

"Mr. Chairman, my fellow countrymen, it is very inspiring to me to stand in the presence of so great a company of my fellow citizens and have the privilege of performing the duty that I have come to perform. That duty is to report to my fellow citizens concerning the work of the peace conference. And every day it seems to me to become more necessary to report, because so many people who are talking about it do not understand what it was. I came back from Paris bringing one of the greatest documents of human history, and one of the things that made it great was that it was penetrated throughout with the principles to which America has devoted her life. Let me hasten to say that one of the most delightful circumstances of the work on the other side of the water was that I discovered that what we called American principles had penetrated to the heart and to the understanding, not only of the great peoples of Europe but to the hearts and understandings of the great men who were leading the peoples of Europe, and when these principles were written into this treaty, they were written there by common consent and common conviction, but it remains true nevertheless, my fellow citizens, that principles are written into that treaty which were never written into any great international understanding before, and that they had their natural birth and origin in this dear country to which we have devoted our life and service.

"I have no hesitation in saying that in spirit and essence it is an American document, and if you will bear with me—for this great subject is not a subject for oratory, it is a subject for examination and discussion—if you will bear with me I will remind you of some of the things that we have long desired and which are at last accomplished in this treaty. I think that I can say that one of the things that America has had most at heart throughout her existence has been that there should be substituted for the brutal processes of war the friendly processes of consultation and arbitration, and that is done in the covenant of the league of nations. I am very anxious that my fellow citizens should realize that that is the chief topic of the covenant of the league of nations; and the greater part of those provisions—the whole intent and purpose of the document—are expressed in provisions by which all the member States agree that they will never go to war without first having done one or other of two things, either submitted the matter in controversy to arbitration, in which case they agree to abide by the verdict, or submitted it to discussion in the council of the league of nations, and for that purpose they consent to allow six months for the discussion, and, whether they like the opinion expressed or not, that they

will not go to war for three months after that opinion is expressed. So that you have, whether you get arbitration or not, nine months' discussion, and I want to remind you that that is the central principle of some 30 treaties entered into between the United States of America and some 30 other sovereign nations, all of which were confirmed by the Senate of the United States. We have such an agreement with France. We have such an agreement with Great Britain. We have such an agreement with practically every great nation except Germany, which refused to enter into any such arrangement, because, my fellow citizens, Germany knew that she intended something that did not bear discussion, and that if she had submitted the purpose which led to this war to so much as one month's discussion she never would have dared go into the enterprise against mankind which she finally did go into. Therefore I say that this principle of discussion is the principle already adopted by America. And what is the compulsion to do this? The compulsion is this, that if any member State violates that promise to submit either to arbitration or discussion, it is thereby ipso facto deemed to have committed an act of war against all the rest. Then, you will ask, Do we at once take up arms and fight them? No; we do something very much more terrible than that. We absolutely boycott them. It is provided in that instrument that there shall be no communication even between them and the rest of the world; they shall receive no goods; they shall ship no goods. They shall receive no telegraphic messages; they shall send none. They shall receive no mail; no mail will be received from them. The nationals, the citizens, of the member States will never enter their territory until the matter is adjusted, and their citizens can not leave their own territory. The most complete boycott ever conceived in a public document; and I want to say to you with confident prediction that there will be no more fighting after that. Gentlemen talk to you as if the most probable outcome of this great combination of all the fighting peoples of the world was going to be fight, whereas, as a matter of fact, the essence of the document is to the effect that the processes shall be peaceful, and peaceful processes are more deadly than the processes of war. Let any merchant put it to himself, that if he enters into a covenant and then breaks it and the people all around him absolutely desert his establishment and will have nothing to do with him, ask him after that if it will be necessary to send the police. The most terrible thing that can happen to an individual and the most conclusive thing that can happen to a nation is to be read out of decent society.

"And there was another thing that we wished to accomplish that is accomplished in this document. We wanted disarmament, and this document provides in the only possible way for disarmament, by common agreement. Observe, my fellow citizens, that, as I said just now, every great fighting nation in the world is to be a member of this partnership except Germany, and inasmuch as Germany has accepted a limitation of her army to 100,000 men, I do not think for the time being she may be regarded as a great fighting nation. Here in the center of Europe a great nation of more than 60,000,000 that has agreed not to maintain an army of more than 100,000 men, and all around her the rest of the world in concerted partnership to see that no other nation attempts what she attempted, and agreeing among themselves that they will not impose this limitation of armament upon Germany merely, but that they will impose it upon themselves. And you know, my fellow citizens, what armaments mean: Great standing armies and great stores of war material. They do not mean burdensome taxation merely; they do not mean merely compulsory military service which saps the economic strength of the nation, but they mean the building up of a military class. Again and again, my fellow citizens, in the conference at Paris, we were face to face with this circumstance, that in dealing with a particular civil government we found that they would not dare to promise what their general staff was not willing that they should promise, and that they were dominated by the military machine which they had created, nominally for their own defense, but really, whether they willed it or not, for the provocation of war. And so soon as you have a military class, it does not make any difference what your form of government is, if you are determined to be armed to the teeth, you must obey the orders and directions of the only men who can control the great machinery of war. Elections are of minor importance, because they determine the political policy, and back of that political policy is the constant pressure of the men trained to arms, enormous bodies of disciplined men behind them, unlimited supplies of military stores, and wondering if they are never going to be allowed to use their education and their skill and ravage some great people with the force

of arms. That is the meaning of armaments. It is not merely the cost of it, though that is overwhelming, but it is the spirit of it, and America has never had, and I hope in the providence of God never will have, that spirit.

"There is no other way to dispense with great armaments except by the common agreement of the fighting nations of the world. And here is the agreement. They promise disarmament, and promise to agree upon a plan.

"But there was something else we wanted that is accomplished by this treaty. We wanted to destroy autocratic authority everywhere in the world. We wanted to see to it that there was no place in the world where a small group of men could use their fellow citizens as pawns in a game, that there was no place in the world where a small group of men without consulting their fellow citizens, could send their fellow citizens to the battle fields and to death in order to accomplish some dynastic ambition, some political plan that had been conceived in private, some object that had been prepared for by universal, world-wide intrigue. That is what we wanted to accomplish. The most startling thing that developed itself at the opening of our participation in this war was, not the military preparation of Germany; we were familiar with that, though we had been dreaming that she would not use it, but her political preparation—to find every community in the civilized world was penetrated by her intrigue. The German people did not know that, but it was known on Wilhelmstrasse, where the central offices of the German Government were, and Wilhelmstrasse was the master of the German people. And this war, my fellow citizens, has emancipated the German people as well as the rest of the world. We do not want to see anything like that happen again, because we know that democracies will sooner or later have to destroy that form of government, and if we do not destroy it now, the job is still to be done. And by a combination of all the great fighting peoples of the world, to see to it that the aggressive purposes of such governments can not be realized, you make it no longer worth while for little groups of men to contrive the downfall of civilization in private conference.

"But I want to say something about that that has a different aspect, and perhaps you will regard it as a slight digression from the discussion which I am asking you to be patient enough to follow. My fellow citizens, it does not make any difference what kind of a minority governs you if it is a minority, and the thing we must see to is that no minority anywhere masters the majority. That is at the heart, my fellow citizens, of the tragical things that are happening in that great country which we long to help and can find no way that is effective to help. I mean the great realm of Russia. The men who are now measurably in control of the affairs of Russia represent nobody but themselves. They have again and again been challenged to call a constitutional convention. They have again and again been challenged to prove that they had some kind of a mandate, even from a single class of their fellow citizens, and they dare not attempt it. They have no mandate from anybody. There are only 34, I am told, and there were more than 34 men who used to control the destinies of Europe from Wilhelmstrasse. There is a closer monopoly of power in Petrograd and Moscow than there ever was in Berlin, and the thing that is intolerable is not that the Russian people are having their way, but that another group of men, more cruel than the Czar himself, is controlling the destinies of that great people. I want to say here and now that I am against the control of any minority anywhere. Search your own economic history and what have you been uneasy about? Now and again you have said there were small groups of capitalists who were controlling the industry and therefore the development of the United States. Very well, my fellow citizens, if that is so, and sometimes I have feared that it was, we must break up that monopoly. I am not now saying that there is any group of our fellow citizens who are consciously doing anything of the kind. I am saying that these allegations must be proved, but if it is proved that any class, any group anywhere, is without the suffrage of their fellow citizens, in control of our affairs, then I am with you to destroy the power of that group. We have got to be frank with ourselves; however, if we do not want minority government in Russia, we must see that we do not have it in the United States. If you do not want little groups of selfish men to plot the future of Europe, we must not allow little groups of selfish men to plot the future of America. Any man that speaks for a class must prove that he also speaks for all his fellow citizens and for mankind, and then we will listen to him. The most difficult thing in a democracy, my fellow citizens, is to get classes where they unfortunately exist to understand one another and unite, and yet you have not got a great democracy until they do understand one another and unite. So that if we

are in for seeing that there are no more Czars and no more Kaisers, then let us do a thorough job and see that nothing of that sort occurs anywhere.

"Then there was another thing we wanted to do, my fellow citizens, that is done in this document. We wanted to see that helpless peoples were nowhere in the world put at the mercy of unscrupulous enemies and masters. There is one pitiful example, which is in the hearts of all of us. I mean the example of Armenia. There a Christian people is helpless, at the mercy of a Turkish Government, which thought it the service of God to destroy them. And at this moment, my fellow citizens, it is an open question whether the Armenian people will not, while we sit here and debate, be absolutely destroyed. When I think of words piled on words, of debate following debate, when these unspeakable things that can not be handled until the debate is over are happening in this pitiful part of the world, I wonder that men do not wake up to the moral responsibility of what they are doing. Great populations are driven out upon a desert where there is no food and can be none, and there are compelled to die, and the men and women and children thrown into a common grave, so imperfectly covered up that here and there is a pitiful arm stretched out to heaven, and there is no pity in the world. When shall we wake to the moral responsibility of this great occasion?

"So, my fellow citizens, there are other aspects to that matter. Not all the populations that are having something that is not a square deal live in Armenia. There are others, and one of the glories of the great document which I brought back with me is this, that everywhere within the area of settlement covered by the political questions involved in that treaty people of that sort have been given their freedom and guaranteed their freedom. But the thing does not end there, because the treaty includes the covenant of the league of nations, and what does that say? That says that it is the privilege of any member State to call attention to anything anywhere that is likely to disturb the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends, and every people in the world that have not got what they think they ought to have is thereby given a world forum in which to bring the thing to the bar of mankind. An incomparable thing, a thing that never was dreamed of before! A thing that was never conceived as possible before, that it should not be regarded as an unfriendly act on the part of the representatives of one nation to call attention to something being done within the confines of another empire which was disturbing the peace of the world and the good understanding between nations! * * * And the majestic thing about the league of nations is that it is to include the great peoples of the world, all except Germany. Germany is one of the great peoples of the world. I would be ashamed not to say that. Those 60,000,000 industrious and inventive and accomplished people are one of the great peoples of the world. They have been put upon. They have been misled. Their minds have been debased by a false philosophy. They have been taught things that the human spirit ought to reject, but they will come out of that nightmare, they will come out of that phantasm, and they will again be a great people; and when they are out of it, when they have got over that dream of conquest and of oppression, when they have shown that their Government really is based upon new principles and upon democratic principles, then we all of us at Paris agreed that they should be admitted to the league of nations.

"In the meantime, her one-time partner, Austria, is to be admitted. Hungary, I dare say, will be admitted, and the only nations outside the league—unless we choose to stay out and go in later with Germany—the only nations left out of any consequence are Germany and Turkey. And we are just now looking for the pieces of Turkey. She has so thoroughly disintegrated that the process of assembling the parts is becoming increasingly difficult, and the chief controversy now is who shall attempt that very difficult and perilous job.

"Is it not a great vision, my fellow citizens, this of the thoughtful world combined for peace, this of all the great peoples of the world associated to see that justice is done, that the strong who intend wrong are restrained, and that the weak who can not defend themselves are made secure? We have a problem ahead of us that ought to interest us in this connection. We have promised the people of the Philippine Islands that we will set them free, and it has been one of our perplexities how we should make them safe after we set them free. Under this arrangement it will be safe from the outset. They will become members of the league of nations; every great nation in the world will be pledged to respect and preserve against external aggression from any quarter the territorial integrity and politi-

cal independence of the Philippines. It simplifies one of the most perplexing problems that has faced the American public, but it does not simplify our problems merely, gentlemen. It illustrates the triumph of the American spirit. I do not want to attempt any flight of fancy, but I can fancy those men of the first generation that so thoughtfully set this great Government up, the generation of Washington and Hamilton and Jefferson and the Adamses. I can fancy their looking on with a sort of enraptured amazement that the American spirit should have made conquest of the world. I wish you could have seen the faces of some of the people that talked to us over there about the arrival of the American troops. At first they did not know that we were going to be able to send so many, but they got something from the first groups that changed the whole aspect of the war. One of the most influential ladies in Paris, the wife of a member of the cabinet, told us that on the Fourth of July of last year she and others had attended the ceremonies with very sad hearts, and merely out of courtesy to the United States, because they did not believe that the aid of the United States was going to be effective; but she said, 'After we had been there and seen the faces of those men in khaki, seen the spirit of their swing and attitude, and seen the vision that was in their eyes, we came away knowing that victory was in sight.' What Europe saw in our boys was not merely men under arms, indomitable men under arms, but men with an ideal in their eyes, men who had come a long way from home to defend other peoples, men who had forgotten the convenience of everything that personally affected them and had turned away from the longing love of the people who were dear to them and had come across the broad sea to rescue the nations of the world from an intolerable oppression.

"I tell you, my fellow citizens, the war was won by the American spirit. Orders were found, were picked up on the battle field, German orders, directing the commanders not to let the Americans get hold of a particular post, because you never could get them out again. And you know what one of our American wits said, that it took only half as long to train an American army as any other, because you only had to train them to go one way. And it is true that they never thought of going any other way, and when they were restrained, because they were told it was premature or dangerous, they were impatient. They said, 'We didn't come over here to wait; we came over here to fight.' And their very audacity, their very indifference to danger, changed the morale of the battle field. They were not fighting prudently; they were going to get there. And America in this treaty has realized, my fellow countrymen, what those gallant boys we are so proud of fought for. The men who make this impossible or difficult will have a lifelong reckoning with the fighting forces of the United States. I have consorted with those boys. I have been proud to call myself their Commander in Chief. I did not run the business. They did not need anybody to run it. All I had to do was to turn them loose.

"And now for a final word, my fellow citizens. If anything that I have said has left the impression on your mind that I have the least doubt of the result, please dismiss the impression. And if you think that I have come out on this errand to fight anybody—anybody—please dismiss that from your mind. I have not come to fight or antagonize anybody, or any body of individuals. I have, let me say without the slightest affectation, the greatest respect for the Senate of the United States, but, my fellow citizens, I have come out to fight a cause. That cause is greater than the Senate. It is greater than the Government. It is as great as the cause of mankind, and I intend, in office or out, to fight that battle as long as I live. My ancestors were troublesome Scotchmen, and among them were some of that famous group that were known as Covenanters. Very well, then; here is the covenant of the league of nations. I am a Covenanter!"

FOREIGN ALLIANCES AND INTERFERENCES.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I desire to present a letter from Mr. Charles Stewart Davison, a lawyer of New York, in which he has brought together extracts, with the references, from the writings of Jefferson in regard to foreign alliances and interferences in the affairs of Europe. I think it will be very useful as a matter of reference, and I ask that it be printed.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

NEW YORK, September 3, 1919.

DEAR SIR: Not Washington only, but Jefferson as well, drew a sharp distinction between the making of "commercial" and other treaties and the making of "political" alliances between this country and the nations of Europe. Commercial treaties, treaties of amity and friendship, and, when necessary, defensive

alliances against aggression they favored. Political conventions both recognized to be foreign to the welfare of the land and fatal to our future.

What Washington said has been often quoted; what Jefferson said has been strangely neglected at this, of all other moments, when it applies so directly. Jefferson for some 40 years spoke and wrote consistently against such conventions being entered into on our part. To quote from his writings:

"I know that it is a maxim with us, and I think it a wise one, not to entangle ourselves with the affairs of Europe." (To E. Carrington (Paris, 1787). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington edition, ii, 334. Ford edition, iv, 483.)

"Better keep together as we are, haul off from Europe as soon as we can and from all attachments to any portions of it." (To John Taylor (Philadelphia, 1798). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington edition, iv, 247. Ford edition, vii, 265.)

"I am for free commerce with all nations; political connection with none; and little or no diplomatic establishment. And I am not for linking ourselves by new treaties with the quarrels of Europe." (To Elbridge Gerry (Philadelphia, 1799). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington edition, iv, 268. Ford edition, vii, 328.)

"Commerce with all nations, alliance with none, should be our motto." (To T. Lomax (Monticello, March, 1799). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington edition, iv, 301. Ford edition, vii, 374.)

"I sincerely join you in abjuring all political connection with every foreign power; and though I cordially wish well to the progress of liberty in all nations and would forever give it the weight of our countenance, yet they are not to be touched without contamination from their other bad principles." (To T. Lomax (Monticello, March, 1799). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington edition, iv, 301. Ford edition, vii, 374.)

"Let our affairs be disentangled from those of all other nations, except as to commerce." (To Gideon Granger (Monticello, 1800). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington edition, iv, 331. Ford edition, vii, 452.)

"The Constitution thought it wise to restrain the Executive and Senate from entangling and embroiling our affairs with those of Europe." (Parliamentary Manual, ix, 81. 1800.)

"To take part in European conflicts would be to divert our energies from creation to destruction." (To George Logan (Washington, March, 1801). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Ford edition, vii, 23.)

"It ought to be the very first object of our pursuits to have nothing to do with the European interests and politics. Let them be free or slaves, at will, navigators or agriculturists, swallowed into one government or divided into a thousand; we have nothing to fear from them in any form." (To George Logan (Washington, March, 1801). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Ford edition, viii, 23.)

"Determined as we are to avoid, if possible, wasting the energies of our people in war and destruction, we shall avoid implicating ourselves with the powers of Europe, even in support of principles we mean to pursue. They have so many other interests different from ours that we must avoid being entangled in them. We believe we can enforce these principles as to ourselves by peaceable means, now that we are likely to have our public councils detached from foreign views." (To Thomas Paine (Washington, March, 1801). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington edition, iv, 370. Ford edition, viii, 18.)

"Our nation has wisely avoided entangling itself in the system of European interests, has taken no side between its rival powers, attached itself to none of its ever-changing confederacies." (Reply to address of Baltimore Baptists (1808). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington edition, viii, 137.)

"The seed of hatred and revenge which they are now sowing with a large hand will not fail to produce their fruits in time." (To M. de Marbois (Monticello, 1817). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington edition, vii, 76.)

And concerning more particularly a league of nations:

"Treaties of alliance are generally insufficient to enforce compliance with their mutual stipulations." (The Anas (1818), ix, 88. The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Ford edition, i, 157.)

"It is a theatrical farce, in which the five powers are the actors." (To President Monroe (Monticello, June, 1823). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington edition, vii, 289. Ford edition, x, 253.)

"It is against our system to entangle ourselves at all with the affairs of Europe." (To Philip Massé (Washington, 1824). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Washington edition, iv, 553.)

Yet Jefferson, disliked by many then and now as to his idealism, was at least as earnest, at least as well read, at least as experienced, at least as liberal, and at least as competent to judge human tendencies and the results of human action as are any of the idealists of to-day. Nor has human nature, which remained unchanged through the centuries and persistently held its traits through many leagues of nations, altered in the last 100 years. Nor are world conditions to-day different from those of Jefferson's time, which was that of the overthrow of Napoleon, of the bankruptcy of Europe, of the threatened revolution in England, of the disorder and misery of the nations, of the great convulsion of the nineteenth century, and of the founding for the same purposes of a league of nations, known as the Holy Alliance, to secure peace and guarantee the territorial integrity of the associated powers. Of it, to quote him finally, Jefferson says:

"With respect to the European combinations against the rights of man, I join an honest Irishman of my neighborhood in his Fourth of July toast, 'The Holy Alliance—to hell the whole of them.'" (To Thomas Leiper (Monticello, 1824). The Writings of Thomas Jefferson. Ford edition, x, 298.)

Yours, truly,

CHAS. STEWART DAVISON.

VIOLENCE AND STRIKES.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President, the other day I read in the Columbia State, a newspaper published in Columbia, S. C., an article on violence and strikes. It is very short and I ask that it may be inserted in the RECORD. It expresses my views better than I can express them.

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

VIOLENCE AND STRIKES.

"Any citizen of Charlotte who is indisposed to work as a conductor or motorman on the street car lines has the indisputable right to get out and keep out of that kind of employment. That, however, is no reason why street cars should not be run in Charlotte. If other men wish to work as motormen or conductors, their indisputable right is to do so, and interference with them in any hostile manner by other men is criminal. Conceding that the strikers in Charlotte have not molested or threatened to molest the nonstrikers, it is certain that some men have done so.

"It happens that at this time this country is big enough for every able-bodied man to get some kind of job.

"If the street car company in Charlotte has no right to serve the people, except as employees or former employees would direct, and if that question has to be settled by force and violence, the sooner it is settled the better for all concerned. The public should know 'where it is at.' Resort to violence is as excusable in one strike as another and if it is to be admitted by tacit consent as a legitimate factor in a dispute between employer and employees in one industry it should be and must be eventually admitted in all industries. That means that if half the cooks in Charlotte strike the public and the law officers should stand by while their friends go into the kitchens, where other cooks are employed and are still at work, to entice or frighten them away from the kitchen sinks. It means that if the cotton pickers on a plantation in Sumter County quit work their friends should be allowed to drive the pickers, with staves and stones, from the cotton field adjoining.

"Why does the public not awake? Why does it assume that a certain kind of ruffianism in relation to a strike should be tolerated? Has not the public sense enough to perceive that if it be winked at long enough it will get to be a rule in all industry? Does not the public well know that three-fourths of our industry is agricultural?

"The Charlotte Observer said last Thursday:

"Conviction has been growing stronger in the minds of both the people and organized labor that the community never could countenance the character of unionism which has been attempted here and which has had violence as its foundation stone. Labor as organized in Charlotte has been freed from all these antagonistic influences and the prospect appears brighter that the mind of labor is being again directed toward the better and more effective principles of persuasion and friendly counsel. Where violence will fail the methods with which the organized labor of this community had so long been identified will win in the end."

"To the organization of laboring men no one can wisely object. Their right to organization is just as good as is that of the bankers or doctors—and no better. A strike by the bank cashiers would not imply a right by their friends to dynamite the vault when other cashiers had been elected and had gone to work. The public has a right to the security of its money in the bank

and to the security of life and limb when riding on a street car. If these things be debatable, now is as good a time as any to debate and settle them. Is civil war the only method by which the right of any and every man to work and carry on business can be settled?

"The majority of the American people want peace and order. Ninety-five per cent want them. There are men enough in the country to perform the country's tasks.

"Why should 5 per cent of the population be allowed to disturb the other 95 per cent?"

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. Mr. President, I have here a telegram from the mayor of Abilene, Tex., Hon. Dallas Scarbrough, transmitting resolutions adopted at a recent mass meeting of citizens of Abilene and Taylor County in favor of the league of nations. I ask that it may be printed in the RECORD.

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

ABILENE, TEX., September 6, 1919.

Hon. MORRIS SHEPPARD and Hon. C. A. CULBERSON,
Washington, D. C.:

In a mass meeting here the following resolutions were passed: "We, the citizens of Abilene and Taylor County, Tex., desire to record in the most emphatic terms our deepest disappointment at the attitude of certain Members on the greatly delayed ratification of the treaty of peace, thus cheating the millions of suffering humanity of the world of the early fruits of peace for which they have been crying for 10 long months, for which our gallant sons and millions of our brothers across the seas died, for which the civil population of the nations of the world have made unprecedented sacrifices, and for which the duly authorized representatives of the United States, with our own great President Woodrow Wilson, have labored unceasingly through many months. We denounce the attempt to make the treaty or the President a partisan issue as unpatriotic and un-American, and call upon the people of our country everywhere to forthwith lodge their earnest protests with the Senate against any further tactics of partisans or obstructionists. To faithfully keep the covenant with the blood of our gallant heroes and with the millions who suffered with them, the Senate is in honor bound to promptly ratify the treaty and render impossible a recurrence of the awful tragedy of a world war."

DALLAS SCARBROUGH, Mayor.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any further morning business? [After a pause.] The morning business is closed. The calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, there is a bill on the calendar which I believe should be disposed of one way or the other. It is House bill 8624, known as the food-control bill, Order of Business 73. I believe it should be disposed of, and I think we can do so during the morning hour. I therefore ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, have we not a rule which requires us to proceed with the calendar on Monday morning?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes. It is enforced once in a while. Mr. JONES of Washington. I hope it will be enforced this morning.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, a parliamentary inquiry. In what position, now, in view of the suggestion made by the Senator from North Dakota, is the unfinished business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. It comes down at 2 o'clock. It would anyway.

Mr. ASHURST. I call for the regular order.

Mr. EDGE. I simply want to take advantage of any moments before 2 o'clock to get the bill on its way.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection to setting aside Calendar Monday by unanimous consent?

Mr. JONES of Washington. Yes, Mr. President. I object to setting it aside.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Then the calendar under Rule VIII is in order.

THE CALENDAR.

The first business on the calendar was the resolution (S. Res. 76) defining a peace treaty which shall assure to the people of the United States the attainment of the ends for which they entered the war, and declaring the policy of our Government to meet fully obligations to ourselves and to the world.

Mr. ASHURST and Mr. OWEN. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be passed over. The bill (S. 529) for the relief of the heirs of Adam and Noah Brown was announced as next in order.

Mr. OWEN. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over. The bill (S. 600) for the relief of the heirs of Mrs. Susan A. Nicholas was announced as next in order.

Mr. OWEN. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1479) for the relief of the estate of Moses M. Bane was announced as next in order.

Mr. OWEN. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1223) for the relief of the owner of the steamer *Mayflower* and for the relief of passengers on board said steamer was announced as next in order.

Mr. OWEN. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 174) for the relief of Emma H. Ridley was announced as next in order.

Mr. OWEN. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

SUBSCRIPTIONS TO UNITED WAR-WORK CAMPAIGN.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) authorizing national banks to subscribe to the united war-work campaign was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It provides that it shall be lawful for any national banking association to contribute to the united war-work campaign in the same manner and under the same conditions as they are authorized to contribute to the American National Red Cross by section 1 of the act entitled "An act authorizing national banks to subscribe to the American National Red Cross," approved May 22, 1918.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 631) repealing certain provisions contained in the urgent deficiency act approved December 22, 1911, was announced as next in order.

Mr. KIRBY. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 1722) for the relief of Watson B. Dickerman, administrator of the estate of Charles Backman, deceased, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 2259) for the relief of Edward S. Farrow was announced as next in order.

Mr. OVERMAN. Let the bill be read.

The Secretary read the bill.

Mr. KIRBY. I ask that it may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

PENSIONS AND INCREASE OF PENSIONS.

The bill (S. 1726) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of such soldiers and sailors, was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, if there is an objection to the consideration of this bill, I desire to move its consideration. I hope there will be no objection.

I wish to state to any Senator who thinks this measure ought to be objected to that it is a bill that passed the Senate during the last session. It was one of the bills that was passed at so late a day that it could not reach the House before final adjournment; and the only amendment that has since been made, as we reintroduced the same bill, was to eliminate the names of those who have died since the previous bill passed the Senate. It received the consideration of the Senate Committee on Pensions when the Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] was chairman of that committee. It is needless to say, therefore, that it had the careful consideration of that committee.

This bill was reported in July. A number of bills have since been reported from the House to be taken up by the Senate; but we have not called a meeting of the Committee on Pensions, because I would not call it to consider those matters until it was definitely determined whether we could put through a bill that has been on the calendar since July 10. I did not understand who objected, but I hope the Senator making the objection will withdraw it under the circumstances.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I have no doubt that if the Senator insists on taking up the bill, regardless of the objection, it will be taken up with but one negative vote on the motion. Still I must object.

Mr. McCUMBER. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the bill.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill (S. 1726) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Regular Army and Navy and of wars other than the Civil War, and to certain widows and dependent relatives of

such soldiers and sailors, which had been reported from the Committee on Pensions with an amendment. It proposes to pension the following persons at the rate named:

Charles F. Cavanaugh, \$17 per month.

Milton M. Lile, \$24 per month.

Amme A. Wilson, \$12 per month.

Charles B. Smith, \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edward Flannery, \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas Kent, \$17 per month.

Palmyra Johnson, \$12 per month.

James A. Criswell, \$12 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Andrew E. Waterman, \$12 per month.

Henry L. Henrysen, \$17 per month.

Isaac F. Roberts, \$24 per month.

Eugene M. Symonds, \$30 per month.

Mary E. Allen, \$25 per month.

Frank H. Seay, \$12 per month.

William H. Hart, \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Thomas J. Scanlain, \$24 per month.

Arthur G. Bosson, \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Albert Grimes, \$30 per month.

James L. Graham, \$12 per month.

David Britton, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. Tarter, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

John Clark, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George E. Lawrence, \$20 per month.

Charles Weittle, \$20 per month.

Mary Melissa Anderson, \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Wilfred W. Phaneuf, \$17 per month.

Rufus H. Hopkins, \$24 per month.

Ulysses S. G. Canfield, \$17 per month.

Joseph J. Horan, \$12 per month.

Dennis Driscoll, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

James D. Wilder, \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Lemuel Lunger, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George Moir, \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charles H. Skillings, \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Elizabeth E. Baker, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John F. Manuel, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Joseph W. Culbertson, \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Elvina Adams, \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Ellen Jones, \$12 per month.

Cornelia A. Nickels, \$50 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

James J. Butler, \$12 per month.

Susan Owens, \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

John Franklin Haynes, \$12 per month.

Marion T. Mitchell, \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Francis E. Searway, \$12 per month.

John J. Duke, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Emeline A. Spaulding, \$12 per month.

Jacob D. Emery, \$12 per month.

Lily D. Murphy, \$12 per month.

Albert L. Newland, \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

George W. McMahan, \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Oscar S. Pomeroy, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

David W. Herriman, \$20 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Edwin W. Gordon, \$12 per month.

John Daley, \$50 per month.

Charles F. Hahn, \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Arthur H. Letts, \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Floyd E. Driskel, \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Sarah Hale, \$25 per month.

Amanda F. Mahin, \$25 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

William W. Treadway, \$17 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Benjamin H. Kimbler, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Lee Begley, \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Henry Fields, \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Charley Shelton, \$12 per month.

The amendment of the Committee on Pensions was, on page 10, after line 22, to strike out:

The name of Carrier Thompson, late of Company L, Sixteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, War with Spain, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

HENRY J. DAVIS.

The bill (S. 610) for the relief of Henry J. Davis was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, Henry J. Davis, who served under the name of Henry Davis, and who was a private of Company K, Seventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the military service of the United States as a member of said company and regiment on the 29th day of November, 1861.

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

BILLS PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 1699) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. That bill can not be disposed of in the morning hour, and therefore I ask that it may go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

The bill (S. 168) to create a commission to investigate and report to Congress a plan on the questions involved in the financing of house construction and home ownership and Federal aid therefor was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. There is no report indicated on the calendar accompanying the bill, and I ask that it go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

MEMORIAL TO AGRICULTURAL DEPARTMENT EMPLOYEES.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 72) authorizing the erection on public grounds in the city of Washington, D. C., of a memorial to employees of the United States Department of Agriculture who died in the war with Germany was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of Agriculture be, and he is hereby, authorized to grant permission to the Department of Agriculture War Memorial Committee for the erection in the Department of Agriculture grounds, situated in the Mall, between Twelfth and Fourteenth Streets S.W., Washington, D. C., of a memorial to the former employees of the said United States Department of Agriculture who lost their lives while in the military or naval service in the war with Germany: *Provided*, That the site chosen and the design of the memorial shall be approved by the Commission of Fine Arts, and that the United States shall be put to no expense in or by the erection of this memorial.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate without amendment, ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

RECREATION ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA.

The bill (S. 2224) to incorporate the Recreation Association of America was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

JOHN M. FRANCIS.

The bill (S. 176) for the relief of John M. Francis was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay to John M. Francis, father of late Cadet John C. Francis, West Point Military Academy, who died on duty at Fort Bayard, N. Mex., the sum of \$181, burial and transportation expenses.

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

CAPT. WILLIAM SHELBY BARRIGER.

The bill (S. 2095) to authorize the President of the United States to appoint William Shelby Barriger captain of Cavalry was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments, in lines 6 and 7, to strike out the word "formerly" and insert "who enlisted in the Regular Army on September 15, 1900, and who rose to be," and in lines 9, 10, and 11, to strike out "next after Sidney D. Maize on the regular list of Army officers" and insert "at the foot of the regular list of captains of Cavalry," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President of the United States, in his discretion, be, and he is hereby, authorized to appoint, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, William Shelby Barriger, who enlisted in the Regular Army on September 15, 1900, and who rose to be a first lieutenant of Cavalry, at present temporary major of Quartermaster Department, a captain of Cavalry, to take rank at the foot of the regular list of captains of Cavalry: *Provided*, That no back pay or allowances shall accrue as a result of the passage of this act: *Provided further*, That the total number of captains of Cavalry is increased by one for the purpose of this act.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

FRED C. KONRAD.

The bill (S. 1447) to correct the naval record of Fred C. Konrad was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Navy be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to review the naval record of Fred C. Konrad, late first-class electrician, United States Navy, and grant him an honorable disability discharge.

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

DIVISION OF TUBERCULOSIS.

The bill (S. 1660) to provide a division of tuberculosis in and an advisory council for the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

DISCOUNT OF BILLS OF EXCHANGE.

The bill (H. R. 7478) to amend sections 5200 and 5202 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by acts of June 22, 1906, and September 24, 1908, was announced as next in order.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I shall want to be heard briefly upon that bill, and I think I shall object for the time being. I have not any desire to delay the legislation unnecessarily. I am disposed to think that perhaps some of the restrictions as to the amount that can be loaned should be eliminated. But under this bill as it now is a borrower, by drawing drafts and attaching bills of lading, could borrow every dollar of deposits that a bank has. There is no limitation whatever under the bill. I think I shall ask that the bill may go over. The Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] was very much interested in it on Saturday, and I asked then that it should go over.

Mr. HARRISON. Will the Senator yield?

Mr. POMERENE. I yield.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I hope the Senator will not insist that the bill shall go over. There are reasons why it should be considered now. We do not know when the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH] is coming back. This is a measure of very great importance to certain industries and certain sections. They are beginning to move cotton in the South, as the Senator knows, and it is almost necessary that something be done to take care of that situation, and it ought to be done as soon as possible. The bill passed the House some weeks ago practically unanimously. It was reported out of the Banking and Currency Committee of the House without objection, and I understood there was no objection on the part of the Banking and Currency Committee of the Senate. If the Senator from Ohio thinks some limitation should be placed in it, let us take up the bill and consider it, and let him offer his amendment.

Mr. POMERENE. Allow me to make a suggestion in regard to it. I do not feel that the bill should be considered hurriedly. I understand that I would be limited to the five-minute rule.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senate is proceeding under the five-minute rule.

Mr. POMERENE. It is impossible to present a matter of this importance in that time. I have not any objection to its being taken up this afternoon, but I want to have it taken up at a

time when we will not be limited by the five-minute rule. I understand the bill which the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. Edge] has in charge is the unfinished business. So far as I am concerned, this bill may be taken up immediately after that is disposed of, or if the Senator from New Jersey will give way to this bill, I am quite willing that that shall be done. I think I can demonstrate to the satisfaction of the Senate that without any limitation this would be very bad legislation.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Ohio and the Senator from Mississippi that I had intended to offer some amendments to this bill on page 3 by providing that paragraphs 1, 2, and 3 should be put under the 25 per cent rule. The objection to the bill which the Senator from Ohio so strongly feels is that under paragraph 1 there might be a loan to a single individual, secured by these securities, up to the full capital or even beyond the full capital, without any limitation at all.

Mr. POMERENE. The only limitation would be the deposits of the bank.

Mr. OWEN. They would not be limited by that, as far as that is concerned.

Mr. POMERENE. No; that is true, if they could go out and borrow it and reloan it.

Mr. OWEN. The purpose of the bill can be accomplished with these limitations in it, I am sure, without any serious difficulty.

Mr. HARRISON. If the Senator from Oklahoma and the Senator from Ohio feel that way about it, it does not appear to me to be very difficult for us to put in an amendment to meet that and let the bill go through.

Mr. POMERENE. I shall object for the time being, but I will aid the Senator in getting it up this afternoon, if that can be done.

Mr. HARRISON. While the Senator from Ohio is on his feet, may I ask the Senator from New Jersey whether it would be agreeable to him this afternoon some time temporarily to lay aside the bill that is now the unfinished business, so that we may take up this little amendment to the Federal reserve act, which I am sure, from what the Senator from Ohio says, and from other expressions I have heard, would not take more than a very few minutes?

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I trust I may be able to meet the suggestion of the Senator from Mississippi. It depends to a great extent upon the progress of the bill for which I am sponsor. I hope we may be able to dispose of it this afternoon. It will depend entirely, I might say, on the situation this afternoon after we commence to discuss the bill. I will certainly do everything possible to try to meet the desire of the Senator from Mississippi.

Mr. POMERENE. I do not want to allow one observation to pass unheeded. My good friend the Senator from Mississippi has referred to this as a "little amendment," but it is a mighty amendment. It enables the borrower under those circumstances to get the entire deposits of the bank without any limitation at all.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

EDWARD W. WHITAKER.

The bill (S. 861) for the relief of Edward W. Whitaker was announced as next in order.

Mr. OWEN. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be passed over.

THE DIXIE HIGHWAY.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 79) exempting the Dixie Highway from the prohibition contained in the act approved July 11, 1919, was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that go over.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

LANDS FOR MILITARY PURPOSES.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 83) to permit the payment for certain lands where requisition of the title thereto was duly served and possession taken thereunder or where a binding agreement was entered into followed by the taking possession thereof and erection of improvements thereon prior to July 11, 1919, was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution was reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments, on page 2, line 6, after the word "thereunder," to insert "and substantial buildings erected thereon"; and in line 9, after the word "and," to strike out "erections" and insert "erection"; and in the same line, after the word "of," to strike out "improvements" and insert "substantial buildings," so as to make the joint resolution read:

Whereas it is provided by the act of Congress approved July 11, 1919 (Public No. 7, H. R. 5227):

"That no part of any of the appropriations made herein nor any of the unexpended balances of appropriations heretofore made for the support and maintenance of the Army or the Military Establishment shall be expended for the purchase of real estate or for the construction of Army camps or cantonments except in such cases at National Army or National Guard camps or cantonments which were in use prior to November 11, 1918, where it has been or may be found more economical to the Government for the purpose of salvaging such camps or cantonments to buy real estate than to continue to pay rentals or claims for damages thereon, and except where industrial plants have been constructed or taken over by the Government for war purposes and the purchase of land is necessary in order to protect the interest of the Government."

And Whereas doubt exists as to the proper interpretation of said provision and the intention of Congress as expressed in said provision:

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That the foregoing provision of said act shall not be construed to prevent payment from said unexpended balances for lands where requisition of the title thereto was duly served and possession taken thereunder and substantial buildings erected thereon, or where a binding agreement for the purchase of lands was followed by the taking of possession thereof, and erection of substantial buildings thereon, prior to the approval of said act.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

Amend the title by striking out the first word of the second line, "title," and inserting the word "title," so that the title will read:

"To permit the payment for certain lands where requisition of the title thereto was duly served and possession taken thereunder, or where a binding agreement was entered into, followed by the taking possession thereof and erection of improvements thereon, prior to July 11, 1919."

PANAMA CANAL ZONE.

The bill (S. 1273) to prohibit intoxicating liquors and prostitution within the canal zone, and for other purposes, was announced as next in order.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I ask that that may go over. It was incorporated in the prohibition-enforcement act which passed the Senate the other day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will go over.

TRAINING IN AERONAUTIC ENGINEERING.

The bill (S. 2733) to provide for the training of officers of the Army in aeronautic engineering and the issue of equipment and materials therefor was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, on page 2, line 1, after the word "appropriated," to strike out "and he is authorized to furnish to institutions to which officers are so detailed such equipment and material belonging to the War Department for use in connection with courses in aeronautic engineering as he may deem advisable, subject to such rules for use, compensation for use, accounting, report, and return as he may prescribe," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, authorized to detail such officers of the Army as he may select, not exceeding 25 at any one time, to attend and pursue courses of aeronautic engineering or associate study at such schools, colleges, and universities as he may select.

SEC. 2. The Secretary of War is authorized to pay tuition for the officers so detailed and to provide them with necessary textbooks and technical supplies from any moneys available for the Air Service of the Army not otherwise specifically appropriated.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to provide for the training of officers of the Army in aeronautic engineering."

CIVILIAN PASSENGERS ON ARMY TRANSPORTS.

The bill (S. 2734) to authorize the transportation of civilians across the Atlantic Ocean upon Army transports under such rules and regulations and at such rates as the Secretary of War may prescribe was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, on page 3, line 24, after the word "Treasury," to strike out "to be credited to the appropriation from which the expenses of operating such transports are paid" and to insert in lieu thereof "as miscellaneous receipts," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized to provide for and to permit the carriage of passengers and their personal baggage, for hire, upon United States transports crossing the Atlantic Ocean between such ports of the United States and Europe as said transports shall use in due course of their employment as such, as he shall designate, under such rules and regulations and at such rates as he shall prescribe: *Provided*, That such transportation of passengers shall be carried on in such a manner as to in no way interfere with the transportation of Government troops or officers or of persons now entitled to carriage on such transports or with the service for which they are maintained and operated.

SEC. 2. That before any such civilian passengers are carried the Secretary of War shall establish a schedule of rates therefor, which shall be adequate for the service rendered and the accommodations afforded, but shall not be less than the rates charged by commercial passenger vessels sailing between the same ports for like service and accommodations.

SEC. 3. That such Army transports shall continue to be maintained and operated solely for the purposes heretofore permitted by law, and shall not be operated, nor shall sailings or schedules therefor be arranged, for any other purpose by virtue of this act. Preferences in all accommodations aboard ship shall be given to troops and to officers in the service of the United States, and persons now or hereafter entitled by law to be carried on Army transports at Government expense, and to the families of such officers, troops, and persons, and no civilian passengers for hire shall be carried where the effect will be to impair the present service to, or to discommode troops, officers, or persons now entitled by law to be carried.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of War, or his authorized representative, may exclude from transportation upon said transports any person or classes of persons not now entitled by law to be carried thereon whom he shall designate. No alien will be accepted for transportation upon any transport sailing to any port of the United States until provision is first made by the proper immigration and inspection officials for examinations, inspections, detention, quarantine, and the performance of any other duty or function required to be performed before aliens are permitted to land in the United States in such a manner as to comply with the immigration and inspection laws.

SEC. 5. That no person shall be accepted for transportation to any port of the United States who is not or will not upon arrival be prima facie entitled to land in this country. Civilian passengers not now entitled by law to be carried on transports will be accepted only for those ports at which provision is or shall be made for proper immigration and customs inspections and the collection of such duties as may be imposed by law.

SEC. 6. That the proceeds arising from the carriage of such passengers shall be reported and accounted for as required by the accounting laws of the United States, and paid into the Treasury as "Miscellaneous receipts." No moneys will be expended for the purpose of making alterations in or fitting up any such transports for the purpose of carrying the civilian passengers herein provided for.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

PAY TO DEPENDENT RELATIVES OF DECEASED OFFICERS AND MEN.

The bill (S. 2497) to provide for the payment of six months' pay to the widow, children, or other designated dependent relative of any officer or enlisted man of the Regular Army whose death results from wounds or disease not the result of his own misconduct was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I wish to get a little light on this bill. What I gather from the reading of the bill is that it proposes to put into force the same practice that was in vogue by the War Department before the war-risk insurance act was passed. That act provides for the insurance of officers and men, and I can not see why this should be reenacted. I should like to have some member of the committee explain why.

Mr. SPENCER. Mr. President, a precisely similar bill was passed at the last session by the Senate and reported favorably from the Committee on Military Affairs of the House, but was lost.

Since 1908 the six months' gratuity—for it is nothing more than that, nor nothing less—has been granted to the family of every officer and man who died in the service, to provide for the immediate expenses of the funeral. That has been the rule since 1908. When the war-risk insurance act came into force it was so construed as to repeal that provision. The Secretary of War makes this recommendation that the gratuity to the Regular Army, to whom alone it is confined, ought to be continued. The committee felt with him that it was only fair that when an officer or man in the service dies six months' pay should be at once given to his family to provide for the immediate expenses incident to his death, and therefore recommended it.

Mr. SMOOT. That may be absolutely correct, but under the war-risk act, while the dependents may not receive the check immediately they do receive the compensation and remuneration from the Government. This is simply putting back an old practice of the War Department to give six months' pay to any officer's or enlisted man's family who may die while in the service. Of course, if the Senate wants to do that, well and good, but that is what the bill amounts to.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION—PEACE TREATY.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege. It is very well known that I have participated to a very limited extent in the discussion of the various matters that have come before the Senate during the present session. I have not taken any part whatsoever in the discussions growing out of the treaty and the league of nations covenant. My only communications with reference to the latter subject have been expressed in private conference with my colleagues on both sides of the Chamber. I am not aware of having expressed my views with reference to the treaty with anything like fullness to any representative of the press, except one from my own State.

On yesterday there appeared in the Washington Post quite a lengthy statement on the first page of that paper, written by one of the correspondents of the paper and published in large type, an article which purports to give my views and my position upon the league of nations with great fullness of detail.

It is not my purpose to enter into any discussion of my position in reference to the league of nations nor of the league itself at this time, nor to engage in any controversy with the author of the article, but simply to make a statement of my position which will show that the article misrepresented my position in every particular. I will, therefore, without going into detail, content myself with the following brief general statement with respect to this matter:

The statements contained in the Sunday's issue of the Washington Post relative to my position with respect to the treaty and league of nations covenant was unauthorized and flagrantly misrepresents my attitude with respect to that great document.

I am in favor of and would gladly vote for the treaty and the league covenant as it was originally presented to the Senate by the President, without amendment or reservation. I agree with the President's interpretation of the controverted provisions of that document, and I do not believe it contains anything which would jeopardize American interests. I also believe it is of the highest importance to this country and the world that it should be ratified without further delay.

However, after a thorough study of the situation in the Senate, I am convinced that some concessions in the way of reservations will have to be made to secure its ratification, and, so believing, I have recently discussed with a number of my colleagues the advisability of reaching some compromise between those who favor the treaty without reservation and those who are in favor of it with conservative reservations of an interpretative character.

I am utterly opposed, however, to the reservations proposed by the Foreign Relations Committee. Some of these reservations are, in substance and essence, amendments which would radically change the scope and character of the instrument, emasculating some of the main provisions of the league, and which would call for reconsideration by the peace conference.

PAY TO DEPENDENT RELATIONS OF DECEASED OFFICERS AND MEN.

The SECRETARY. The next business on the calendar is Senate joint resolution 69—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understood the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] to object to the bill preceding the joint resolution?

Mr. SMOOT. I did not object. I simply wanted to make a statement with reference to it, and then let the Senate take such action as it might see fit.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I object to the present consideration of the bill, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will go over.

CONDITIONS IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 69) appointing a commission to report on conditions in the Virgin Islands was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The joint resolution had been reported from the Committee on Pacific Islands and Porto Rico with an amendment, in line 10, page 2, to strike out "\$3,000" and insert "\$2,500," so as to read:

Whereas the United States acquired from Denmark the islands of St. Thomas, St. Croix, and St. Johns, commonly known as the Virgin Islands; and
Whereas there is but little information as to the needs of said islands on the part of the American Congress; and
Whereas the United States Government is charged with the solemn duty to establish a stable government in said islands and to do all that it possibly can for the people thereof: Therefore be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That a joint commission, to consist of three Members of the Senate and three Members of the House, to be appointed by the Vice President of the United States and the Speaker of the House, respectively, is hereby created to visit the said Virgin Islands and to report fully to Congress as to whether or not the present plan of government of said islands is conducive to their welfare; what, if anything, Congress should do to stimulate industry and agriculture in said islands, and anything else with relation thereto that may be of aid to the American Congress in dealing with the problem of the government and advancement of the people of said islands. There is hereby appropriated the sum of \$2,500 to be used only for the expenses of the members of said commission in visiting the said islands. Said commission shall file its report before the 1st day of January, 1920, and said commission shall end on said date.

The amendment was agreed to.

The joint resolution was reported to the Senate as amended, and the amendment was concurred in.

The joint resolution was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

The preamble was agreed to.

PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO THE CONSTITUTION.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 41) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Let that go over, Mr. President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The joint resolution will be passed over.

AMENDMENT OF NATIONAL SECURITY AND DEFENSE ACT.

The bill (H. R. 8624) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense by encouraging the production, conserving the supply, and controlling the distribution of food products and fuel," approved August 10, 1917, was announced as next in order.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I understood the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA], to say that he desired to insist upon the consideration of that bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I will say to the Senator from Colorado that I asked unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill this morning.

Mr. THOMAS. I assumed from that that when it was reached upon the calendar, as it has now been reached, the Senator would press for the consideration of the bill. There is one amendment reported to the bill upon which I desire to submit some observations. I do not think it would be a very wise provision to insert in the proposed statute. I do not want to object to the consideration of the bill if the Senator from North Dakota really thinks it important that it should be disposed of this morning, but I regard the amendment on page 4 of the bill as one of very great importance and one which should not be voted upon without a full understanding of its terms and operation.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I object to the consideration of the bill until we get through with the calendar.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of Montana in the chair). The bill goes over on objection.

EDWARD JOHNSON.

The bill (S. 2469) for the relief of Edward Johnson was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with an amendment, on page 1, line 10, after the date "May, 1863," to insert:

Provided, That no pay, bounty, or other emolument shall become due or payable by virtue of the passage of this act.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That in the administration of any laws conferring rights, privileges, and benefits upon honorably discharged soldiers, Edward Johnson, who was a musician in Company H, Fifty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, shall hereafter be held and considered to have been discharged honorably from the military service of the United States as a musician of said company and regiment on the 12th day of May, 1863: *Provided*, That no pay, bounty, or other emolument shall become due or payable by virtue of the passage of this act.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

SALARIES OF LOUISIANA MARSHAL AND DISTRICT ATTORNEYS.

The bill (S. 597) providing for an increase of salary for the United States marshal and district attorney for the western district and for the United States district attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on the Judiciary with an amendment, on page 1, line 6, after the words

"rate of," to strike out "\$4,000" and to insert "\$3,500," and in line 8, after the words "rate of," to strike out "\$5,000" and to insert "\$4,500," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That from and after the passage of this act the salary of the United States marshal and the salary of the United States district attorney for the western district of Louisiana shall each be at the rate of \$3,500 per year, and the salary of the United States district attorney for the eastern district of Louisiana shall be at the rate of \$4,500 per year.

The amendment was agreed to.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

YORK COUNTY SAVINGS BANK, OF BIDDEFORD, ME.

The bill (S. 2811) for the relief of the York County Savings Bank, of Biddeford, Me., was considered as in Committee of the Whole. The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to redeem certificate of indebtedness of the United States of America No. 13867, denomination of \$5,000, of the issue dated August 6, 1918, and maturing December 5, 1918, with interest at the rate of 4 1/2 per cent from August 6, 1918, to December 5, 1918, in favor of the York County Savings Bank, of Biddeford, Me., without presentation of the certificate, the said certificate of indebtedness having been lost or destroyed: *Provided*, That the said York County Savings Bank, of Biddeford, Me., shall first file in the Treasury Department of the United States a bond in the penal sum of double the amount of the principal and interest of said certificate of indebtedness of the United States of America in such form and with such sureties as may be acceptable to the Secretary of the Treasury to indemnify and save harmless the United States from any loss on account of the lost or destroyed certificate of indebtedness hereinbefore described.

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

The bill (S. 2875) to amend section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1919, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 7 of the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the legislative, executive, and judicial expenses of the Government for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and for other purposes," approved March 1, 1919, be, and the same is hereby, amended by adding at the end of the first paragraph thereof, to follow the words "adjusting the pay of such employees," the following additional proviso: "*Provided further*, That no employee of the Federal Government shall, for service in the Philippine Islands, receive additional compensation under this section at a rate which is more than 20 per cent of the rate of the total annual compensation received by such employee."

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

LIBRARY INFORMATION SERVICE IN BUREAU OF EDUCATION.

The bill (S. 2457) to provide for a library information service in the Bureau of Education was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Let that bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being made, the bill will go over.

ADVANCEMENT OF RETIRED NONCOMMISSIONED OFFICERS AND ENLISTED MEN.

The bill (S. 131) to provide that petty officers, noncommissioned officers, and enlisted men of the United States Navy and Marine Corps on the retired list who had creditable Civil War service shall receive the rank or rating and the pay of the next higher enlisted grade was announced as next in order.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I should like to have some information with regard to what the effect of this measure will be; what it is going to cost the Government of the United States; and what has been the practice in the past. However, I do not see at this moment any member of the committee present, and therefore will ask that the bill go over.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection being made, the bill goes over.

LIFE-SAVING SERVICE PENSIONS.

The bill (S. 1473) granting pensions to certain members of the former Life-Saving Service was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The bill had been reported from the Committee on Commerce with amendments, on page 1, line 7, after the word "been," to strike out "or is entitled to be"; in line 11, after the word "and," to strike out "whose" and insert "when said"; and on page 2, after line 13, to insert a new section, as follows:

SEC. 2. That no agent, attorney, or other person engaged in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting any claim under the provisions of this act shall, directly or indirectly, contract for, demand, receive, or retain for such services in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting such claim a sum greater than \$10, which sum shall be payable only on the order of

the Commissioner of Pensions; and any person who shall violate any of the provisions of this section, or shall wrongfully withhold from the pensioner or claimant the whole or any part of a pension or claim allowed or due such pensioner or claimant under this act, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall, for each and every offense, be fined not exceeding \$500, or be imprisoned not exceeding one year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That any person who served in the former Life-Saving Service of the United States as a keeper or surfman, and who, on account of disability due to a wound or injury received or disease contracted in said Life-Saving Service in line of duty, has been carried on the pay rolls for a period of one year or more under the provisions of section 7 of the act approved May 4, 1882, and who ceased to be a member of said service on account of such disability, and when said disabilities still continue, shall, upon making due proof of such facts according to such rules and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, be placed on the pension roll of the United States and be entitled to receive a pension: *Provided*, That the rate, commencement, and duration of such pension shall be governed by the provisions and limitations of the general pension laws, and for the purpose of this act the rank of a surfman and keeper shall be held to be equivalent to that of a seaman and warrant officer of the United States Navy, respectively: *Provided further*, That no person shall receive a pension under any other law at the same time or for the same period that he is receiving a pension under the provisions of this act.

SEC. 2. That no agent, attorney, or other person engaged in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting any claim under the provisions of this act shall, directly or indirectly, contract for, demand, receive, or retain for such services in preparing, presenting, or prosecuting such claim a sum greater than \$10, which sum shall be payable only on the order of the Commissioner of Pensions; and any person who shall violate any of the provisions of this section, or shall wrongfully withhold from the pensioner or claimant the whole or any part of a pension or claim allowed or due such pensioner or claimant under this act, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall, for each and every offense, be fined not exceeding \$500, or be imprisoned not exceeding one year, or both, in the discretion of the court.

The amendments were agreed to.

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

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

EDWARD SIGERFOOS.

The bill (S. 2807) to correct the military record of Edward Sigerfoos was considered as in Committee of the Whole.

The Secretary read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Edward Sigerfoos, deceased, who was a colonel in the United States Army, and who was nominated by the President for appointment as brigadier general October 4, 1918, said nomination being confirmed by the Senate October 10, 1918, after the death of said Edward Sigerfoos, which occurred after his nomination, October 7, 1918, as the result of wounds received in line of duty, shall hereafter be held and considered to have become a brigadier general of the United States Army in the service of the United States, and to have held that office until the date of his death; and the President is hereby authorized to issue a commission as brigadier general of the United States Army in the name of Edward Sigerfoos, with rank to date from October 4, 1918.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, I wish to say a word in behalf of this measure. Col. Edward Sigerfoos was one of the ablest and best of the many splendid officers who went to Europe to fight for their country's cause.

On September 29 he was sent to the battle line and, while in the line of duty, was struck by a shell. On October 4 the President sent his nomination to the United States Senate for the commission of brigadier general. On October 7 Col. Sigerfoos died without any knowledge of the promotion that had been accorded to him by the President. On October 10, three days after his death, the Senate of the United States confirmed his nomination. On October 20, I believe, The Adjutant General, who had therefore sent the commission to Mrs. Sigerfoos, first learned of the death of Col. Sigerfoos. He felt that under the law he was obliged to recall the commission and wrote to Mrs. Sigerfoos asking her to return it, which she did. Now, this gallant officer's widow, mother of his fatherless children, desires this commission not only as a recognition of the bravery and the splendid services of her husband, but as a heritage for herself and her children. I am sure there can be no objection to the passage of the bill, and thereby give to the widow the object of her heart's desire.

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

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, the report on the bill just passed was presented by the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SPENCER] by direction of the Committee on Military Affairs. I ask that it may be incorporated in the Record without reading.

There being no objection, the matter referred to was ordered to be printed in the Record, as follows:

Mr. SPENCER, from the Committee on Military Affairs, submitted the following report:

The Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill (S. 2807) to correct the military record of Edward Sigerfoos, having had the same under consideration, report favorably thereon with the recommendation that the bill do pass without amendment.

This is an unusual case; in fact, there has been only one similar, so far as could be ascertained from the records of the War Department. It appears that Col. Sigerfoos was commissioned, after the outbreak of the war with Germany, as a temporary colonel in the Regular Army and later commissioned a colonel in the National Army. On October 4, 1918, he was nominated by the President to be a brigadier general, and was confirmed by the Senate on October 10. His commission was signed by the President and sent to his wife, who received it on October 21. Prior to his nomination for advanced rank, he was sent from the School of the Line, of which he had been commandant, to take command of the Fifty-sixth Brigade, Twenty-eighth Division, in the Argonne. While going to the front to assume command of the brigade, he was struck by a shell and, on October 7, died from his wounds. It will be noted that his death occurred between the time he was nominated and the date of his confirmation by the Senate. At the request of The Adjutant General, after the news of Col. Sigerfoos's death had been received by the War Department, his widow returned the commission. It is the purpose of this bill to permit the commission to be issued to Mrs. Sigerfoos, that she may preserve it.

In the Sixty-third Congress a law having a similar object was enacted, permitting the issuance of a commission, after the death of the officer, in the name of Maj. John T. Haines.

Your committee believes that, in view of the fact that Col. Sigerfoos was nominated and confirmed and that he received his fatal injuries while on his way to assume a command usually given to a brigadier general, that the bill should pass.

MILITARY MERIT BADGE.

The bill (S. 2780) authorizing a military merit badge and additional pay based thereon, was considered as in Committee of the Whole and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of War, under such regulations as he may prescribe, be, and he is hereby, authorized to award, but not in the name of Congress, a military merit badge, of appropriate design, to any enlisted man who shall hereafter complete a full three years' enlistment period of three years of continuous service with a record of exemplary behavior, good appearance, efficiency, fidelity during the whole of such period; and a suitable bar or other device for each subsequent three years' enlistment period or three years of continuous service similarly completed. That each enlisted man of the Army, to whom a military merit badge, bar, or device shall be awarded shall be entitled to additional pay for the first such award at the rate of \$1 per month, and for each additional award at the rate of 50 cents per month from the date of each such award, but the right to such additional pay and the right to wear the badge herein authorized may be withdrawn or suspended, under such regulations as the Secretary of War may prescribe, for misconduct on the part of any enlisted man to whom the badge shall have been awarded. That the Secretary of War be, and he hereby is, authorized to expend from the appropriation for contingent expenses of his department from time to time such sums as may be necessary to defray the cost of such badges, bars, or other devices.

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

THE PHILIPPINE SCOUTS.

The bill (S. 2809) relating to compensation and war-risk insurance for members of the Philippine Scouts under the provisions of an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended, was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the compensation for death or disability hereafter paid to members of the Philippine Scouts who are natives of the Philippine Islands, under the provisions of an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended, shall be one-half of the corresponding amount specified in that act.

SEC. 2. That insurance under the provisions of an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended, may be applied for by members of the Philippine Scouts within 120 days after enlistment or after entrance into or employment in the active service and before discharge or resignation, or after the date of approval of this act: *Provided*, That members of the Philippine Scouts who were in active service between October 12, 1917, and November 11, 1918, may apply for such insurance within 120 days from the date of approval of this act, but any person applying for insurance under this proviso whose period of service in which he was serving between the said dates has terminated, shall not be entitled thereto unless the termination of such service was under honorable conditions: *Provided further*, That those members of the Philippine Scouts who applied for insurance under the terms of an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, as amended, within 120 days from October 12, 1917, or within 120 days from the date of their entry into or employment in active service and prior to resignation or discharge, shall be held to have been covered by insurance in force as applied for by them from the date of their applications, and they shall have the right of reinstatement of such insurance under such regulations as the Bureau of War Risk Insurance may prescribe. Members of the Philippine Scouts affected by this proviso shall not be allowed to apply for new insurance under the authority of this act, but shall be allowed to increase any insurance previously applied for to the maximum allowed by law within 120 days from the date of approval of this act.

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

BILL PASSED OVER.

The bill (S. 2923) to provide funds for the care and maintenance of the graves on foreign soil of members of the military forces of the United States was announced as next in order.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I do not see the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH], the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee, here, and I want to inquire about this bill. I therefore object to its consideration at present.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The bill will be passed over.

FREDERICK W. COBB.

The bill (S. 412) to transfer Frederick W. Cobb from the list of chief machinists, United States Navy, to the list of chief pay clerks, United States Navy, temporary lieutenant, Pay Corps, United States Navy, was considered as in Committee of the Whole. It authorizes the President to appoint Frederick W. Cobb, now a chief machinist, United States Navy, temporary lieutenant, United States Navy, to be a chief pay clerk, United States Navy, temporary lieutenant, Pay Corps, United States Navy, provided that he shall be placed at the foot of the list of chief pay clerks as it exists on the date of the passage of the act, and provided further that he shall receive the same pay as a chief pay clerk of like rank and length of commissioned service as though his commissioned service had been rendered in the grade of chief pay clerk.

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER. That concludes the bills on the calendar.

EXTRACTS FROM THE PRESIDENT'S SPEECHES.

Mr. McCORMICK. I ask unanimous consent that certain remarks of the President bearing on the pending treaty be incorporated in the RECORD.

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

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] this morning offered the addresses of the President and had them inserted in the RECORD.

Mr. McCORMICK. These do not all express views identical with those recently uttered by the President.

Mr. JONES of Washington. These are former addresses?

Mr. McCORMICK. They cover a considerable period.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Very well. It will be very interesting to see how the former remarks coincide with the recent ones.

The extracts from the President's utterances are as follows: "The certain prospect of the success of the Republican Party is that we shall be drawn in one form or other into the embroilments of the European war." (Speech at Shadow Lawn, Sept. 30, 1916.)

"Senator McCUMBER. Would our moral conviction of the unrighteousness of the German war have brought us into this war if Germany had not committed any acts against us without the league of nations, as we had no league of nations at that time?"

"The PRESIDENT. I hope it would eventually, Senator, as things developed.

"Senator McCUMBER. Do you think that if Germany had committed no act of war or no act of injustice against our citizens that we would have gotten into this war?"

"The PRESIDENT. I do think so.

"Senator McCUMBER. You think we would have gotten in anyway?"

"The PRESIDENT. I do." (Meeting of the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate with the President, Aug. 19, 1919.)

"In all the belligerent countries men have drawn together to accomplish a successful prosecution of the war. Is it not a more desirable thing that all Americans should put partisan prepossessions aside and draw together for the successful prosecution of peace? I covet that distinction for America." (Address to the Railways Business Association in New York City, Jan. 27, 1916.)

NEUTRALITY AND PEACE.

"The United States must be neutral in fact as well as in name during these days that are to try men's souls. We must be impartial in thought as well as in action, must put a curb upon our sentiments as well as upon every transaction that might be construed as a preference of one party to the struggle before another." (Appeal to the American people for neutrality, Aug. 19, 1914.)

"The great war that broke so suddenly upon the world two years ago, and which has swept within its flame so great a part of the civilized world, has affected us very profoundly, and we are not only at liberty, it is perhaps our duty, to speak very frankly of it and of the great interests of civilization which it affects.

"With its causes and its objects we are not concerned. The obscure fountains from which its stupendous flood has burst

forth we are not interested to search for or explore." (Address before the League to Enforce Peace, Washington, May 27, 1916.)

"There are actually men in America who are preaching war, who are preaching the duty of the United States to do what it never would before, seek entanglements in the controversies which have arisen on the other side of the water—abandon its habitual and traditional policy and deliberately engage in the conflict which is now engulfing the rest of the world. I do not know what the standard of citizenship of these gentlemen may be. I only know that I for one can not subscribe to those standards. * * *

"Every nation now engaged in the titanic struggle on the other side of the water believes, with intensity of conviction that can not be exaggerated, that it is fighting for its rights, and in most instances that it is fighting for its life; and we must not be too critical of the men who lead those nations." (Speech at Des Moines, Feb. 1, 1916.)

"It would tear the heartstrings of America to be at war with any of the great nations of the world. We can show our friendship for the world and our devotion to the principles of humanity better and more effectively by keeping out of this struggle than by getting into it." (Speech at Kansas City, Feb. 2, 1916.)

"You are right in assuming that I shall do everything in my power to keep the United States out of war. * * * I do not doubt that I shall continue to succeed." (Letter to Senator Stone, then chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, Feb. 24, 1916.)

"I can assure you that nothing is nearer my heart than keeping this country out of war." (Address to a delegation of Scandinavians in the White House, Mar. 13, 1916.)

"The European war * * * is a competition of foreign standards, of national traditions, and of national politics—political systems." (Address at Charlotte, N. C., May 20, 1916.)

"We have been neutral, not only because it was the fixed and traditional policy of the United States to stand aloof from the politics of Europe * * * but because it was manifestly our duty to prevent, if it were possible, the extension of the fires of hate and desolation kindled by that terrible conflict." (Speech accepting renomination, Sept. 2, 1916.)

"The American people do not desire it (war), and our desire is not different from theirs. I am not proposing or contemplating war or any steps that need led to it. No course of my choosing or of theirs will lead to war. War can come only by the willful acts and aggressions of others." (Address to Congress, Feb. 26, 1917.)

"There is no precedent in American history for any action which might mean that America is seeking to connect herself with the controversies on the other side of the water. Men who seek to provoke such action have forgotten the traditions of the United States, but it behooves those you have intrusted with office to remember the traditions of the United States." (Speech at Milwaukee, Jan. 31, 1916.)

"I believe that we can serve the nations at war better by remaining at peace and holding off from this contest than we could possibly serve them in any other way. Your interest, your sympathy, your affection may be engaged on one side or the other, but it is your duty to stand off and not let this Nation be drawn into the war." (Speech at Chicago, Jan. 31, 1916.)

"Recalling the humane and enlightened attitude hitherto assumed by the Imperial German Government in matters of international right, and particularly with regard to the freedom of the seas; having learned to recognize the German views and the German influence in the field of international obligation as always upon the side of justice and humanity, the Government of the United States was loth to believe, it can not now bring itself to believe, that these acts, so absolutely contrary to the rules, the practices, and the spirit of modern warfare, could have the countenance or sanction of that great Government. * * *

"Long acquainted as this Government has been with the character of the Imperial German Government and with the high principles of equity by which they have in the past been actuated and guided, the Government of the United States can not believe that the commanders of the vessels which committed these acts of lawlessness did so except under a misapprehension of the orders issued by the Imperial German naval authorities." (First *Lusitania* note, May 10, 1915.)

"The example of America must be a special example. The example of America must be the example of peace, not merely because it will not fight, but of peace because peace is the healing and the elevating influence of the world and strife is not. There is such a thing as a man being too proud to fight." (Address to newly naturalized American citizens, at Philadelphia, May 10, 1915.)

"America stands apart in its ideals; it ought not to allow itself to be drawn, as far as its heart is concerned, into anybody's quarrel." (Address to the Daughters of the American Revolution, Oct. 11, 1915.)

"During these days of terrible war, it would seem that every man who was truly an American would instinctively make it his duty and his pride to keep the scales of judgment even and prove himself a partisan of no nation but his own. But there are some men among us, calling themselves Americans, who have so far forgotten themselves and their honor as citizens as to put their passionate sympathy with one or the other side in the great European conflict above their regard for the peace of the United States." (Annual message to Congress, Dec. 7, 1915.)

APPEAL FOR DEMOCRATIC MAJORITY.

"If you have approved of my leadership and wish me to continue to be your unembarrassed spokesman at home and abroad, I earnestly beg that you will express yourself unmistakably to that effect by returning a Democratic majority in both the Senate and the House of Representatives." (Statement to the voters of the country, Oct. 24, 1918.)

"An acute English historical scholar has said that 'the Americans of the United States are a Nation because they once obeyed a king'; we shall remain a Nation only by obeying leaders." (Essay on the character of democracy in the United States appearing in *The Old Master and Other Essays*.)

"His (the President's) is the only national voice in affairs. Let him once win the admiration and confidence of the country, and no other single force can withstand him, no combination of forces will easily overpower him. * * * His office is anything he has the sagacity and force to make it. * * * The personal force of the President is perfectly constitutional to any extent to which he chooses to exercise it. * * * The President can never again be the mere domestic figure he has been throughout so large a part of our history." (From Chapter III of *Constitutional Government in the United States*, by Woodrow Wilson.)

"His (the President's) only power of compelling compliance on the part of the Senate lies in his initiative in negotiation, which affords him a chance to get the country into such scrapes, so pledged in the view of the world to certain courses of action, that the Senate hesitates to bring about the appearance of dishonor which would follow its refusal to ratify the rash promises or to support the indiscreet threats of the Department of State.

"The machinery of consultation between the Senate and the President is, of course, the committee machinery. The Senate sends treaties to its standing Committee on Foreign Relations, which ponders the President's messages accompanying the treaties and sets itself to understand the situation in the light of all the information available. * * * There seems to have been at one time a tendency toward a better practice. In 1813 the Senate sought to revive the early custom, in accordance with which the President delivered his messages in person, by requesting the attendance of the President to consult upon foreign affairs; but Mr. Madison declined." (From Chapter IV of *Congressional Government*, by Woodrow Wilson.)

"One of the greatest of the President's powers I have not yet spoken of at all—his control, which is very absolute, of the foreign relations of the Nation. The initiative in foreign affairs, which the President possesses without any restriction whatever, is virtually the power to control them absolutely. The President can not conclude a treaty with a foreign power without the consent of the Senate, but he may guide every step of diplomacy, and to guide diplomacy is to determine what treaties must be made if the faith and prestige of the Government are to be maintained. He need disclose no step of negotiation until it is complete, and when in any critical matter it is completed the Government is virtually committed. Whatever its disinclination, the Senate may feel itself committed also." (Woodrow Wilson's "Constitutional Government in the United States," Chapter III, 1917.)

"But there is another course which the President may follow, and which one or two Presidents of unusual political sagacity have followed, with the satisfactory results that were to have been expected. He may himself be less stiff and offish, may himself act in the true spirit of the Constitution and establish intimate relations of confidence with the Senate on his own initiative, not carrying his plans to completion and then laying them in final form before the Senate to be accepted or rejected, but keeping himself in confidential communication with the leaders of the Senate while his plans are in course, when their advice will be of service to him and his information of the greatest service to them, in order that there may be veritable counsel and a real accommodation of views instead of a final challenge and contest.

The policy which has made rivals of the President and Senate has shown itself in the President as often as in the Senate, and if the Constitution did intend that the Senate should in such matters be an executive council it is not only the privilege of the President to treat it as such, it is also his best policy and his plain duty." (Woodrow Wilson's "Constitutional Government in the United States," Chapter V, 1917.)

"I have sought this opportunity to address you because I thought that I owed it to you, as the council associated with me in the final determination of our international obligations, to disclose to you without reserve the thought and purpose that have been taking form in my mind in regard to the duty of our Government in the days to come, when it will be necessary to lay afresh and upon a new plan the foundations of peace among the nations." (Address to the Senate, Jan. 22, 1917.)

"May I not hope, gentlemen of the Congress, that in the delicate tasks I shall have to perform on the other side of the sea, in my efforts truly and faithfully to interpret the principles and purposes of the country we love, I may have the encouragement and the added strength of your united support? I am the servant of the Nation. I can have no private thought or purpose of my own in performing such an errand. I shall count upon your friendly countenance and encouragement. I shall not be inaccessible. The cables and the wireless will render me available for any counsel or service you may desire of me, and I shall be happy in the thought that I am constantly in touch with the weighty matters of domestic policy with which we shall have to deal." (Address to Congress, Dec. 2, 1918.)

"I am heartily glad that you have demanded an investigation with regard to the possession of texts of the treaty by unauthorized persons. I have felt that it was highly undesirable officially to communicate the text of a document which is still in negotiation and subject to change.

"Anyone who has possession of the official English text has what he is clearly not entitled to have or to communicate. I have felt in honor bound to act in the same spirit and in the same way as the representatives of the other great powers in this matter, and am confident my countrymen will not expect me to break faith with them." (Cablegram to Senator HITCHCOCK, June 9, 1919.)

"You know, there is temptation in loneliness and secrecy. Haven't you experienced it? I have. We are never so proper in our conduct as when everybody can look and see exactly what we are doing. If you are off in some distant part of the world and suppose that nobody who lives within a mile of your home is anywhere around, there are times when you adjourn your ordinary standards. You say to yourself: 'Well, I'll have a fling this time; nobody will know anything about it.' * * * The most dangerous thing in the world is to get off where nobody knows you." (From *The New Freedom*, by Woodrow Wilson, 1913, Chapter VI.)

"I say the heart of the country is in this war because it would not have gone into it if its heart had not been prepared for it. It would not have gone into it if it had not first believed that here was an opportunity to express the character of the United States. We have gone in with no special grievance of our own, because we have always said that we were the friends and servants of mankind." (Address at dedication of Red Cross Building, Washington, May 12, 1917.)

"It is plain enough how we were forced into the war. The extraordinary insults and aggressions of the Imperial German Government left us no self-respecting choice but to take up arms in defense of our rights as a free people and of our honor as a sovereign Government. The military masters of Germany denied us the right to be neutral—the war was begun by the military masters of Germany, who proved to be also the masters of Austria-Hungary. These men have never regarded nations as peoples—men, women, and children of like blood and frame as themselves—for whom governments existed and in whom governments had their life. They have regarded them merely as serviceable organizations which they could by force or intrigue bend or corrupt to their own purpose. They have regarded the smaller States, in particular, and the peoples who could be overwhelmed by force, as their natural tools and instruments of domination." (Flag Day address at Washington, June 14, 1917.)

"This war had its roots in the disregard of rights of small nations." (Address to Congress, February 11, 1918.)

"What is the war for? At first it seemed hardly more than a war of defense against the military aggression of Germany. Belgium had been violated, France invaded, and Germany was afield again, as in 1870 and 1866, to work out her ambitions in Europe; and it was necessary to meet force with force." (Address to the citizens of the United States on Labor Day, September 2, 1918.)

"I believe that Belgium and her part in the war are in one sense the key of the whole struggle, because the violation of Belgium was the call to duty which aroused the nations." (Address to the Belgian Chamber of Deputies at Brussels, June 19, 1919.)

"The enemy committed many outrages in this war, gentlemen, but the initial outrage was the fundamental outrage of all. They, with an insolent indifference, violated the sacredness of treaties. They showed that they did not care for the independence of any nation, whether it had raised its hand against them or not; that they were ruthless in their determination to have their whim at their pleasure.

"Therefore, it was the violation of Belgium that awakened the world to their realization of the character of the struggle." (Address to the Belgian Chamber of Deputies at Brussels, June 19, 1919.)

"America did not at first see the full meaning of the war that has just ended. At first it looked like a natural raking out of the pent-up jealousies and rivalries of the complicated politics of Europe." (Address to American soldiers and sailors returning to the United States aboard the *George Washington*, July 4, 1919.)

MR. WILSON ON THE PEACE.
THE 14 POINTS.

"I. Open covenants of peace openly arrived at, after which there shall be no private international understandings of any kind, but diplomacy shall proceed always frankly and in the public view.

"II. Absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas outside territorial waters alike in peace and in war, except as the seas may be closed in whole or in part by international action for the enforcement of international covenants.

"III. 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.

"IV. Adequate guaranties given and taken that national armaments will be reduced to the lowest point consistent with domestic safety.

"V. A free, open-minded, and absolutely impartial adjustment of all colonial claims, based upon a strict observance of the principle that in determining all such questions of sovereignty the interests of the populations concerned must have equal weight with the equitable claims of the Government whose title is to be determined.

"VI. The evacuation of all Russian territory and such a settlement of all questions affecting Russia as will secure the best and freest cooperation of the other nations of the world in obtaining for her an unhampered and unembarrassed opportunity for the independent determination of her own political development and national policy and assure her of a sincere welcome into the society of free nations under institutions of her own choosing; and, more than a welcome, assistance also of every kind that she may need and may herself desire. The treatment accorded Russia by her sister nations in the months to come will be the acid test of their good will, of their comprehension of her needs as distinguished from their own interests, and of their intelligent and unselfish sympathy.

"VII. Belgium, the whole world will agree, must be evacuated and restored without any attempt to limit the sovereignty which she enjoys in common with all other free nations. No other single act will serve as this will serve to restore confidence among the nations in the laws which they have themselves set and determined for the government of their relations with one another. Without this healing act the whole structure and validity of international law is forever impaired.

"VIII. All French territory should be freed and the invaded portions restored, and the wrong done to France by Prussia in 1871 in the matter of Alsace-Lorraine, which has unsettled the peace of the world for nearly 50 years, should be righted in order that peace may once more be made secure in the interest of all.

"IX. A readjustment of the frontiers of Italy should be effected along clearly recognizable lines of nationality.

"X. The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.

"XI. Roumania, Serbia, and Montenegro should be evacuated; occupied territories restored; Serbia accorded free and secure access to the sea; and the relations of the several Balkan States to one another determined by friendly counsel along historically established lines of allegiance and nationality; and international guaranties of the political and economic independence and territorial integrity of the several Balkan States shall be entered into.

"XII. The Turkish portions of the present Ottoman Empire should be assured a secure sovereignty, but the other nationalities which are now under Turkish rule should be assured an undoubted security of life and an absolutely unmolested opportunity of autonomous development, and the Dardanelles should be permanently opened as a free passage to the ships and commerce of all nations under international guaranties.

"XIII. An independent Polish State should be erected which should include the territories inhabited by indisputably Polish populations, which should be assured a free and secure access to the sea, and whose political and economic independence and territorial integrity should be guaranteed by international covenant.

"XIV. A general association of nations must be formed under specific covenants for the purpose of affording mutual guaranties of political independence and territorial integrity to great and small States alike." (Address to Congress, Jan. 8, 1918.)

"There can be but one issue. The settlement must be final. There can be no compromise. No halfway decision would be tolerable. No halfway decision is conceivable. These are the ends for which the associated peoples of the world are fighting and which must be conceded them before there can be peace:

"I. The destruction of every arbitrary power anywhere that can separately, secretly, and of its single choice disturb the peace of the world; or, if it can not be presently destroyed, at the least its reduction to virtual impotence.

"II. The settlement of every question, whether of territory, of sovereignty, of economic arrangement, or of political relationship, upon the basis of the free acceptance of that settlement by the people immediately concerned, and not upon the basis of the material interest or advantage of any other nation or people which may desire a different settlement for the sake of its own exterior influence or mastery.

"III. The consent of all nations to be governed in their conduct toward each other by the same principles of honor and of respect for the common law of civilized society that govern the individual citizens of all modern States in their relations with one another; to the end that all promises and covenants may be sacredly observed, no private plots or conspiracies hatched, no selfish injuries wrought with impunity, and a mutual trust established upon the handsome foundation of a mutual respect for right.

"IV. The establishment of an organization of peace which shall make it certain that the combined power of free nations will check every invasion of right and serve to make peace and justice the more secure by affording a definite tribunal of opinion to which all must submit and by which every international readjustment that can not be amicably agreed upon by the peoples directly concerned shall be sanctioned.

"These great objects can be put into a single sentence. What we seek is the reign of law, based upon the consent of the governed and sustained by the organized opinion of mankind.

"These great ends can not be achieved by debating and seeking to reconcile and accommodate what statesmen may wish with their projects for balances of power and of national opportunity. They can be realized only by the determination of what the thinking peoples of the world desire." (Address at Mount Vernon, July 4, 1918.)

"These, then, are some of the particulars, and I state them with the greater confidence because I can state them authoritatively as representing this Government's interpretation of its own duty with regard to peace:

"First, the impartial justice meted out must involve no discrimination between those to whom we wish to be just and those to whom we do not wish to be just. It must be a justice that plays no favorites and knows no standard but the equal rights of the several peoples concerned;

"Second, no special or separate interest of any single nation or any group of nations can be made the basis of any part of the settlement which is not consistent with the common interest of all;

"Third, there can be no leagues or alliances or special covenants and understandings within the general and common family of the league of nations;

"Fourth, and more specifically, there can be no special, selfish economic combinations within the league and no employment of any form of economic boycott or exclusion except as the power of economic penalty by exclusion from the markets of the world may be vested in the league of nations itself as a means of discipline and control;

"Fifth, all international agreements and treaties of every kind must be made known in their entirety to the rest of the world." (Address at Metropolitan Opera House, September 27, 1918.)

"We accepted the issues of the war as facts, not as any group of men either here or elsewhere had defined them, and we can accept no outcome which does not squarely meet and settle them. Those issues are these:

"Shall the military power of any nation or group of nations be suffered to determine the fortunes of peoples over whom they have no right to rule except the right of force?

"Shall strong nations be free to wrong weak nations and make them subject to their purpose and interest?

"Shall peoples be ruled and dominated, even in their own internal affairs, by arbitrary and irresponsible force or by their own will and choice?

"Shall there be a common standard of right and privilege for all peoples and nations, or shall the strong do as they will and the weak suffer without redress?

"Shall the assertion of right be haphazard and by casual alliance or shall there be a common concert to oblige the observance of common rights?" (Address at Metropolitan Opera House, Sept. 27, 1918.)

"You do not love humanity if you seek to divide humanity into jealous camps. Humanity can be welded together only by love, by sympathy, by justice, not by jealousy and hatred." (Address to newly naturalized American at Philadelphia, May 10, 1915.)

"Repeated utterances of the leading statesmen of most of the great nations now engaged in war have made it plain that their thought has come to this, that the principle of public right must henceforth take precedence over the individual interests of particular nations, and that the nations of the world must in some way band themselves together to see that right prevails as against any sort of selfish aggression; that henceforth alliance must not be set up against alliance, understanding against understanding, but that there must be a common agreement for a common object, and that at the heart of that common object must lie the inviolable rights of peoples and of mankind. The nations of the world have become each other's neighbors. It is to their interest that they should understand each other, it is imperative that they should agree to cooperate in a common cause, and that they should so act that the guiding principle of that common cause shall be even-handed and impartial justice." (Address to the League to Enforce Peace, May 27, 1916.)

"I said the other evening * * * that small and weak States had as much right to their sovereignty and independence as large and strong States." (Address at Arlington, Memorial Day, May 30, 1916.)

"There had been growing up in Europe a mutual suspicion, an interchange of conjectures about what this Government and that Government was going to do, an interlacing of alliances and understandings, a complex web of intrigue and spying, that presently was sure to entangle the whole of the family of mankind on that side of the water in its meshes. Now, revive that after this war is over and sooner or later you will have just such another war." (Address at Cincinnati, Oct. 26, 1916.)

"The objects which the statesmen of the belligerents on both sides have in mind in this war are virtually the same, as stated in general terms to their own peoples and to the world. Each side desires to make the rights and privileges of weak peoples and small States as secure against aggression or denial in the future as the rights and privileges of the great and powerful States now at war. Each wishes itself to be made secure in the future, along with all other nations and peoples, against the recurrence of wars like this and against aggression or selfish interference of every kind. * * * Each deems it necessary to settle the issues of the present war upon terms that will certainly safeguard the independence, the territorial integrity, and the political and commercial freedom of the nations involved." (Note to the belligerent Governments, dated Dec. 18, 1916.)

"If the contest must continue to proceed toward undefined ends by slow attrition until the one group of belligerents or the other is exhausted; if millions after millions of human lives must continue to be offered up until on the one side or the other there are no more to offer; if resentments must be kindled that can never cool and despairs engendered from which there can be no recovery, hopes of peace and of the willing concert of free peoples will be rendered vain and idle." (Note to the belligerent Governments, Dec. 18, 1916.)

"They (the statesmen of the nations at war) imply, first of all, that it must be a peace without victory. It is not pleasant to say this. I beg that I may be permitted to put my own interpretation upon it and that it may be understood that no other interpretation was in my thought. I am seeking only to face realities and to face them without soft concealments. 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 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. The right state of mind, the right feeling between nations, is as necessary for a lasting peace as is the just settlement of vexed questions of territory or of racial and national allegiance.

"No peace can last, or ought to last, which does not recognize and accept the principle that Governments derive all their just powers from the consent of the governed, and that no right anywhere exists to hand peoples about from sovereignty to sovereignty as if they were property. * * * Any peace which does not recognize and accept this principle will inevitably be upset. It will not rest upon the affections or the convictions of mankind. The ferment of spirit of whole populations will fight subtly and constantly against it, and all the world will sympathize. The world can be at peace only if its life is stable, and there can be no stability where the will is in rebellion, where there is not tranquillity of spirit and a sense of justice, of freedom, and of right.

"And the question of limiting naval armaments opens the wider and perhaps more difficult question of the limitation of armies and of all programs of military preparation. Difficult and delicate as these questions are, they must be faced with the utmost candor and decided in a spirit of real accommodation if real peace is to come, with healing in its wings, and come to stay. Peace can not be had without concession and sacrifice. There can be no sense of safety and equality among the nations if great preponderating armaments are henceforth to continue here and there to be built up and maintained." (Address to the Senate, Jan. 22, 1917.)

"Every people should be left free to determine its own polity, its own way of development, unhindered, unthreatened, unafraid, the little along with the great and powerful." (Address to the Senate, Jan. 22, 1917.)

"We have no quarrel with the German people. We have no feeling toward them but one of sympathy and friendship. It was not upon their impulse that their Government acted in entering this war.

"Cunningly contrived plans of deception or aggression, carried, it may be, from generation to generation, can be worked out and kept from the light only within the privacy of courts or behind the carefully guarded confidences of a narrow and privileged class. They are happily impossible where public opinion commands and insists upon full information concerning all the nation's affairs. A steadfast concert for peace can never be maintained except by a partnership of democratic nations. No autocratic Government could be trusted to keep faith within it or observe its covenants. It must be a league of honor, a partnership of opinion. * * *

"We are glad, now that we see the facts with no veil of false pretense about them, to fight thus for the ultimate peace of the world and for the liberation of its peoples, the German peoples included, for the rights of nations great and small and the privilege of men everywhere to choose their way of life and of obedience. The world must be made safe for democracy. Its peace must be planted upon the tested foundations of political liberty. We must have no selfish ends to serve. We desire no conquest, no dominion. We seek no indemnities for ourselves, no material compensation for the sacrifices we shall freely make.

"It will be all the easier for us to conduct ourselves as belligerents in a high spirit of right and fairness because we act without animus, not in enmity toward a people or with the desire to bring any injury or disadvantage upon them, but only in armed opposition to an irresponsible Government which has thrown aside all considerations of humanity and of right and is running amuck. We are, let me say again, the sincere friends of the German people, and shall desire nothing so much as the early reestablishment of intimate relations of mutual advantage between us, however hard it may be for them for the time being to believe that this is spoken from our hearts." (Address to Congress, Apr. 2, 1917.)

"We are fighting for the liberty, the self-government, and the undictated development of all peoples, and every feature of the settlement that concludes this war must be conceived and executed for that purpose. Wrongs must first be righted and then adequate safeguards must be created to prevent their being committed again. * * *

"No people must be forced under sovereignty under which it does not wish to live. No territory must change hands except for the purpose of securing those who inhabit it a fair chance of life and liberty. No indemnities must be insisted on, except those that constitute payments for manifest wrongs done. No

readjustments of power must be made except such as will tend to secure the future peace of the world and the future welfare and happiness of its peoples." (Cablegram to Russia, May 26, 1917.)

"We know now as clearly as we knew before we were ourselves engaged that we are not the enemies of the German people and that they are not our enemies. They did not originate or desire this hideous war or wish that we should be drawn into it; and we are vaguely conscious that we are fighting their cause, as they will some day see it, as well as our own. * * *

"And the great fact that stands out above all the rest is that this is a people's war, a war for freedom and justice and self-government amongst all the nations of the world, a war to make the world safe for the peoples who live upon it and have made it their own, the German people themselves included." (Flag Day speech, June 14, 1917.)

"The object of this war is to deliver the free peoples of the world from the menace and the actual power of a vast military establishment controlled by an irresponsible Government. * * *

"This power is not the German people. It is the ruthless master of the German people. * * *

"Responsible statesmen must now everywhere see, if they never saw before, that no peace can rest securely upon political or economic restrictions meant to benefit some nations and cripple or embarrass others, upon vindictive action of any sort, or any kind of revenge or deliberate injury. The American people have suffered intolerable wrongs at the hands of the Imperial German Government, but they desire no reprisal upon the German people, who have themselves suffered all things in this war, which they did not choose. They believe that peace should rest upon the rights of peoples, not the rights of Governments—the rights of peoples great or small, weak or powerful—their equal right to freedom and security and self-government and to a participation upon fair terms in the economic opportunities of the world, the German people of course included if they will accept equality and not seek domination.

"The test, therefore, of every plan of peace is this: Is it based upon the faith of all the peoples involved or merely upon the word of an ambitious and intriguing Government on the one hand and of a group of free peoples on the other? This is a test which goes to the root of the matter; and it is the test which must be applied.

"We believe that the intolerable wrongs done in this war by the furious and brutal power of the Imperial German Government ought to be repaired, but not at the expense of the sovereignty of any people—rather a vindication of the sovereignty both of those that are weak and of those that are strong. Punitive damages, the dismemberment of empires, the establishment of selfish and exclusive economic leagues, we deem inexpedient and in the end worse than futile, no proper basis for a peace of any kind, least of all for an enduring peace. That must be based upon justice and fairness and the common rights of mankind." (Reply to the Pope, Aug. 27, 1917.)

"I believe that the spirit of freedom can get into the hearts of Germans and find as fine a welcome there as it can find in any other hearts. * * *

"Moreover, a settlement is always hard to avoid when the parties can be brought face to face. I can differ from a man much more radically when he is not in the room than I can when he is in the room, because then the awkward thing is he can come back at me and answer what I say. It is always dangerous for a man to have the floor entirely to himself. Therefore we must insist in every instance that the parties come into each other's presence and there discuss the issues between them and not separately in places which have no communication with each other." (Buffalo address, Nov. 12, 1917.)

"I believe that it is necessary to say plainly what we here at the seat of action consider the war to be for and what part we mean to play in the settlement of its searching issues. We are the spokesmen of the American people, and they have a right to know whether their purpose is ours. * * *

"I believe that I speak for them when I say two things: First, that this intolerable thing of which the masters of Germany have shown us the ugly face, this menace of combined intrigue and force which we now see so clearly as the German power, a thing without conscience or honor or capacity for covenanted peace, must be crushed and; if it be not utterly brought to an end, at least shut out from the friendly intercourse of the nations; and, second, that when this thing and its power are indeed defeated and the time comes that we can discuss peace—when the German people have spokesmen whose word we can believe and when those spokesmen are ready in the name of their people to accept the common judgment of the nations as to what shall henceforth be the basis of law and of covenant for the life of the world—we shall be willing and glad to pay the full price

for peace, and pay it ungrudgingly. We know what that price will be. It will be full, impartial justice—justice done at every point and to every nation that the final settlement must affect, our enemies as well as our friends.

"You catch with me the voices of humanity that are in the air. They grow daily more audible, more articulate, more persuasive, and they come from the hearts of men everywhere. They insist that the war shall not end in vindictive action of any kind; that no nation or people shall be robbed or punished because the irresponsible rulers of a single country have themselves done deep and abominable wrong. It is this thought that has been expressed in the formula, 'No annexations, no contributions, no punitive indemnities.'

"Let it be said again that autocracy must first be shown the utter futility of its claims to power or leadership in the modern world. But when that has been done—as, God willing, it assuredly will be—we must at last be free to do an unprecedented thing, and this is the time to avow our purpose to do it. We shall be free to base peace on generosity and justice to the exclusion of all selfish claims to advantage on the part of the victors.

"The people of Germany are being told by the men whom they now permit to deceive them and to act as their masters that they are fighting for the very life and existence of their Empire, a war of desperate self-defense against deliberate aggression. Nothing could be more grossly or wantonly false, and we must seek by the utmost openness and candor as to our real aims to convince them of its falseness. We are in fact fighting for their emancipation from fear, along with our own—from the fear as well as from the fact of unjust attack by neighbors or rivals or schemers after world empire. No one is threatening the existence or the independence or the peaceful enterprise of the German Empire.

"The wrongs, the very deep wrongs, committed in this war will have to be righted. That of course. But they can not and must not be righted by the commission of similar wrongs against Germany and her allies. The world will not permit the commission of similar wrongs as a means of reparation and settlement. Statesmen must by this time have learned that the opinion of the world is everywhere wide awake and fully comprehends the issues involved. No representative of any self-governed nation will dare disregard it by attempting any such covenants of selfishness and compromise as were entered into at the Congress of Vienna. The thought of the plain people here and everywhere throughout the world, the people who enjoy no privilege and have very simple and unsophisticated standards of right and wrong, is the air all governments must henceforth breathe if they would live. * * *

"A supreme moment of history has come. The eyes of the people have been opened and they see. The hand of God is laid upon the nations. He will show them favor, I devoutly believe, only if they rise to the clear heights of His own justice and mercy." (Address to Congress, Dec. 4, 1917.)

"We owe it to ourselves, however, to say that we do not wish in any way to impair or to rearrange the Austro-Hungarian Empire. 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 all matters, great and small." (Address to Congress, Dec. 4, 1917.)

"To whom have we been listening, then? To those who speak the spirit and intention of the resolutions of the German Reichstag of the 9th of January last, the spirit and intention of the liberal leaders and parties of Germany, or to those who resist and defy that spirit and intention and insist upon conquest and subjugation? Or are we listening, in fact, to both, unreconciled and in open and hopeless contradiction? These are very serious and pregnant questions. Upon the answers to them depends the peace of the world.

"It will be our wish and purpose that the processes of peace, when they are begun, shall be absolutely open, and that they shall involve and permit henceforth no secret understandings of any kind. The day of conquest and aggrandizement is gone by; so is also the day of secret covenants entered into in the interest of particular governments and likely at some unlooked-for moment to upset the peace of the world.

"We have no jealousy of German greatness, and there is nothing in this program that impairs it. We do not wish to injure her or to block in any way her legitimate influence or power. We do not wish to fight her either with arms or with hostile arrangements of trade if she is willing to associate herself with us and the other peace-loving nations of the world in covenants of justice and law and fair dealing. We wish her only to accept a place of equality among the peoples of the

world—the new world in which we now live—instead of a place of mastery.” (Address to Congress Jan. 8, 1918.)

“ * * * What we demand * * * is that the world be made safe * * * for every peace-loving nation which like our own wishes to live its own life, determine its own institutions, be assured of justice and fair dealing by the other peoples of the world as against force and selfish aggression.” (Address to Congress Jan. 8, 1918.)

“The peoples of Austria-Hungary, whose place among the nations we wish to see safeguarded and assured, should be accorded the freest opportunity of autonomous development.” (Address to Congress Jan. 8, 1918.)

“The United States has no desire to interfere in European affairs or to act as arbiter in European territorial disputes. She would disdain to take advantage of any internal weakness or disorder to impose her own will upon another people.” (Address to Congress Feb. 11, 1918.)

“All the parties in this war must join in the settlement of every issue anywhere involved in it; because what we are seeking is a peace that we can all unite to guarantee and maintain, and every item of it must be submitted to the common judgment, whether it be right and fair.” (Address to Congress Feb. 11, 1918.)

“We are ready, whenever the final reckoning is made, to be just to the German people, deal fairly with the German power, as with all others. There can be no difference between peoples in the final judgment, if it is indeed to be a righteous judgment. To purpose anything but justice, even-handed and dispassionate justice, to Germany at any time, whatever the outcome of the war, would be to renounce and dishonor our own cause, for we ask nothing that we are not willing to accord. * * *

“They (the military masters of Germany) are enjoying in Russia a cheap triumph in which no brave or gallant nation can long take pride. A great people, helpless by their own act, lies for the time at their mercy. Their fair professions are forgotten. They nowhere set up justice, but everywhere impose their power and exploit everything for their own use and aggrandizement; and the peoples of conquered Provinces are invited to be free under their dominion!” (Liberty loan speech in Baltimore, Apr. 6, 1918.)

“If it be indeed and in truth the common object of the Governments associated against Germany and of the nations whom they govern, as I believe it to be, to achieve by the coming settlements a secure and lasting peace, it will be necessary that all who sit down at the peace table shall come ready and willing to pay the price, the only price, that will procure it. That price is impartial justice in every item of the settlement, no matter whose interest is crossed; and not only impartial justice, but also the satisfaction of the several peoples whose fortunes are dealt with. * * *

“The counsels of plain men have become on all hands more simple and straightforward and more unified than the counsels of sophisticated men of affairs, who still retain the impression that they are playing a game of power and playing for high stakes. That is why I have said that this is a people's war, not a statesmen's. Statesmen must follow the clarified common thought or be broken.

“Special alliances and economic rivalries and hostilities have been the prolific source 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.” (Address at Metropolitan Opera House, New York City, Sept. 27, 1918.)

“We have used great words, all of us have used the great words ‘right’ and ‘justice,’ and now we are to prove whether or not we understand these words and how they are to be applied to the particular settlements which must conclude this war. And we must not only understand them, but we must have the courage to act upon our understanding.” (Speech at Buckingham Palace, London, Dec. 27, 1918.)

“They fought to do away with an old order and to establish a new one, and the center and characteristic of the old order was that unstable thing which we used to call the ‘balance of power,’ a thing in which the balance was determined by the sword which was thrown in on the one side or the other, a balance which was determined by the unstable equilibrium of competitive interests, a balance which was maintained by jealous watchfulness and an antagonism of interests which, though it was generally latent, was always deep-seated.” (Speech at London, Dec. 28, 1918.)

“It is from quiet places like this all over the world that the forces are accumulated that presently will overpower any attempt to accomplish evil on a great scale. It is like the rivulet that gathers into the river and the river that goes to the sea. So there come out of communities like these streams that fer-

tilize the conscience of men, and it is the conscience of the world we now mean to place upon the throne which others tried to usurp.” (Address at the Lowther Street Congregational Church, London, Dec. 29, 1918.)

“And so it does seem to me that the theme that we must have in our minds now in this great day of settlement is the theme of common interest and the determination of what it is that is our common interest. * * * For the moment there is the slightest departure from the nice adjustment of interests, then jealousies begin to spring up. There is only one thing that can bind peoples together, and that is common devotion to right.

“Therefore it seems to me that in the settlement which is just ahead of us something more delicate and difficult than was ever before attempted has to be accomplished—a genuine concert of mind and of purpose. * * *

“We must provide the machinery for readjustments in order that we have the machinery of good will and friendship. Friendship must have a machinery. If I can not correspond with you, not cooperate with you, I can not be your friend, and if the world is to remain a body of friends it must have the means of friendship, the means of constant friendly intercourse, the means for constant watchfulness over the common interests.” (Speech at Manchester, England, Dec. 30, 1918.)

“ * * * the President said:

“I am glad you asked me that, for I want to tell you a good joke on myself. I did not see this joke until I came over here. Under the league of nations there will be no neutrals. They will all be in the league and subject to the league's decisions on the matter of the exertion of armed force. If there are no neutrals there will be no issue over sea rights, for the freedom of the seas puzzle arose over relations between belligerents and neutrals. The league will now settle all matters of naval policy. So it might be said, ‘There ain't no such thing’ as an issue of freedom of the seas.”

“Mr. Wilson was asked if the British had brought that argument to him, and Mr. Wilson replied, ‘No; I arrived at that conclusion in the privacy of my own soul.’” (London Times, weekly edition, Paris correspondence.)

“But we can not stand in the shadow of this war without knowing there are things which are in some senses more difficult than those we have undertaken, because, while it is easy to speak of right and justice, it is sometimes difficult to work them out in practice, and there will be required a purity of motives and disinterestedness of object which the world has never witnessed before in the councils of nations.

“There is only one thing that holds nations together, if you exclude force, and that is friendship and good will. The only thing that binds men together is friendship, and by the same token the only thing that binds nations together is friendship. Therefore our task at Paris is to organize the friendship of the world; to see to it that all the moral forces that make for right and justice and liberty are united and are given a vital organization to which the peoples of the world will readily and gladly respond.” (Speech before the Italian Chamber of Deputies at Rome, Jan. 3, 1919.)

“Perhaps you gentlemen think of the members of your Government and the members of other governments who are going to confer in the city of Paris as the real makers of war and peace; but we are not. You are the makers of war and of peace. The pulse of the modern world beats on the farms and in the mines and in the factories. * * * That is one reason why, unless we establish friendships, unless we establish sympathies, we clog all the processes of modern life.” (Speech to the citizens of Turin, Italy, Jan. 6, 1919.)

“We are here to see, in short, that the very foundations of this war are swept away. Those foundations were the private choice of a small coterie of civil rulers and military staffs. Those foundations were the aggression of great powers upon the small. Those foundations were the power of small bodies of men to wield their will and use mankind as pawns in a game. And nothing less than the emancipation of the world from these things will accomplish peace.” (Address before the peace conference, Jan. 25, 1919.)

“So it is for that reason that I have said to those with whom I am at present associated, that this must be a people's peace, because this was a people's war. The people won this war, not the Governments, and the people must reap the benefits of the war. At every turn we must see to it that it is not an adjustment between Governments merely, but an arrangement for the peace and security of men and women everywhere.” (Address to delegation of working women, Paris, Jan. 26, 1919.)

“The rulers of the world have been thinking of the relations of Governments and forgetting the relations of peoples. They have been thinking of the maneuvers of international dealings, when what they ought to have been thinking of was the for-

tunes of men and women and the safety of homes, and the care that they should take that their people should be happy because they were safe.

"The nations of the world are about to consummate a brotherhood which will make it unnecessary in the future to maintain those crushing armaments which make the peoples suffer almost as much in peace as they suffered in war.

"So, as we sit from day to day at the Quai d'Orsay, I think to myself, we might, if we could gain an audience of the free peoples of the world, adopt the language of Gen. Pershing and say, 'Friends, men, humble women, little children, we are here; we are here as your friends, as your champions, as your representatives. We have come to work out for you a world which is fit to live in and in which all countries can enjoy the heritage of liberty for which France and America and England and Italy have paid so dear.'" (Speech in the French Chamber of Deputies, Paris, Feb. 3, 1919.)

"The men who are in conference in Paris realize as keenly as any American can realize that they are not the masters of their people; that they are the servants of their people, and that the spirit of their people has awakened to a new purpose and a new conception of their power to realize that purpose; and that no man dare go home from that conference and report anything less noble than was expected of it.

"And I said I have had this sweet revenge: Speaking with perfect frankness, in the name of the people of the United States, I have uttered as the objects of this great war ideals, and nothing but ideals, and the war has been won by that inspiration." (Message to the American people, Boston, Feb. 24, 1919.)

"Do not let yourselves suppose for a moment that the uneasiness in the populations of Europe is due entirely to economic causes or economic motives; something very much deeper underlies it all than that. They see that their Governments have never been able to defend them against intrigue or aggression, and that there is no force or foresight or of prudence in any modern cabinet to stop war. And therefore they say, 'There must be some fundamental cause for this,' and the fundamental cause they are beginning to perceive to be that nations have stood singly or in little jealous groups against each other, fostering prejudice, increasing the danger of war rather than concerting measures to prevent it; and that if there is right in the world, if there is justice in the world, there is no reason why nations should be divided in the support of justice.

"They are therefore saying if you really believe that there is a right, if you really believe that wars ought to be stopped, stop thinking about the rival interests of nations, and think about men and women and children throughout the world. * * * There can be no mercy where there is no hope, for why should you spare another if you expect yourself to perish? Why should you be pitiful if you can get no pity? Why should you be just if, upon every hand, you are put upon?" (Address at Metropolitan Opera House, New York City, Mar. 4, 1919.)

"The war was ended, moreover, by proposing to Germany an armistice and peace which should be founded on certain clearly defined principles which set up a new order of right and justice. Upon those principles the peace with Germany has been conceived, not only, but formulated. Upon those principles it will be executed." (Statement dealing with the Italian-Jugo-Slav dispute, Paris, Apr. 23, 1919.)

"The peoples of the world are awake and the peoples of the world are in the saddle. Private counsels of statesmen can not now and can not hereafter determine the destinies of nations." (Memorial Day address, France, May 30, 1919.)

"For if this is not the final battle for right there will be another that will be final." (Memorial Day address, France, May 30, 1919.)

FOREIGN FINANCIAL OPERATIONS.

Mr. EDGE. As the calendar has been completed, unless there is some other business to be taken up before 2 o'clock, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2472, the unfinished business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of Montana in the chair). The Senator from New Jersey moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Senate bill 2472, to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, before that motion is acted on, I desire to occupy a few moments of the time of the Senate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair is of the opinion that the motion made by the Senator from New Jersey is not debatable.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Very well.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. JONES of Washington. There are some Senators absent who desire to be here when the bill is taken up.

Mr. ASHURST. We will call for a quorum right afterwards.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I therefore make the point of no quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The absence of a quorum is suggested. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Stanley
Borah	Kendrick	Norris	Thomas
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Nugent	Trammell
Curtis	Keyes	Owen	Underwood
Edge	La Follette	Poindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Gronna	Lenroot	Reed	Watson
Hale	McCumber	Simmons	Williams
Harding	McLean	Smith, Md.	Wolcott
Harrison	McNary	Smoot	
Jones, N. Mex.	New	Spencer	

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President, I desire to announce the unavoidable absence of my colleague [Mr. FLETCHER] on account of illness.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Thirty-eight Senators have answered to their names. There is not a quorum present. The Secretary will call the roll of absentees.

The Secretary called the names of the absent Senators, and Mr. GERRY, Mr. KIRBY, Mr. OVERMAN, Mr. PAGE, and Mr. SHEPPARD answered to their names when called.

Mr. KIRBY. I desire to announce that my colleague [Mr. ROBINSON] is detained from the Senate by official business.

Mr. McCORMICK, Mr. CUMMINS, Mr. CAPPER, Mr. PHELAN, Mr. NELSON, Mr. SWANSON, Mr. BALL, Mr. BRANDEGEE, Mr. LODGE, Mr. POMERENE, Mr. CULBERSON, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. DIAL entered the Chamber and answered to their names.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], the junior Senator from Georgia [Mr. HARRIS], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. SMITH] are detained on official business.

The Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], the senior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL], the senior Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] are absent on public business.

I wish to announce that the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY] is necessarily absent on business of the Senate. He is paired with the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. MOSES].

I wish also to announce that the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON] is necessarily absent on business of the Senate. He is paired with the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK]. I ask that these announcements may stand for the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Fifty-six Senators having answered to their names, there is a quorum present.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, I desire to ask whether Senate bill 2472 is now before the Senate?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. It is not. A motion, however, has been made to lay the bill before the Senate. The question is on the motion of the Senator from New Jersey.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2472) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS—THE PRESIDENT'S ADDRESSES.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I observe from reading the daily papers that the President of the United States has taken to the hustings and is debating before the people the league of nations. I have no comment to make upon the action of the President in this regard except to say that inasmuch as he is well equipped to conduct such a debate, has under his command the resources of his great office, has the luxuries and the conveniences of travel at the expense of the Government, is surrounded by a body of competent and able clerks and reporters, I assume it will not be inappropriate, since he has the opportunity and the facility of answering any questions that are submitted to him, to call attention to a few principles that are involved in the covenant of the league of nations which he is discussing.

The President is going west, and it seems that the farther west he goes the more vituperative he becomes and his feeling more intense. I make these preliminary remarks in justification of calling attention to certain questions which have been suggested by the speeches which the President has already made on this tour.

The President says that we should protect Armenia. Military authorities, Mr. President, estimate that 150,000 men would be required for this purpose, and that it would cost a billion dollars. Of course, the protection of Armenia, which the Presi-

dent urges as one of the immediate duties involving upon us under the league of nations, means the policing of Turkey. It is impossible to protect Armenia without policing Turkey. Turkey is the power from whose ruthlessness Armenia is to be protected. I notice that one press agent of the administration in Europe estimates that it would take 100,000 men to perform this duty. Experts in the War Department, however, estimate that it would take 150,000 men. But whether it would require 100,000 men or 150,000 men it would cost the United States more than \$1,000,000,000 to raise, equip, train, transport for 4,000 miles, and maintain in Asia this army for a length of time sufficient to establish the permanent safety of Armenia.

Upon whom, Mr. President, will the taxes fall to raise the billion dollars that will be required under this obligation which the President is urging Congress to assume? To raise this \$1,000,000,000 will not the taxes inevitably be passed along until they rest upon the consumer and burden the poor? I may interpolate here the suggestion that while efforts are made to frame tax bills so that the burden rests upon the rich, by the operation of natural laws, over which Congress has no control, the vast sums of money required for the support of military expeditions into distant parts of the world when put in the form of taxes are passed along from those upon whom they are nominally levied until inevitably they rest upon the prices of necessities of life and create the problem known as the high cost of living.

The President says if the league of nations is not adopted he can not deal with the problem of the high cost of living. The high cost of living is due to the obligations, to the expenses, and to the burdens which have been imposed upon this Nation by the peace conference, which was composed of the same nations that will compose the league of nations and controlled by the same powers and which imposed upon the Government and the people of the United States the same obligations that will be imposed upon them permanently if the peace conference is continued in Paris or in Geneva by a permanent government known as the league of nations.

How is the army that is to police Turkey to be raised? Whose sons are to compose it? If those who are in favor of organizing and sending to Armenia an army of 100,000 men have sons whom they will bring forward to offer for this service, some of them to die, in a duty which does not devolve upon us, but ought to devolve upon the nations which are situated in the proximity of Turkey and Armenia, those people who are willing to offer their sons probably could not be criticized as being selfish or unfair in advocating the adoption of this policy. But if they are not, they have no just right to demand that the sons of others shall either be conscripted or asked to volunteer to compose this army.

How can the President police Turkey without sending an army? How can Armenia be protected without military force?

While plans are being made to send an American army to Turkey and another to Siberia and still another to Germany, how can the President tell the American people that if the league of nations is adopted no khaki-clad troops will ever again cross the Atlantic? While he is telling the people of his audiences that if the league of nations is adopted no khaki-clad troops will ever again cross the Atlantic, at the moment he is making the statement to them he is engaged in enlisting and organizing and transporting khaki-clad troops across the Atlantic to serve in Siberia and in Germany in performance of the obligations which will be imposed upon us under the league of nations.

If armies are now being raised to be sent to Siberia and to Germany, if another army is to be raised to police Turkey under plans now being made, how are we to be able to perform our obligations in Mexico? Will it be necessary to raise still another army for that purpose?

When at this moment American soldiers are being enlisted under the authority of the President for service in Siberia and in Germany under the league of nations how can the President say that it is a peace league? To how many other places in Europe, Asia, and Africa are American soldiers to be sent in the performance of the duties that will devolve upon us under the league of nations?

What is to be the cost of all these armies?

How is the money to be raised?

How are the men to be obtained and of what ages are they to be, what classes are to be called, and what classes exempt from this service?

It may be interesting to the American people to know the details of the military service which they will be called upon to perform in all parts of the world.

If it be said, however, that no soldiers are to be sent to Europe under the league of nations, how can the armies that we are now raising for Germany and Siberia be maintained there without the consent of the league of nations?

If no soldiers are to be sent to Europe or Asia in the performance of our duties under the league of nations, then what are we to do under the league of nations? The duties that will devolve upon us under the league of nations are duties in Europe. They consist of the government of those portions of Europe which are involved in the disputes between various European nations in regard to boundaries, after-the-war settlements, and the establishment of new governments.

How is the Government of the United States to perform these proposed obligations there unless it has soldiers there?

I should like the President or anybody who is interested in that question to explain it to the people, and I think that in fairness that ought to be done.

If no soldiers are to be sent to Europe or Asia in the performance of our duties under the league of nations, if we are to do nothing under the league of nations, then why join the league of nations?

If, as the President says, we are to depend on blockades and destructive economic isolation, will not that be a sure cause of war?

Will blockades, social ostracism, and economic isolation, as prescribed by the President, tend to make any nation peaceable?

If the President thinks, as he says, that Lenin is so despicable, why did the President eulogize his terms of peace at the treacherous conference at Brest-Litovsk?

Why did the President, both before and after we entered the war, attempt to bring about peace on the same terms as proposed by Lenin?

Why was the President, as was Lenin, for peace without victory, as he declared both before and after we entered the war?

For what reason does the President propose we should grant independence to the Philippines and assume a mandate over Armenia?

On what theory or policy does the President refuse to preserve order in Mexico and undertake to do it in Siberia and Germany?

The President says that if we reject the league we will be "contemptible quitters." What would we be quitting?

He says we must "stay with the game." What is "the game" and when will the game be finished, if it is not finished now?

He says we won the war for France and England, and, having won it, it would be dishonorable for us now to abandon them. How did winning the war for France and England put us under obligation to them or to the rest of Europe? Is it not the truth that the service we rendered Europe in the war puts Europe under obligation to us instead of putting us under obligation to Europe?

Would our people ever have voted for war if they had foreseen that after they had won it the President would tell them it would be dishonorable for them to come home and to bring our armies home?

If the President thinks the league of nations would be a benefit to the United States, why did he say at the Metropolitan Opera House in New York on March 5 that it would be a supreme sacrifice? If it is a supreme sacrifice, as he said it was, is he not violating his oath of office in attempting to impose it on the American people?

Will the President deny that the covenant of the league of nations gives the supervision of our trade in arms to the league, while the Constitution of the United States gives it to Congress and through Congress to the people of the United States?

Is it not true that the covenant of the league of nations provides that when the size of the armies and navies has been fixed as therein provided it can not be increased without the consent of the league, while the Constitution gives Congress the absolute power to raise armies and navies?

Is it not true that the covenant obligates us to defend the territorial integrity of all the proposed members of the league? How could we defend territorial integrity without war?

What voice do our people have in such a war, provided for in advance by the league of nations, if we are to keep our obligations under the league?

Is it not true that every question likely to lead to a rupture is to be decided by the league, and that we are bound to obey its decisions? Does not this involve every interest of the United States, without exception, in this decision?

Does not Great Britain with her colonies have six votes in the body of delegates while the United States has only one? Why

should Great Britain have six times as many votes as the United States?

Does not Hejaz have as many votes in the assembly of delegates as the United States? Why should Hejaz or Haiti or Liberia each have as many votes as the United States in the body of delegates of the league of nations? That is what the covenant of the league of nations provides.

The President says limitation of armament can not be obtained without the league of nations. That is what the President says. Is that so? If that is so, how is it that we have already and have had for many years limitation of armament between the United States and Canada without a league of nations? If we can not have limitation of armament without a league of nations, how does it occur that you can travel for 3,000 miles along the boundary between the United States and Canada without seeing a fort or a soldier?

Does not the President himself say also that disarmament can only come by international conference and agreement?

Can we not have international conference and agreement without a league of nations? Of course, these questions answer themselves. I am only submitting them to call attention to the facts. Everybody knows that we can have a conference between nations about a limitation of armaments without having a league of nations. If it is desired to have an agreement between the United States and other nations to bring about disarmament or a limitation of armaments, the natural, common-sense way to go about it would be to call such a conference and have that conference devise some plan of disarmament or limitation of armaments.

The President says there is an international agreement for disarmament in the league of nations. I think he made that statement a number of times—that there is an international agreement for disarmament or for a limitation of armaments in the league of nations. Without desiring to dispute the President's statement too categorically or to seem offensive, I wish to say there is no such provision in the covenant of the league of nations—none whatever. It was not even attempted by the delegates or representatives who framed the league of nations to devise any plan for disarmament or limitation of armaments, which the President says is contained in it. There was no effort made for that purpose. They were there long enough to do it. If those delegates were really in favor of a limitation of armaments, it looks as though they could have arrived at a plan or program for it during the seven months they were in session; but they did not try to do it, and there is nothing in the covenant of the league of nations to that effect.

The covenant of the league of nations provides that after the league of nations is adopted, if it shall ever be adopted, then the league of nations—not the nations acting individually in conference, but the league of nations by the council that gathers in Geneva—shall proceed within some time in the unknown future to devise a plan for a limitation of armaments.

There is some dispute as to whether or not when that plan has been devised it shall take effect at once upon the diktat of the league or whether it will have to be ratified by the several nations. There is, however, no dispute whatever, because there can not be any, that if such a plan should ever be carried out, and the size of the armies and the size of the navies of the different countries should be fixed as of that date, with reference to conditions that are existing then, the United States, through its Congress and its President, could never increase its Army and could never build another battleship without getting the consent of the league of nations.

If the American people desire that, if they are able under the Constitution to humiliate themselves by subjecting the control of their Military Establishment, which is necessary for the defense of the Nation, to the absolute domination of a foreign congerie of powers, why, of course, they would have no one to blame. Before it is done, however, the American people at least ought to have an opportunity of voting upon the question; I do not mean to say by having the specific question submitted to them at an election, but having it submitted to them in the ordinary way in which the American people are accustomed to decide the great issues of the Government; having it set forth in platforms by political parties and in statements of principles by candidates who submit themselves for election. Then, if the American people, after it has been discussed in the rural school-houses as well as in the great cities, in the local neighborhoods as well as on a tour of the President in a great special train, surrounded by an army of publicity agents—when the people have had an opportunity to understand and to consider the thing in its exact form and in the consequences which it will have upon the control of our country, if they want to say that the increase of their Army and the increase of their Navy can not be effected until they get the permission of the council of a

league of nations sitting in Geneva, perhaps they would have no cause of complaint.

The council of the league of nations must be unanimous, according to the covenant. So under the terms of this instrument, if it is adopted in its exact form as the President demands, Japan can say to the United States, "You can not increase your Army; we will not vote for it." Japan can say, "You must get our consent before you increase your Army or your Navy." I should like the President to discuss that question on the Pacific coast. No doubt he will. I do not think he can dispute the statement of fact which I have made, for it is written in specific language in the covenant of the league of nations.

If this question should be referred to the body of delegates, Hejaz and a sufficient combination of little powers constituting the various protégés and allies of Great Britain and the other European powers, whose influence has been predominant in the formation of the league, can say that the United States can not increase its Army or its Navy without getting their consent.

Does the President claim that the plan for the limitation of armaments which the league is to provide is to be binding on the nations without their consent? That is not very clear in the covenant. Does the President claim that as soon as the league of nations has agreed upon it, it shall be binding? If it is not binding, then how is it to be established except by conference and consent? And if it is not to be established except by conference and consent, a league of nations is wholly superfluous and unnecessary. If the league of nations' decision, on the other hand, is to be binding on the nations without their consent, then the President should say so. If that is the President's view, he should so declare. Then we would know that we are to become a subject people.

But how can the President tell the people of the United States—and I only mention the President because of the extraordinary debating tour in which he is now engaged—how can he or anyone else tell the people that there will be a limitation of armaments under the league when he knows, and everybody else who is familiar with the proceedings knows, that Great Britain, which has six votes to our one in the league of nations, has already decreed that league or no league the predominance of her sea power will be maintained? How are we going to have a limitation of armaments under that fiat? What is the purpose of telling the people that the object here is to obtain a limitation of armaments when it is known that even before the league is adopted the consideration of the limitation of the British armament, that power by which she has ruled the seas and through her command over the seas has ruled a large portion of the world, has been withdrawn by Great Britain even from the consideration of the league of nations?

Now, Mr. President, I wish to submit another question. There is an assumption by many of its advocates that the league of nations is going to stand for peace, for righteousness, for justice in the international affairs of the world. How is the stand of the league of nations to be determined? It is to be determined by the council of the league of nations. What is the council of the league of nations? It is a little body, a little handful of astute international statesmen gathered at some point in Europe and vested with the mighty powers of the league of nations. Why does the President, why does anybody, assume that this little council, far removed from the people whose fortunes are in their hands, are going to be for peace or that they will direct the affairs of the league of nations for peace? Why is it assumed that they are going to be righteous men with no evil in their hearts? Why is it assumed that they will not be controlled by the selfish interests of the nations they represent? Did anybody ever see an international statesman whose actions were not controlled by such motives? Is there anything in history to justify the assumption that they are going to be always good and never bad? Is it not true, on the contrary, that every centralized world power has been tyrannical and oppressive and that every council representing such a league has been swayed by selfish interests, rent by factional strife, and corrupted by ambition? That is the experience of the world. That is the observation of human nature. Why is it assumed that the men who are to compose this council of a league of nations are going to be regenerated from the vices of the world and become entirely virtuous?

The Monroe doctrine was established on the principle that Europe should not participate in the control of American affairs. I have tried to state in simple language, but in correct analysis, this great governing principle of our foreign policy—the principle that Europe should not participate in the control of American affairs, and its corollary, that America should not participate in

the control of European affairs. That is the Monroe doctrine in simple form and in complete form. How can the President honestly tell the people that a world league founded on the principle that Europe shall participate in the control of American affairs, and that America shall participate in the control of European affairs, does not abrogate the Monroe doctrine? If the covenant of the league expressly provides that the things forbidden by the Monroe doctrine shall be done, what good will it do to stipulate that it shall not interfere with the Monroe doctrine? You can put all the stipulations that you can write into the instrument and they will have no effect, because the body of the instrument is founded on the participation by America with the other members of the league in the control of European affairs, and the participation of the other members of the league in Europe and in Asia in the control of American affairs; and when you have provided that you have uprooted the Monroe doctrine, and it is withered and dead, and it never can breathe again the breath of life.

The ancient and modern policy of America, from Washington and Jefferson down, has been to keep ourselves free from foreign entanglements. How can the President honestly tell the people that a league of nations which obligates us to participate in every important European quarrel is not a violation of these ancient principles? I think he has told them that; but how can he do it? Under these unwritten laws of our foreign policy we have grown great, we have been free, prosperous, and happy, and we have been able to render valuable service to the world under these ancient muniments of our foreign policy. Why does the President suppose that our condition would be improved, or our ability to render service to the world would be increased, by an abandonment of these policies?

The President said on the 5th of March in the Metropolitan Opera House in New York:

We must join our fortunes with the fortunes of men everywhere.

That was the language of the President. Now, I should like the President, referring to that statement that he made on the 5th of March, to tell the people on this trip that he is making how we can join our fortunes with the fortunes of Japan, Turkey, Bulgaria, Italy, and the British dominions, and at the same time while we are doing that keep our fortunes independent of theirs? And if we can not keep our fortunes independent of theirs after we have joined ours to theirs, we are then in a state of foreign control of our own fortunes.

It is not so long, Mr. President, since our fathers made their desperate but successful struggle to free our States from a union with European powers. When the President now utilizes the powerful and almost immeasurable influence of his great office to bring about the formation of a union with European powers, is he not desecrating the memory of the fathers of the Nation? Is he not betraying the most sacred trust of his office?

The President has said that Germany would not have invaded Belgium if there had been a league of nations. Does he not know that there was a league of nations and a formal covenant for the integrity of Belgium, and that it was treated as a scrap of paper? Why does he assume that in such an emergency his league will not be treated as a scrap of paper?

The President says that Germany would not have invaded Belgium if she had known that the United States would intervene. What prevented the United States from intervening? The President says that if the United States had been obligated to intervene there would have been no Great War, and if this is so the lives of 50,000 American soldiers would have been saved. What prevented the United States from intervening. Is it not true that President Wilson himself prevented us from intervening in order that he might make a campaign for the Presidency on the cry, "He kept us out of war"?

Both Germany and the United States were parties to The Hague convention, which guaranteed the inviolability of neutral States. Why did not the President protest against this violation of that convention to which we were a party and to which Germany also was a party? Did you ever hear any protest that he made against it while flagrant violations of its provisions were going on and while the President was in control of the foreign affairs of this Nation? What reason is there to suppose that in a future emergency we may not again have a President who will quietly submit to a violation of the covenant of the league of nations and content himself with the proud boast that "We are too proud to fight"? A show of force and some proof of self-respect might have saved Belgium. Was the President prevented from acting because he did not have a league of nations? We were asked to join the league of nations opposed to Germany and refused. If a league of nations has the miraculous power of preserving peace in and of itself, why did not the President accept the appeal of France and Great Britain, join

the existing league of nations for the great emergency, and preserve the peace of the world?

We were free then to act to save mankind and ourselves. In order to do it we did not have to have a league of nations, established 50 years before by people who are dead and gone, to govern our actions when the war with Germany broke out. Our fathers had been wiser than that. They had left the Government so that we, in this generation, when we were confronted by the emergency, when we were the ones to furnish our sons and to pay the treasure that was necessary to carry on the war, would have the power to control our action and our destiny. We could control it in such a way as we saw fit under the forms of government which existed; and the President—this same President who is now speaking—was at the head of the Government, in charge under the Constitution, with the initial control of the foreign relations of the Nation. We could have joined the league if it would have had the effect that he says it would.

I may pause to remark, as I have often remarked before, I think, that Mr. Henry Van Dyke, an estimable gentleman, former minister to Holland, was commissioned by Mr. Balfour, in charge of the foreign relations of the British Government when the Great War broke out, to hasten to the United States and appeal to President Wilson to throw in the fortunes of this great Republic with the fortunes of those nations which stood in the breach of civilization. Did the President think so well of a league of nations when the time for action came? Apparently not, because he rejected the appeal. He allowed the war to go on and the slaughter to continue, which, he says, could have been prevented. We were free then to save mankind, and perhaps it could have been done by the economic pressure and the social strangulation which the President suggests.

We are free now to so act, and we will be free unless we transfer our allegiance to the league of nations to control our affairs; we will be free to so act if we deem it in the interest of the American people and of mankind in the future.

What change is to be made in this condition by the league of nations? Is our independence of action in a matter involving the life of the Nation to be surrendered to the council and the body of delegates of the league of nations? If that is so, the President is under a sacred obligation to the people of this country to tell them so before he places this yoke upon them. If that is not so, then for what purpose is the league of nations?

The President says, in his stately style, "Put up or shut up"; accept the league of nations or offer a substitute for it. The opponents of the league of nations offer as a substitute for it the Constitution of the United States, the Declaration of Independence, and Lincoln's "government by the people." That is the substitute for a league of nations.

The President offers us a government by a council in Geneva, and says, "You must take it if you have nothing better to offer." It is not a question of having anything better to offer. The question is whether there is anything worse that could be offered. It is as though one were offered a dose of deadly poison and told that he must drink it to the dregs unless he could propose some alternative. The natural alternative would be not to drink it. He would probably suggest that immediately.

When Washington was sharing the sufferings of his men in the gloomy winter of Valley Forge there was no doubt in his mind as to the alternative for a union with a European power. Washington's alternative was to sever the union. That was what he was fighting for. That is what he and his soldiers suffered for, and that is what is involved in this issue before the American people to-day.

Now, when a European union is again proposed the alternative is to reject the proposal and pillory the man who proposes it. If a rattlesnake is about to strike you, would the President ask what alternative you have to propose? The alternative is to kill the rattlesnake. When the President asks this question, does he not know that the alternative to the wars for which he is even now enlisting American boys to be carried on in Asia and Europe under the league of nations, the hate they will engender, the burdens of taxation on the backs of the poor, the bereft parents of these sons, the widows and orphans of those who would carry out the mandate of the league of nations on a fool's errand in Asia, the supreme sacrifice of all this, as the President characterizes it—does he not know that the alternative to all of this misery and folly is the peace which we have earned in a victorious war that is now finished?

Will he not be frank and tell the people that the "old order," of which he said at Suresnes we were ashamed, brought us the supreme happiness of mankind. If the President is ashamed

of our past, as he says he is, does he not know that our people are not ashamed of it? Does he not know that the alternative which we have to offer for the international ill will which the league of nations, even in its formation, has created is the peace and honest friendship with all nations which, with few intervals, we have enjoyed since the foundation of the Government? Why does the President say we must adopt the league of nations or live in isolation from the rest of the world? Why does he say that? That is what he says. The President of the United States, on a tour to explain the league of nations to the people, says, "Adopt this instrument or live in isolation from the rest of the world if you do not adopt it." No doubt everyone has read that statement. It has been repeated over and over again. It is one of the favorite arguments for the league of nations.

It is not possible, however, that the President thinks that. The President is familiar with the past experience of this Nation, and during all of this time when we have been growing great, enjoying the blessings of liberty which we inherited from our fathers, we had no league of nations; it was anathema to the great leaders, the greatest who ever lived in this or any other country, the statesmen who founded this Nation upon the natural rights of man, and preserved, through Lincoln, government by the people, to entangle ourselves with European affairs in a league of nations. We had none. And when, during all that period, did we ever live in isolation from the rest of the world? He says we must live in isolation from the rest of the world or have a league of nations. We have lived to the present time without a league of nations, and we have never been for one moment of that time in isolation from the rest of the world. The man who says so is deceiving the people.

On the contrary, without any league of nations, we have maintained intimate economic and social relations with all the civilized world. No one knows better than the President that we will continue to do so without the league of nations, unless the animosities engendered during his stay in Paris, by his effort to dictate the affairs of other people in which we had no concern, should bring about such isolation. Why does the President say that a league of nations would prevent war? That is another statement that I have heard, that the league of nations will prevent war. A great many people are for the league of nations because the President has told them that the league of nations would prevent war. They have a just and proper respect for the authority of the President.

Would this league of nations, if we had had it, have prevented our Civil War? If so, will the President point out how it would have done so? Would the other members of the league have intervened, or applied their economic boycott, which the President so humanely recommends, in favor of the Federal or the Confederate States? If so, what would have been the result, unless it had been to plunge the whole world into war? Was not that, as a matter of fact, a war between the members of a Federal union; and if so, what is to prevent a war between the members of a league? Has not the President already succeeded, I ask deliberately, in dividing the league into factions, by forming a league within the league, which restores at one stroke the old balance of power, and arrays one against the other? That is in the league of nations. Does not the division of this league into rival groups at one stroke negative and destroy the whole principle and theory of a harmonious league of all nations, in which the hostile array of one group of nations against another was to be obliterated?

The President says a league of nations will prevent war. We can only judge the future by the past. There was a league of nations in 1914. It did not prevent the German war. Would the league of nations have prevented our war for independence? He says it will prevent war. Would it have prevented that? If so, will the President point out how it would have prevented it?

The President says he desires to prevent all wars. Does he regret the war by which we gained the freedom he would sacrifice? Would he have had a league of nations to prevent that war? If so, he would have deprived mankind of the greatest blessing it has received in the long struggle up from barbarism.

Would he have a league of nations that would prevent such a war for freedom in the future? If so, if that is his object and purpose he is setting up the most monstrous obstacle to the progress of man that the reactionary forces of the devil could devise.

But the President may say that a league of nations would have so operated that no cause would have been given to the Colonies to wage a war for independence. Would the President have desired that result? There were many then, and there are many now, who would have desired it. But even so there are thousands who thank God that there was a cause and that there were mighty men who preferred national independence, even at the price of war, to a league of nations.

What other wars would it have prevented? Will the President advise the people that the league of nations would have prevented our war with Great Britain in 1812 for our rights upon the seas? If so, how? Would it have been by the sacrifice of those rights; would it have been by blighting in its infancy that maritime development which was one of the chief factors in the story of our growth? Or would a league of nations have preserved the freedom of the seas? Why does the President think that in any such case the league of nations would protect our rights upon the seas as against the claims of Great Britain? Certainly it would not do so if Great Britain had 6 votes to our 1 in the body of delegates, and was in secret or open special alliance with a dozen others, and in addition to that had the votes of such dependencies as Hedjaz, Portugal, and others that might be named. Furthermore, how does the President suppose that such a league would have prevented our War of 1812 for the freedom of the seas by maintaining the freedom of the seas when the freedom of the seas has already in advance been excluded from consideration by the league by those who will be in control of it?

What other wars in which we have been engaged would have been prevented by the league of nations? Would the league of nations have prevented us from going to the rescue of Cuba from the cruel clutch of Spain? Would the President's league of nations have corrected the abuses of Weyler and others, which became an offense to the world? It would not have corrected the abuses, because Mr. Wilson tells us it can not interfere with the domestic affairs of any nation. It would have prevented the United States from coming to the rescue, because every member would have obligated itself to preserve the territorial integrity of the members of the league. Will the President tell us if it is not true that in such a case his league would be obligated to bring to bear upon us its pleasant process, which he has described so often, of social ostracism and economic strangulation, and to supplement this, if necessary, by force of arms, if it fulfilled its obligation to preserve the territorial integrity of Spain; and would all this have been for the sake of enforcing peace by making war in behalf of a brutal despotism and to prevent aid from reaching a people struggling for freedom? Will Mr. Wilson tell the people, with intellectual honesty, that that is not the working and the purpose of the league to enforce peace? Cuba, smiling in the Caribbean, may thank God that freedom came to her before the blight of such a league of nations fell upon the world.

Mr. Lawrence says "the President makes an open bid for the support of the Irish by hinting that America can not intrude upon England's affairs now, but that under a league of nations Ireland can get a hearing and the moral support of the United States."

The Irish case is not our case, but it may be suggested that the Irish will belie their racial brightness if they are caught by any such gull bait as that. They would be more credulous than those who were caught by the President's molasses-to-catch-flies speech on the Panama Canal. The idea that any right claimed by Great Britain can be invaded by appealing to the league of nations which she created, and which she and her allies will dominate, will be as futile as China's plea for her people to this same league of nations. China was told to leave her case to the peace conference.

The Chinese delegation desired to retain an American lawyer to represent the Chinese Republic in the protection of her great and strategic Province of Shantung. They were told by the American delegation not to employ a lawyer, to leave it to them. The Chinese delegation wanted to file a brief of their case on Shantung. They were told by the American delegation not to file a brief, to leave it to them. They left it to them, as the President tells the Irish to leave the Irish question to them, and the league of nations took care of the rights of Shantung in this vital matter by turning their rights over to Japan. That is the way they took care of them.

The control of Shantung means the control of China under the conditions which exist there. There is a good deal of misapprehension about the importance of the Shantung question. The control of the Shantung railway, which forms a junction with the main arterial north and south railway from Shanghai to Peking, is the control of the transportation of China. It is the military, strategic, dominating point on the Chinese coast. America is interested in that question because of well-known issues between certain peoples in the Orient and the United States, which we have been dodging for a good while, but which one of these days we will have to confront. We can not keep on dodging them.

The control of Shantung, and through the control of Shantung, the control of China, has a vital interest for the United States as well as for Japan and our ally China, whom we helped to rob and dismember in the peace conference, a peace

conference composed of the same nations that are to compose and control the league of nations. But they say they are going to be good men, that they will not do anything wrong. And yet pretty nearly everything that they do is wrong. But there seems to be an imaginary future in which they are going to be regenerated, and although they are robbing China now, and they impress various people with the principle of self-determination and claim that in the future this league of nations is going to be righteous. That is just a picture that is just imaginary. You judge people by what they do, not by what they tell you they are going to do.

I met a man the other day in the corridor of the Capitol, an acquaintance of mine, who is almost a fanatic on the subject of the league of nations, and he began to denounce the Shantung outrage. "Oh," I said, "I thought you were in favor of the league of nations?" He said, "I am in favor of the league of nations." "Oh," I said, "you are in favor of the league of nations, but you do not like what the league of nations does. Is that it?" He admitted that was the situation.

I do not understand how people can be for an institution when they disapprove of the principal things that the institution effects.

President Wilson said in his speech the other day at one of the cities in which he was speaking, that we could not have prevented France and England from giving Shantung, the Chinese Province where the grave of their old leader and mentor of centuries, Confucius, is located, to Japan. That may possibly be true, but if we could not prevent France and England from giving Shantung to Japan, that was not any reason why we should join with them and help to carry out the transaction and ourselves sign the guaranty. France and England had some excuse for their conduct. We did not have any at all. France and England had the excuse of secret treaties made in the desperate urgency of a war for their existence. France and England had been carrying on the war for their existence and for civilization for three years before the President was induced to cast in the influence of the United States on their side. That is why they made these treaties, or at least it was an incident of that war. They had some excuse, but we were not even in the war when the first steps toward these treaties were taken. We ought to have been in, but we were not. We were not bound by any such treaty, the President's excuse for the dismembering of our ally in the war. Previous to the time of those treaties that France and England made with Japan, one of the means by which France and England were trying to preserve their national existence in the desperate struggle in which they were engaged, what was the President doing? The President was trying at that time to bring about a peace while Germany was in possession of Belgium and northern France. The President shortly before those treaties were made was using the mighty influence of this Nation to bring about a peace without victory, which would have meant a German peace. Our situation was quite different from that of France and Great Britain on the Shantung question. We had no such justification. But even supposing that France and Great Britain had no excuse at all—and I am not saying that their excuse is sufficient, I am only relating the circumstances, it was an outrage in whatever light it is regarded—but suppose they had no excuse, when we see a gang of powerful burglars break into a house we may not be able to stop them, but that is not any reason why we should join them and help to burglarize the house. The argument that Japan would have a cause of complaint against us if we do not agree to the transaction is quite transparent. We are under no obligation to Japan in regard to Shantung, and yet it is said by writers and speakers of influence that if we do not sign this treaty giving Shantung to Japan, Japan will have cause for war against us. She will not have anything of the kind. We are under no obligation to sign that instrument. We never agreed to do it. Japan has no right to expect or to claim that we should do it. We are entirely free agents in the matter. The attempt to coerce and terrorize the public opinion of the United States on this great question by the false assertion that we are liable to have war with Japan or with France or with England if we do not join in the rape of China is a rank deceit attempted to be practiced upon the people. There is no such danger. There is no such condition.

The President says the league of nations will help China to get her rights back. How can the league of nations help her to get her rights back when the nations that control the league of nations are the very ones which have taken her rights and her province and the key to her empire from her.

But the President tells the good Presbyterians who are for the league of nations but against the rape of China that Japan has promised to give Shantung back to China. Who promised?

What right did he have to promise, or to bind Japan? None whatever. The Japanese Government has made no such promise. Whoever it was that made such a promise, if there ever was such promise made, I should like to ask the President, if I may do so respectfully, did he say when Japan would give Shantung back to China? I have never yet heard any dates mentioned. The fact of the case is he expressly refused to say when they would give it back.

If President Wilson has a promise from anyone that Shantung will be restored to China within any definite time known to man, will he advise the people whom he is addressing on that subject when that time will arrive? That particular time will never arrive because there is no such particular time; it has not been designated, and the promise, if it was made, is perfectly worthless, in the first place, because the man who made it had no right to speak for the Japanese Government, and, in the second place, because the promise to do something when you do not fix a time for doing it amounts to nothing.

The President asks, Will we go to war with France and Great Britain for Shantung? Does the President think we will have to go to war with France and Great Britain if we keep our fingers out of this dirty business? In other words, did the President sign the agreement to give a part of China to Japan under compulsion, in order to keep the United States out of war with Japan, France, and Great Britain? How could there be a war as long as we are going to have a league of nations to enforce peace? Was it for the same reason we gave Great Britain equal rights with ourselves in our own Panama Canal? If it was not for that purpose what was the President's purpose in joining in the deed?

Does the language of the twenty-third article obligating the members of the league to provide for the free transit of the commerce of all the members mean free trade? If it does not mean free trade, what does it mean? If it means something else, why did the covenant not state what it means? Was it purposely left in this form, as a joker in the league, so that the free-trade countries of Europe, seeking an American market, could place their own interpretation upon this clause, so as to carry out the well-known free-trade policies of Col. House and President Wilson? Freedom of transit of commerce means freedom of transit of the commodities of commerce from the point of shipment to the point of destination, and in international shipments, referred to in this covenant, that means free trade.

The removal of economic barriers means free trade. That was in the 14 points of peace. Is the "freedom of transit of commerce" simply another and a higher stage of existence of this same bug? Did it have any relationship to the shipment of Texas cotton?

The President himself affords the strongest argument against the league. He said at Des Moines, Saturday, September 6, 1919, that our labor conference could not perform its functions until we know what is to be done with the peace treaty. He said at another time that the high cost of living was due to delay in ratifying the peace treaty, which contains the league of nations. The war has been over for 10 months; and yet the President says the settlement of our most vital social and economic problems is so tied up with Europe by this instrument that we can not settle them except in connection with this treaty. If the President has succeeded in so binding us to Europe by his half year's negotiations, that we can not hold a labor conference, or suppress Bolshevism—the President says we can not suppress Bolshevism unless we have a league of nations or reduce the high cost of living without the adoption of a league of nations—why, then, we should not delay a moment in freeing ourselves from the entanglement if we are tied up in that way.

According to the President our domestic economy is tied up in the peace treaty with Europe which he has brought back. If that is so the whole treaty should be rejected at once, and the economic independence of the Nation reasserted.

Will the President explain how the league of nations will reduce the cost of living? I understand he has said that it would. I should like to understand how it would. Will he point out in plain terms what the league of nations will have to do with a labor conference called to consider domestic labor conditions? If an international labor conference is desired can one not be called without having a league of nations? Will the President assert to the people that an international labor conference, supposing that such a conference is desirable, can not be called without the formation of a league of nations?

The President says intervention in Europe is an accomplished fact, and no longer open to debate. It is true we intervened in the German war because it was a menace to the United States. Our own vital interests were involved. If Germany had occupied France and then proceeded to conquer Eng-

land, it would only have been the question of a brief time until she would have consolidated her resources and attacked the United States. There has been a good deal of idealistic talk about why we went into the German war. That is the reason we went into it. We went into it to save our independence. It was our duty to go into it to cooperate with those who were standing against Germany, while we had a chance to cooperate, in order that we would not have to stand against her alone. That is why we went into the German war. Remember that, when you hear talk about the alleged fact that we had no interest in this war and that we went into it as unselfish servants of mankind, we did go into it as servants of mankind, and we served mankind in the greatest way in which mankind could be served, by preserving this Republic as a beacon light for all the world.

It was the only emergency of the kind that has arisen since the Nation was founded. It was a special occasion. When we intervened we did so upon our own independent judgment as a Nation, the people and Government of the United States freely determining their course by existing circumstances, and not under compulsion of a bond executed beforehand, and not under the direction or coercion of a league of nations. The action of the United States was based on the vital interests of its people. The action of a league of nations would be based upon the interests of those who controlled the league. The proposed league would be wholly controlled by Europe and its Asiatic allies and dependencies. The action of the United States was determined by the interests of the people of the United States.

Such a European emergency, threatening civilization and menacing the independence of the United States, is not likely to arise again for 50 years. When it does arise, be it soon or late, are the people of the United States, of that generation, who will be required to submit their bodies and their treasure to meet the emergency, to be free to govern their own action according to the conditions which will then exist, and which we can not possibly foresee, or are they to be obligated in advance to enter the conflict under the direction of a league of nations or be confronted by the alternative of repudiating the bond which we of this generation placed upon them? Is the United States to bind itself in advance to participate in every European war because it participated in this one? Then by our victory, if that is the case, we have gained not peace but a heritage of war.

But the President says the league of nations is merely advisory. If it is merely advisory, how can it be a league to enforce peace? How can it be merely advisory if it has the power to coerce by economic strangulation, described in detail by the President in his recent speeches? If our obligations in the league are not contractual but moral and subject to our own discretion, as stated by the President, by what authority can the league undertake to enforce those obligations by embargoes and economic isolation? If the league is merely advisory and obedience to its decrees rests merely in the good judgment of its members, as the President states, then why have a league at all? Why not have merely an advisory council, if the league of nations is to be merely an advisory council?

But if the obligations of the members of the league are not merely discretionary, but contractual; if the instrument is really a constitution, as it was first called, or a covenant, as it is now called; if the council and body of delegates of the league have the power to enforce the decrees of the league by economic strangulation; if disobedience of its decrees constitutes an act of war; if "force is in the background," as the President says; if it is to have, as the covenant provides, supervision of the trade in arms and munitions of war; if the army or the navy of a member of the league can not be increased without the permission of the league, as the covenant covenants, however vital the emergency; if every demand or controversy that is made against the United States by any other nation, about any matter whatever, is to be submitted to the league for determination—if these things are true, as I assert they are true—then is it not a super-government?

If the league is merely advisory it is useless, because we can accomplish the purpose without a great institution of this kind by having an advisory council which you could write in six lines on a sheet of note paper. If it is mandatory, however, it is a despotism. I think that is a sound deduction of the alternative upon the differing constructions of the character of the league of nations. If it is to be merely advisory, we do not need it. If its powers are mandatory, then it is a despotism.

How can either the honor, the self-respect, the independence, or the material welfare of the United States continue to exist if Japan or Great Britain, by withholding the unanimous vote required in the council of the league, can deny permission to the United States to increase its Army or Navy, curb its power, and control its means of defense at sea? You may say that

they do not intervene unless territory is attacked. How about rights at sea? No nation, however great, can continue prosperous unless it preserves its rights upon the great thoroughfares of commerce, upon the high seas of the world. What is said about that? Some of our wars have been fought about that. Suppose we have an international conflict or controversy about the safety of our commerce, the rights of our sailors, the freedom of our ships upon the great oceans, where we have as much right as any other nation has, where no nation is sovereign? If this league of nations can intervene about such a controversy, then it can control the destinies of this country.

How can the Nation continue to exist if Japan or Great Britain, by withholding the unanimous vote required in the league of nations, can prevent the protection of our citizens abroad and so suppress and control our status in the world? Such protection is essential to the dignity, the honor, the prosperity, and, I think, the existence of the Nation. It must not only protect its own territory, but the aegis of its laws should follow its citizens wherever they go, in the myriad paths of commerce, and give them that protection to which the laws of nations entitle them. If the league of nations has jurisdiction to determine disputes over such matters it will control the status of the United States in its relations to other nations throughout the world.

But, it is said, the nations that will control this league are our friends. Mr. President, there is no such thing as friendship in State affairs. They are our friends when it is to their interest to be our friends. Their own national interests, the commerce, the food, the prosperity of their own people, are of more concern to them than our interests, and from their standpoint it is proper that it should be so. Now, this of course is quite elementary, but it seems necessary in dealing with idealists to recall and set before them in very plain terms elementary principles.

But it is said that this council will be just and fair. Why is it supposed that they will be just and fair? The representatives of these nations sitting at the peace conference have not been so at all times. Why is it supposed that they will be more just or fair or generous when they get upon the council of the league of nations?

This is one of the illusions of the league fanatics. There is no reason to be found either in any observation of human nature or in the teachings of history to suppose that the men of state, sitting on the council of the league of nations, promoting the interests of their people, will be anything but crafty, shrewd, nationally selfish, and internationally cruel and despotic. Mr. Wilson found them so at the peace conference. Why has he the delusion that he will not find them so when he finds them invested with the veto powers of the league of nations?

The assumption that virtue has completely triumphed over evil in the hearts of international statesmen, and that the American people can trust their rights and liberties to the benevolence of the council of a league of nations is what President Wilson has so aptly described in referring to the result of others of his own acts, the "metaphysical tragedy of to-day." It cost the blood and tears of centuries to learn that the only safe protection of a people is to keep their government and the control of their vital interests in their own hands.

A former Government official of the United States advises his countrymen to ratify the league of nations without reservations. I am referring to a statement which was published in the newspapers a few days ago by a prominent former official of the Government, now out of office. He says we should sign this league of nations covenant just as it stands, without delay, and then that we immediately should send a delegation to the league of nations and appeal to them to protect the institutions of the United States. I say that the man who gives that advice to the people is a traitor to his country.

The Kaiser, the socialists, the communists, the anarchists, the Bolsheviks, and a certain element of those who are in favor of a league of nations, are all internationalists. I do not know but that they all are, but I do not like to make it absolutely inclusive. There may be some advocates of the league of nations who think they are not internationalists, but most of them are internationalists. So is the Kaiser, so are the anarchists, so are the communists, so are the Bolsheviks. They all believe in the doctrine of internationalism. They all favor—those that I have characterized—a central world authority based on force and overriding national lines.

Mr. President, is not such a centralized superauthority in its very nature a frightful despotism? They think it is liberty. I do not see how it could be, in its very nature, anything but a despotism. What reason or experience is there to assume that it is not? Frightful consequences would ensue from it if it is. Is it this internationalism that affords the explanation of the

President's declaration that the day of seeking our national advantage has passed?

Under our form of government the majority rules. But the powers of even the majority are special and limited. Even the majority can not do everything. A conspicuous feature of our Constitution is the bill of rights, founded on the immortal charter of George Mason in the Virginia constitution, in which she established her independence from Great Britain, guarding and entrenching by express mention the rights of the individual. But this is not all. "The powers not delegated to the United States by the Constitution, nor prohibited by it to the States, are reserved to the States, respectively, or to the people." I recognize and submit to the rule of the majority subject to the limitations of liberty; but I do not recognize in the President, nor in Congress, nor in the majority, should such a majority ever exist, any authority to transfer by means of a world constitution, or a world covenant, my allegiance in any attribute of government from the United States to a combination of foreign powers.

This "covenant" of the league of nations, which we are discussing, is not a treaty. It is a constitution of government. It does not establish a condition to be dealt with by the independent action of the parties to the arrangement, as in the case of a treaty. It sets up an elaborately organized government outside of, separate, and apart from the Government of the United States. We have never had a treaty that ever did that. It invests this organization with vast governmental powers. It contains no bills of rights. It makes no reservation of powers not specifically granted. It undertakes to transfer to a permanent government in Europe powers which our people have vested in the President, in Congress, under their control.

No such new constitution of government, even if its powers were vested in our own Nation, could be established without a submission to the people or to the States. The imperious and autocratic demand of the President that it must be adopted in the exact form in which he has proposed it is too great a departure from our conception of freedom to receive consideration.

FOREIGN FINANCIAL OPERATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2472) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, I am in favor of the pending bill. I shall therefore be brief in discussing the amendment I have to propose. Not only do I think that this bill should pass at an early date, but I am going to be one of those who will assist the majority here in preparing and passing at the earliest date the proper reconstruction measures that we ought to pass. Our country is in a perilous position. A way-faring man can see that, and I believe he will serve his country well now, even though he be in the minority, as I am, if he will but honestly and fairly assist in passing the bills that are so necessary to stabilize the country. So I regard this measure as a constructive measure which should receive favorable action.

While this bill is important, and the business interests to which it relates are important to our country, it is not the only subject requiring attention. I want to take 10 minutes of the time of the Senate to call attention to another problem that presents itself for solution.

The United States has loaned to the allied and associated powers of the Great War over \$10,000,000,000. These figures do not include the loan made, or alleged to have been made, last Saturday. I do not know the exact amount of that alleged loan. These figures I am about to read are four days old. We have loaned—

Belgium.....	\$343,445,000.00
Cuba.....	10,000,000.00
Czechoslovakia.....	55,330,000.00
France.....	3,047,974,777.24
Great Britain.....	4,316,000,000.00
Greece.....	48,236,629.05
Italy.....	1,587,675,945.99
Liberia.....	5,000,000.00
Roumania.....	30,000,000.00
Russia.....	187,729,750.00
Serbia.....	20,780,465.56
Total.....	9,658,172,567.84

Mr. President, I am an optimist. My spectacles are always tinted with the hues of the rainbow. I instinctively and naturally see the pleasant side of all things, in war or peace. But optimist as I am, I doubt very much if thinking men believe that this money loaned to European powers is going to be paid back; at least paid back soon. I ask Senators to arise, if they think the European loans are going to be paid back to us, and tell me who will repay, and when will be repaid, if at all, the loan we made to Russia? The morning papers announce that a further loan will be made to European Governments.

Mr. President, we should be just as well as generous, we should be fair to our own people and just to them before we are generous to strangers.

Having loaned upward of \$10,000,000,000 to these insolvent countries, we hesitate and pitifully flounder as to whether or not we will lend to our own soldiers \$500,000,000, or one-third the amount we have already loaned to Italy. How can the American people think well of their Congress when we ladle out with a lavish hand \$10,000,000,000 and threaten to ladle out \$5,000,000,000 more to countries that may yet become our enemies, to countries that have not assisted us in any way, and then we deprive the American soldier of the opportunity to get a loan from his Government?

So, Mr. President, I shall offer an amendment to this bill which will provide that \$500,000,000 shall be loaned to returned soldiers who wish to borrow. I am not going to insult the soldier by giving him anything; a man who walks uprightly and courageously does not want any gifts, any largess, or any bounties. Some time ago I took a modest part in securing the passage of an amendment to a bill granting a bonus of \$60 to each honorably discharged soldier. I have received a few letters thanking me for such action, but I have received scores of letters from soldiers denouncing me for the insult I offered to the soldier in proposing to give him money. Make no mistake, the American soldier in this country is not an object of charity. He was not afraid of German gas, he was not afraid of hissing rockets and exploding shells. He wants to stand before the world as a man with no gift money in his pocket. But I voted for the bounty of \$60 that was paid to the soldier and urged it in three speeches, and now I find that the soldier has a truer, larger conception of manhood than I have. He does not want any gifts or any charity, but he does feel that his Government should lend him money with which he can purchase a farm.

This amendment I am going to propose is the Mondell bill, which has been reported favorably by the House Committee on the Public Lands. I have simply taken the Mondell bill, already reported favorably from the Committee on the Public Lands of the House. I have not changed a word of it, because that bill has had the careful, deliberate consideration of a great committee of the House. They have heard the evidence, and they have reported the bill favorably. The bill provides, in substance, that the sum of \$500,000,000 will ultimately be placed in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior, and that working through the State land boards, working through the executive officers of the various States, loans may be made to soldiers who desire to procure them. It will be repaid in 40 years with interest at the rate of 4 per cent per annum.

Mr. President, I should like to see a roll call and see the Senator or the Representative who will stand up and say, "I have said nothing when billions were loaned to foreign Governments, but I voted 'No' when it came to lending my own soldiers money at 4 per cent interest."

This bill, I say, carefully safeguards the interests of the Treasury. It has been recommended by President Wilson. But possibly President Wilson is now so hotly pursued by partisan opponents that his recommendation amounts to little, though his recommendation has weight with me. But even if the President's recommendation should amount to nothing with some Senators, I call attention to the fact that Secretary Lane, one of the great statesmen of our country, one of the towers of strength in the Cabinet, recommends this bill.

Then some Senators may say, "While it is true that the President has recommended this bill, and Secretary Lane has recommended the bill, we fear it is partisan; we fear that it has not been investigated sufficiently."

I call attention to the fact that former President Roosevelt recommended this very bill. So upon all grounds I conclude that we ought to pay some attention to this measure. I hope, but I do not expect, that it will be adopted by the Senate at this particular time. I see the distinguished chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Lands has come in. With his splendid leadership he has just put through a bill looking to the unlocking of our coal lands that have been tied up 10 years. I hope the Senator will convene his committee and bring into the Senate a bill providing for loans to soldiers. And I repeat here, because the Senator was out when I stated it before, if we can lend to Russia \$187,000,000, why can we not lend \$500,000,000 to our own soldiers?

I believe in being generous with those who have been just and generous with us. This money we are giving to Russia and Liberia and Bulgaria has been earned by the toil of the American people; it has been extracted from their pockets by taxation laws, and let us begin now the policy of being just to the American people before we are generous to anybody else.

Mr. President, I said a moment ago, and I repeat, that the returned soldier is in favor of this bill. I call attention to the fact that at the St. Louis caucus of the American Legion, which was held last May, a resolution was introduced proposing to give to each returned soldier six months' pay. A debate was had, and that resolution was unanimously defeated, and in the course of the discussion young Theodore Roosevelt said he was opposed to the six months' bounty, because the soldiers who saved this Government did not propose "to take anything out of the Government, but to put something into the Government." That statement by young Roosevelt sounded like a bugle call from the Mighty Hunter who reached the end of the long trail on the 6th of last January. "We are here not to take something out of the Government, but to put something in." Reflect on that.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Arizona a question?

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly.

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask for information. I am not very familiar with the amendment which the Senator is about to offer to the pending measure. Is the loan which is proposed to be made to the soldier conditioned upon his entering on the public domain?

Mr. ASHURST. No; it is not. The Senator will pardon me if I give an extended reply. As I said, I took the so-called Mondell bill, which has been reported favorably to the House of Representatives and which proposes ultimately to appropriate \$500,000,000, and the money will be spent through the agencies of the executive departments of the various States. For instance, a returned soldier in Vermont desires to obtain a farm in Vermont. Under the bill the Government will advance him money to purchase the farm if he wishes to. A returned soldier in Florida wishes to drain some of the swamp lands in his State. He may obtain a loan from his Government at 4 per cent, repayable in 40 years, to reclaim those lands.

There is, of course, an idea that the western arid and irrigable lands, of which we have a vast area, will be reclaimed, and that the water will be stored and put upon them. But the bill in no sense limits its operations to the arid and irrigable lands. In other words, there will be about \$10,000,000 that will be available to each State to lend to the soldiers. It is intended that the soldier will get the benefit of what we call the increment. Instead of having to pay for the increment, he would become the beneficiary of it; he would reap the benefit of the growing value by taking raw lands where possible.

Mr. CUMMINS. This money is not to be loaned, then, directly to the soldier? It is to be expended in the interest of the soldier by the several States?

Mr. ASHURST. Upon such particular land as the soldier may wish. It is my judgment that in the operation of this bill the soldier could identify a tract of land in Iowa, Arizona, Texas, Florida, or Pennsylvania, or any other State.

Mr. CUMMINS. Suppose the soldier wanted to go into some other business than agriculture. Why should not the Government lend him money for that purpose as well as for agriculture?

Mr. ASHURST. I agree with the Senator that it should. As I say, I think the bill grants ample authority, although I may not be correct about that. I am in favor of that, and would not oppose an amendment to that effect. It makes land the basis of the loan. I think I would support such an amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. It is for the benefit of the soldier and not for the benefit of any particular vocation or calling. So I can not see why, if we are going to do this for the soldier in order to enable him to become a more efficient member of society, we should not extend the privilege to any kind of safe enterprise into which a soldier might desire to enter.

Mr. ASHURST. The suggestion of the Senator is apparently irresistible; that is, there seems to be no answer, and standing alone there is no answer to it. My judgment is that that would better be put in a separate and independent bill, because the problem of all nations from the time of the wars of Cæsar down to this very hour has been how to get the soldier back into community life. After the Revolutionary War there was such a vast domain lying west and north of the Ohio River awaiting the settler that the soldier could find land easily, and after the Civil War there was a mighty migration of discharged soldiers that built up the plains and the Western States. But now since we have not very much public land left that is desirable unless reclaimed, that would raise crops without irrigation or some improved and scientific methods of farming, it has been deemed wise by those who have investigated to enact such a law.

But the point I want to emphasize here to-day is that \$10,000,000,000 have been loaned to foreign governments, and yet we are

told in the public prints and elsewhere that the bill providing for the loan of half a billion dollars to our soldiers is in peril.

Mr. CUMMINS. The difficulty is, as I see it, that the bill would provide for a loan to possibly one-fiftieth or one-twentieth part of all our soldiers and the remaining forty-nine fiftieths or nineteen-twentieths would receive no benefit whatever from it. That, it seems to me, would be rather a serious discrimination between men who were equally brave and equally patriotic.

Mr. ASHURST. Yes; it would be. Let me call the Senator's attention to the fact that the bill provides for the purchase and ultimate ownership of a house in the city. This is my information, that the Mondell bill provides for a home settlement.

Mr. SMOOT. No; the Senator is mistaken.

Mr. ASHURST. I will stand corrected if the bill does not provide for that, but the policy of this legislation was to deal with soldier settlements, to get them into the world of production. There is a widespread outcry against the high cost of living. The high cost of living, of course, is the inevitable, the natural, result of a long war. The high cost of living is a phenomenon which has made itself manifest after every great war, because during the war so many millions of men are withdrawn from civil life, from the industrial and productive world, and put into the destructive world. The result after a long war is a scarcity of foodstuffs and inevitably a rise in prices.

The best way, in my judgment, to bring about a lowering of the high cost of living is to increase the supply as well as to eliminate the profiteer.

So I repeat that, while that might apparently only furnish soldiers, 1 out of every 50, a farm, the money would not be spent unless it were necessary to be spent. If the soldier did not wish to avail himself of the use of it, the money would not be spent. I presume Russia or perhaps Bulgaria would get it, or we might send some of it to Turkey.

However, as I say, I have no objection to an amendment of that sort, and if the Senator sees fit to offer it I will vote for it.

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

Mr. ASHURST. Oh, certainly.

Mr. SMOOT. I would not want Senators to understand from what the Senator from Arizona says that that is the sentiment of the Public Lands Committee.

Mr. ASHURST. No; I am not a member of that committee.

Mr. SMOOT. The security that would have to be required in a case of that kind is not provided for under the provisions of the bill, and, in fact, that theory is entirely different from the theory of the bill to which the Senator is referring.

I will say to the Senator from Iowa [Mr. CUMMINS], with the permission of the Senator from Arizona—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield, of course.

Mr. SMOOT. It is the theory of this bill to give employment to the soldier and at the same time get the soldier on the land. It is following after the plans that were adopted years ago, known as the reclamation of arid lands. A soldier ultimately will have to pay back to the Government, with 4 per cent interest, every dollar advanced to him. The security provided for is the land itself, which will include the increased value of the land, with all improvements. The lands are open to entry to-day, and any citizen of the United States could make an entry upon them if it was possible to secure water to cultivate them as required by law, and, after a certain length of residence thereon and certain improvements, would be entitled to a patent to the land so entered.

The theory of the bill is to reclaim such land by providing storage water and thus provide homes for our returning soldiers. Reclamation projects similar to those created in the past under the reclamation act will be constructed to conserve the flood water, impound it, and then distribute that water upon arid land and make it as fertile land as will be found anywhere in the world. The advances for these purposes will be apportioned to the acreage under the project, and the soldier who goes upon a project under the bill has a right to employment in the construction of the works, and that will enable him to meet his first payment; that is, 10 per cent will be reserved under the bill which I introduced for the purpose of assisting in the first payment upon the land when the project is completed. The advances made are limited to certain improvements. All the advances are made to enhance the value of the land, so that every dollar that the soldier puts upon the land improves its value, and the Government securities in that way enhance every time an acre of land is plowed and by every dollar that the soldier puts upon his place, and instead of being worth, when the payments are all made, \$4,000, if that is the maximum amount drawn by him, no doubt the place will be worth twice that amount, with his home and his improvements upon it.

The bill provides that these payments, if it becomes necessary, shall extend over a period of 40 years. But remember that

the soldier is paying all the time 4 per cent upon all the deferred payments, and the Government in the end will receive every dollar that is advanced. That is a short explanation.

Mr. ASHURST. I want to thank the Senator. His explanation is more lucid than my statement, because he is more familiar with the bill than I am.

Mr. SMOOT. That explanation applies to the arid lands of the West. Then, the benefit applies to cut-over lands in the Northwest, and it also provides for the reclamation of swamp lands, and the Senator knows there are millions of acres of those lands in the United States that ought to be reclaimed, and will some time or other be reclaimed. This bill provides for the reclamation of such lands.

The theory of the bill is, and it so states, that there shall be at least one of these projects in each State, so that the amount of the money expended shall not be put in any one particular section of the United States, but shall cover the East, the West, the South, and the North.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from Utah if there is a drainage project contemplated in the bill?

Mr. SMOOT. There is, and there is a provision that allowance shall be made to a soldier for his work for the drainage of the swamp lands, just as there is a provision for assisting in the impounding of water to be used upon the arid lands. There is a provision, also, for the pulling of stumps on stump land, but I will say to the Senator that in some sections of the country it is going to cost at least \$125 to \$150 an acre to pull those stumps, but when pulled the land will become very valuable.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President—

Mr. ASHURST. I yield to the Senator from Iowa.

Mr. CUMMINS. I had just enough information about the bill to prompt my inquiry to the Senator from Arizona, and the remarks just made by the Senator from Utah confirm the impression I had generally of the bill. It is really not a bill which assists or extends aid by way of a loan to soldiers. The primary purpose of the bill is to bring under cultivation a greater area of land than is now in use. That is a very worthy purpose, but I am very much afraid that in tempting the soldier into the enterprise involved in either draining land or irrigating land or occupying cut-over land, instead of relieving him in any way or putting him in a position in which he may be a productive member of society, we are, in fact, imposing a very great burden upon him if he yields to the temptation to take the land.

Mr. ASHURST. Just let me say there that if the American soldier could face the German gas and shells and cooties that had military training, he will be willing to face a little American soil if he thinks it will develop into a home; and if he can obtain a home in his own country, he will face those hardships.

Mr. CUMMINS. For my part, if we desire to do this thing in an effective way and for the benefit of the soldier, I would much rather offer to loan to the soldier a sum of money that would enable him to buy a farm in North Dakota, the eastern part of it anyhow, or a farm in Iowa, Illinois, or Wisconsin, than to hold out this glittering generality that there is a fortune in irrigated lands.

Mr. ASHURST. You are not holding out to the soldier a false promise. Only 20 years ago there were lands in the West, not only in my State but in other States, raw lands that were dreary, that could be purchased for \$2 or \$3 an acre or even for a lower price than that, and after intelligent effort and water had been applied to them, we find they have a value of at least \$200 an acre. There is an abundance of that sort of land left.

Mr. CUMMINS. I realize that, Mr. President, and no one can exceed me in the hope that all these lands may be reclaimed; I think they ought to be reclaimed; but we have had enough experience to know that it is not a poor man's project. It is rich land, I am aware, that only needs water to make it the most fruitful region of the earth; but it will have cost \$150 or \$200 or \$250 an acre when it shall have reached that stage of development which will afford any return whatever. That, to me, is not quite in harmony with the general idea of furnishing to the soldiers of our returning Army money with which to buy property that can within a reasonable time become productive. I want to speed the reclamation of these lands in every way that I can, but if we are doing it for the benefit of the soldier and not for the benefit of the country as a whole, I had much rather furnish him a loan of money which he could immediately utilize for the purpose of entering some business or enterprise that was not so far in the future in its promise of returns.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, the Committee on the Public Lands of the other House had that very suggestion brought before them, though, of course, not so well put as the Senator puts it; in fact, they had six or seven different propositions before them. One was to grant to each soldier a bounty of six months' pay; another to grant him a bounty of three months' pay; but after many weeks of investigation, it was ascertained that the sentiment of the soldier was that the soldier did not want any gift, did not want any bounty, but was a man ready to earn his own living if only given a fair chance.

Mr. CUMMINS. I glory in that.

Mr. ASHURST. Certainly; the soldier wants to become a part of the substantial realty-holding community, to own a farm. If he does not wish the farm, he need not take it; of course, he would not be compelled to go there. I shall be glad to vote for any other legislation which will lend money to the soldier upon security.

Mr. CUMMINS. Then why not pass a bill which will loan to each soldier a sum of money proportionate to the entire appropriation, which he may use for any purpose for which he desires to employ it, if he shall give to the Government fair and reasonable security for its repayment?

Mr. ASHURST. I have not the slightest objection to such legislation.

Mr. CUMMINS. Why limit it merely to those who want to become farmers? Second, why limit it to those who want to enter upon the arid lands of the country or upon the swamp lands of the country or upon the cut-over lands of the country? It seems to me that if you put such reservations upon it, you have done very little for the soldier.

Mr. ASHURST. The limitation is made because when you give a man an opportunity to enter upon the arid lands or the swamp lands after they have been reclaimed, you have given him an opportunity to become independent if not opulent for his lifetime. Lend him \$1,500, \$2,000, \$5,000; I have no objection to that; but he would prefer to have a loan where he could have 40 years in which to repay. He will repay it easily in 10 years, if he so desires, after the land has been reclaimed.

When the vast irrigation systems of the West were initiated some of us feared that the settlers could not repay the advances within the 10 years, and my distinguished colleague [Mr. SMITH of Arizona] secured the passage of a bill extending the time of payment from 10 to 20 years. We now find, however, that it is not a hardship for them to repay the money, so rich are the lands that have been reclaimed and to such high prices have food products and other products of the farm mounted.

I thank the Senator from Iowa for his statesmanlike suggestion as to the bill before us, but the particular subject the committee has reported is a bill establishing community life for the farmer. I am sure that the Senate will in due time take up the other questions.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to include in the RECORD as a part of my remarks the report of the House Committee on Public Lands and also a letter signed by Col. Henry D. Lindsley, chairman of the national executive committee of the American Legion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ASHURST. I will tender the amendment and shall ask a vote upon it at the appropriate time.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I call the attention of the Senator from Arizona to a condition that has arisen in reference to the House bill as reported?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes; that is the bill I have offered as an amendment to the pending bill.

Mr. SMOOT. I understood that the Senator had offered that bill as an amendment to the pending bill?

Mr. ASHURST. Yes.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to say to the Senator from Arizona that I have received a letter from the Interior Department, and I have also had Mr. Cory, who has this particular matter in hand for the Secretary of the Interior, call upon me to point out a number of provisions of the House bill that should not be agreed to. He has given his reasons why they should not. On that account I will say to the Senator from Arizona that I should not like to vote for the amendment as now framed as an amendment to the pending bill.

However, I will say further to the Senator that as chairman of the Committee on Public Lands I expect before many days to call the committee together to begin the consideration of the soldiers' settlement bill. I have applications from, I suppose, 50 people from different parts of the United States asking that they be allowed to be heard upon the bill. I recognize the fact that there is great opposition to the bill, coming from a great many sources. I do not feel justified in saying that those people

should not be heard. Therefore, I am going to ask the Public Lands Committee to set a day for hearings and to continue such hearings until we get through with those asking to be heard. After the hearings I shall ask the committee to consider the bill; and if we can agree upon the bill and amendments to it, which will justify reporting the bill to the Senate, I expect to do that. Then we can discuss it pro and con until the Senate itself decides as to whether or not it wishes to enact the proposed legislation.

Mr. ASHURST. Mr. President, with the assurances that have been made by the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT], who is the chairman of the Senate Committee on Public Lands, that he will convene his committee very soon and give this question a complete and independent examination, without relating it to other subjects, I shall withdraw the amendment which I have proposed.

The report referred to is as follows:

[House Report No. 216, Sixty-sixth Congress, first session.]

Mr. SINNOTT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, submitted the following report:

The Committee on the Public Lands, to whom was referred the bill (H. R. 487) providing employment and rural homes for those who have served with the military and naval forces through the reclamation of lands to be known as the national soldier settlement act, having considered the same, report it to the House with the recommendation that it do pass, with sundry amendments which appear at the end of this report.

The committee has given the most patient and thorough consideration to the matter of framing a comprehensive constructive program in the interest of our returning soldiers.

Broadly, the problem is how to absorb them into our national life on terms that shall be satisfactory to them and profitable to the Nation. Specifically, the problem as presented in all of the bills referred to the committee is how to furnish them with immediate employment and to open the way to self-sustaining homes on the land, and how to furnish them with the necessary capital.

The basis of the discussion has been H. R. 487, introduced by Representative MOXDELL, of Wyoming, but the committee has encouraged the freest expression of opinion on every aspect of the subject. As a consequence, the testimony has covered a wide range, and developed a variety of opinion. But there is one thing on which all agreed: Something should be done for the soldier. As a means of showing how the committee has reached its own conclusions, it will be helpful briefly to review various propositions which have been advanced as substitutes for the legislation proposed by the Secretary of the Interior, indorsed by the President and embodied in several bills that have come to the committee.

VARIOUS SUBSTITUTES PROPOSED.

1. A bonus for all soldiers: This has been proposed in three different forms: (a) Three hundred dollars for each enlisted man, which would require a total appropriation of \$1,200,000,000; (b) a bonus of \$25 per month for each month in service, which would amount to about the same total if the average length of service was one year; (c) a bonus of \$5,000 for each soldier, which will call for \$20,000,000,000.

2. Individual farm loans: These have been proposed for various amounts and purposes, but all on the basis of the "infiltration plan," a term now commonly used to describe the method of individual settlement on scattered farms, as distinguished from the plan of community settlement. It has been proposed: (a) That a flat sum of \$4,000 be offered to each soldier for the purchase of an approved farm wherever he may select it, such advance to be made upon the basis of 100 per cent of the value, at 4 per cent interest, payable in 40 years. If all soldiers accepted the offer it would call for an appropriation of \$16,000,000,000; (b) the same proposition with a maximum loan of \$10,000, which would call for \$40,000,000,000 if accepted by all; (c) the same proposition extended to cover advances for necessary improvements, live stock, and equipment; (d) the same proposition, except that the loan shall be elastic in amount, ranging down to 50 per cent of value.

3. Loans for city or country homes: That every man returned from the colors be offered a loan of \$2,500 at a low rate of interest (4 per cent suggested), payable over 40 years' time, provided he invest the money either in a farm or in acquiring a home in city or town. Assuming the unanimous acceptance of this proposition, it would call for \$10,000,000,000.

4. Loans for all lines of business: That soldiers desiring to engage in any line of business be provided with loans of various amounts, ranging up to 100 per cent of the necessary capital. It is impossible to estimate the appropriation that would be required, but the idea is for the Nation to supply the financial backing for every soldier who desires to engage in trade, industry, or profession of whatever nature.

5. Advancing money to the States: That \$500,000,000 be apportioned among the several States on the basis of the number of men supplied to the colors, and that the States be permitted to use the money in any way they consider best for the soldier's welfare. The same suggestion was made on the basis of a larger but indefinite appropriation.

6. Leave it to private capital: That the matter be left entirely to private capital to finance, with helpful cooperation on the part of the Government in safeguarding any proposition for investors and settlers.

The problem of dealing with disbanded armies: The problem we are facing is not new in human history. It has been the problem of all countries after all great wars, and it is preeminently the problem of all countries to-day. "From Rome under Caesar, to France under Napoleon, down even to our own Civil War," said Secretary Lane in his letter of May 31, 1918, to the President and Members of Congress. "The problem arose as to what could be done with the soldiers to be mustered out of the military service."

There are two considerations to be borne in mind in dealing with the question: The first is the welfare of the soldier himself. It is incumbent upon Congress to see that no man who offered his life to protect the Nation in time of war shall come to want in time of peace. Every soldier who needs employment upon being discharged from the Army should have employment; and, so far as possible, employment at some congenial task. Moreover, it will be desirable in many instances to provide the soldier with a permanent occupation, and this should be of such a nature as to lead in the direction of genuine economic independence. The second consideration to be observed is, of course, the welfare of the Nation.

The American stock is of the colonizing breed. Not only the descendants of our earliest settlers but even our latest immigrants belong to the element which does not rest content with existing conditions, but constantly seeks to better them by reaching out to new opportunities in new lands. Our great patrimony of free public lands has been the safety valve of the Republic in the past. Lord Macaulay predicted that when this was gone—"then will come the real test of your institutions." If there was any measure of truth in the prediction, the present moment carries a challenge to the genius of American statesmanship, for the free public lands suitable for agriculture without irrigation are practically gone. Nevertheless, if the past is any guide for the present and the future, this is a challenge which must be accepted in order that the Nation shall remain sound and wholesome, and that man's conquest over the resources of nature shall go on in this and in coming generations.

In this connection it is worth while to recall how the veterans of the Revolution made their way through the almost trackless forests of the Alleghenies and planted the seeds of the great civilization we now behold both north and south of the Ohio River. It is well to recall how the veterans of the Civil War completed the occupation and development of the great region watered by the Mississippi and its tributaries, carrying their homes and farms to the extreme limit of the district where crops are assured by natural rainfall, and to the very threshold of the arid region.

There is another lesson which it is very important for us to learn from the past. The number of veterans who actually availed themselves of land opportunities at the close of former wars was small as compared with the total number engaged. Even so, the invitation to go on with the development of natural resources was effective not only in meeting the needs of the discharged soldier, but in steadying the whole fabric of industry and society at the most critical periods in our history.

As has already been said, the problem of how best to provide for the welfare of the returning soldier is not our problem alone, but equally that of all other countries. It is interesting to observe that the other great English-speaking countries—England, Canada, and Australia—are turning to the land as a means of meeting the need of the hour. England has a density of population equal to that of any American State. Its last acre of free public land disappeared centuries ago. And yet England is finding room upon her crowded soil to make more homes and farms for her soldier boys, and she is backing them in the new adventure with her money and credit. Canada and Australia have adopted most generous policies in this regard, as fully set forth in the report of the Secretary of the Interior on H. R. 487.

LEADING PRINCIPLES OF A SOUND POLICY.

In view of the foregoing considerations, the committee has decided that it is unquestionably the duty of Congress to enact legislation with the least possible delay which shall make provision for the welfare of returning soldiers, sailors, and marines; and that such legislation should be based on these principles:

First. The continuation of our historic policy of opening the way to work and homes on the land for the veterans of our wars.

Second. In the absence of any considerable area of public land suitable to the purpose, the acquisition of lands now in private ownership followed by such improvement as may be necessary, either by clearing, fertilizing, draining, or irrigating, in order to render them fit for the best forms of agriculture.

Third. The employment of soldiers wherever practicable in all departments of the work to be done on the basis of current wages to the end (a) that opportunities for remunerative work may be supplied to those who need or desire it, and (b) that the soldiers may have opportunity to accumulate the amount of money that will be required as first payment upon property subsequently allotted to them.

Fourth. The advance of limited sums of money to be used by the settlers in the construction of permanent improvements, such as houses, barns, and fences, and of other limited sums for the purchase of necessary live stock and equipment, always with a reasonable margin of security for the Government.

Fifth. The subdivision of lands into lots, farm-workers' tracts and farms and the disposal of such property upon such terms as shall, in a period of not more than 40 years, reimburse the Government for its entire outlay, with interest at 4 per cent per annum.

Sixth. The provision of reasonable safeguards against speculation in farm allotments, to the end that permanent homes shall be made in good faith.

Seventh. The colonization of soldier settlers in groups of sufficient size to enable them to take advantage of every opportunity for economy and efficiency in the purchase of supplies and sale of products and for organized social life; also to permit them to receive the full benefit of community-created values.

Eighth. The absolute solvency of the entire enterprise, alike from the standpoint of the Government and the soldier settler, and the authorization of a total expenditure of not more than \$500,000,000, but with actual appropriations made from time to time as particular projects shall be submitted to Congress by the Secretary of the Interior.

SUBSTITUTE PROPOSALS CONSIDERED.

The adoption of these fundamental principles necessarily eliminates from consideration some of the ideas which have been suggested as substitutes for H. R. 487.

The proposition for a bonus to be given to all enlisted men, involving a total immediate outlay ranging from one billion to twenty billion dollars, is not within the jurisdiction of the committee.

Practically the same observations apply to the proposal to advance capital for the purpose of setting soldiers up in any and every line of business. Except as it deals with lands now owned or hereafter to be owned by the Government, it is not within the jurisdiction of this committee.

The proposal to leave the entire question of providing for the soldiers' welfare to private enterprise and capital is, of course, in conflict with what the committee regards as the plain duty of Congress at this time, while the proposition to advance money to build or purchase homes in cities and towns is a matter which should be embodied in separate legislation, if at all. In that case, it would be the business of some other committee.

DANGERS OF INFILTRATION.

The infiltration plan is different, and, upon superficial consideration, may be regarded as a somewhat satisfactory substitute for H. R. 487. On careful analysis, however, the committee has been unable to adopt it, notwithstanding the fact that it undoubtedly commands

the earnest support of some of the sincerest friends of the movement to establish the soldiers upon the land.

In the first place, it would call for the expenditure of a vast sum of money and could not be made a sound, solvent proposition for the Government, at least if it authorized a loan for 100 per cent of the value of the property purchased, while if it did not authorize a 100 per cent loan it could be availed of only by soldiers possessing a considerable amount of money. This is true because it does not offer one hour's employment; hence, no opportunity whatever for the soldier to earn and accumulate money against the time when he will enter into the possession of his farm. For the same reason it provides no means for getting the necessary live stock, implements, and other equipment, or the necessary working capital.

The soldier settler, possibly devoid entirely of agricultural knowledge, experience, or training, would be suddenly thrown upon a farm subject to a mortgage of 100 per cent, without a horse, a cow, or a chicken; without plow, harrow, or any other agricultural tools, and without a dollar in the bank to enable him to live and make his crop. At least that would be the precise situation in very many instances; or, if not, then we would have simply shut the door in the face of the soldier whose sole assets are strong arms, and a sturdy heart—the very man who merits first consideration.

In other words, the infiltration plan fails utterly to meet the situation in which a very large proportion of our soldiers find themselves at the time of demobilization.

It is argued that many more soldiers would purchase farms if they could borrow 100 per cent and locate wherever they chose, than would do so under the plan of community settlement. Undoubtedly this is true, especially if they are permitted to sell the farm at any time, as is proposed by most of the advocates of infiltration.

Analyze this argument and what do you find? First, a demand for an immediate appropriation of, say, \$10,000,000,000. This figure is named by the advocates of the plan on the basis of an average loan of \$5,000 and the expectation that at least 2,000,000 men would borrow the money, buy a farm, and take their chances in working it or trying to sell at a quick profit. But in considering the effects of the policy we must assume that the entire 4,000,000 soldiers would have the right to borrow \$5,000 each, on condition that they immediately bought farms.

Now, suppose it were announced to-morrow that the credit of the United States, to the extent of \$20,000,000,000, the aggregate amount of all four Liberty loans, has been made available for this purpose, what would be the effect on the market for country lands? Nothing less than the imagination of Jules Verne could picture the result. We should witness the greatest orgy of speculation in the history of the world. No scheme of official appraisalment that could be devised could possibly protect the soldier and the country from imposition in the sale of unfit properties at exorbitant prices. The law of supply and demand would itself go very far to boost land prices out of sight, and that at a time when existing land values are at the highest level in the history of the United States—three times as great as in 1900, 19 years ago. Four million buyers standing in line scattered over every State and every county; over every city, town, and hamlet from Maine to California, from the Lakes to the Gulf, each with \$5,000 spot cash to pay for a farm. It staggers the imagination. We reel under the thought of the consequences, even the first consequences, not to think of the ultimate outcome, the final aftermath—the "morning after."

Even under normal conditions, without artificial inflation of prices already extremely high, the soldier settler purchasing a going and paying farm in an established community would be at a disadvantage as compared with a soldier who takes advantage of "the ground floor" proposition proposed by community settlement. Nothing works more inexorably than the law of unearned increment, and in every well-established community this law has already ground its grist. On the other hand, where large tracts of unimproved land are acquired and put in condition for cultivation by wholesale operations, and where there is a simultaneous movement of hundreds of families practically at one time, followed by the creation of many public and private improvements, the law of unearned increment works to the advantage of the settler.

In the one case he is the victim of the law; in the other, the beneficiary. In the one case he pays the increment; in the other, he gets it. The history of a thousand communities throughout the United States might be cited in confirmation of this proposition, but a single instance will suffice. Let anyone consider the history of Salt Lake Valley in Utah, the earliest community settlement undertaken in the western half of the continent, and observe how the pioneer settlers were enriched to the extent of tens of millions by this principle, and he will certainly be convinced of the soundness of this view.

The conclusive argument against the infiltration plan rests, however, not upon what might happen in the future, but upon what actually has happened in the past.

Australia has led the way in formulating policies to establish homes on the land. And Australia was beguiled by the plausible argument put forth in favor of infiltration. Australia tried it, found it an absolute failure, abandoned it, adopted community settlement in its place, found it gloriously successful, and is now extending it beyond anything dreamed of at this time in the United States. Why should we adopt the model that failed in preference to the model that succeeded?

According to Dr. Elwood Mead, for nine years in charge of land settlement in Australia, as he now is in California, Australia found that it was practically impossible for the Government to exercise any effective supervision over settlers located on scattered farms. Official supervision of settlers looking to the Government for their entire capital is, of course, not only prudent but essential; first, at the time when farms are purchased, and then over the long period required for the settler to get firmly established on a solvent basis. But the mere overhead cost of travel and salaries for Government agents proved prohibitive. There was constant danger that settlers would be imposed upon in the sale of farms. Every man who had a farm for sale pursued the man eligible to borrow Government money for the purpose of buying his farm. There were many opportunities for collusion between sellers, buyers, and intermediary agents. The net result was that buyers did not get the worth of their money, while the Government was unable to devise any system of effective protection for the settler or itself.

Precisely the same difficulties hampered the Government in its effort to look after the settler and to assist him to succeed. The system was inherently unworkable. Practically the same experience was had in England, and in consequence of the lesson learned at the cost of disappointment, hardship, and pecuniary loss, England has now adopted the plan of community settlement for the benefit of her returning soldiers, fixing the minimum unit at 100 families.

PROVISIONS OF THE BILL.

The present bill has been perfected after consultation with many elements of citizenship representing many different parts of the United States. Soldiers, statesmen, sociologists, men of large affairs, practical farmers, gardeners, live-stock men, experienced administrators of the immensely successful Mormon colonization work in Utah—all have been consulted, in the hope of evolving a measure that should be founded on sound economic principles, yet made sufficiently elastic to fit the widely varying conditions which must be dealt with in different parts of the country.

The original idea was to develop projects in every State where feasible opportunities were found, and the latest reports are to the effect that such projects will be found in every State. The ideal project would be one which should offer a sufficient area to make possible complete community development and thus to afford the cooperation, assistance, encouragement, and stimulus to be found in a well-organized community. The bill, however, fixes no minimum unit either for the farm or the project. It will be entirely feasible, under the wide discretion granted to the Secretary of the Interior, acting in cooperation with State authorities, to develop a small number of contiguous farms. In this connection it is well worth while to quote the testimony of Arthur P. Davis, the Director of the United States Reclamation Service:

"We know of an attractive tract in Pennsylvania and quite a number in the State of New York. In Greene County, N. Y., there is a tract that I had better describe as being typical of others that can probably be found in other parts of the Northeast, where the settlement is supposed to be rather dense."

"Not far from Albany, in the Hudson Valley, is an area of eighteen or twenty thousand acres already in farms, and with farm buildings. The farms are usually from 154 to 400 acres, and most of them are under cultivation, but the majority are farmed by tenants. The great majority of the farms in the group I speak of are listed for sale, and I should say that the majority of the farms that are offered for sale could, at the time I looked, last December, be purchased at less than the present value of the improvements."

Secretary Lane has also directed attention to opportunities in the Northeastern States, as follows:

"We have the land; we have it in every part of this country, in the North as well as in the South. One of the richest parts of the United States is Aroostook County, Me. Maine has been deserted in part in her farming regions because the boys have had a lust for the western country that I love, and I can not blame them for that; but they have left good farms there. In Massachusetts it may surprise you to know, perhaps, that we have one little section of country around Cape Cod where there is some of the richest land in the United States, and it has been proved so in the last two or three years; and in the body of the State they have very considerable quantities of land that needs to be cared for a little bit—cut-over land that has been deserted, that needs to be brought into shape—that will make good farm land. The same thing is true in New York."

It should be said that it is not proposed, as some critics have averred, to divert men from their own States and ask them to settle in "district swamps and deserts." The idea is to find opportunities of employment and homemaking in their own State and, so far as practicable, in their own districts, unless they prefer to go elsewhere. Since there will be an average fund of something more than \$10,000,000 available for each State, it will be entirely possible to have many small projects in a given State, provided favorable opportunities are found. It will be possible also to create industrial settlements near centers of population where groups of soldiers engaged as wage earners may desire to make homes on very small farms and perpetuate the beneficent scheme of war gardens. In a word, the soldier-settlement fund is designed to assist soldiers in getting homes under the best conditions as these shall develop in practical administration.

Attention should be called to the safeguards which will surround the expenditure of the large appropriation authorized in this bill. The first actual appropriation asked for will be very small, only sufficient to enable the Secretary of the Interior to negotiate with various State commissions and enter into preliminary contracts for the acquisition of the needed lands. Each particular project and contract will then be submitted to the Committee on Appropriations and, if approved, presented for the action of Congress. Under this system the danger of serious blunders in the selection of projects would be very small indeed. Four different agencies will be brought into action before a dollar is expended in actual development, viz: First, the Secretary of the Interior, with his well-equipped organization for investigation, acting in cooperation with the farm-loan board of the district; second, the governors and their State commissions, who will doubtless cooperate with important civic bodies in their various States; third, the Committee on Appropriations, which must consider and pass upon each contract and project; fourth, both Houses of Congress, who must actually vote the appropriation before the money can be expended.

The project having been developed to a point where the lands, by restoration, clearing, drainage, or irrigation, or a combination of these, were in fit condition for utilization for farming, the area would be divided into farms of suitable size to support a family, and the price fixed on the farms, which in the aggregate will pay the cost of the project, the price of each farm to represent, as near as it is possible, its value compared with the total cost and the value of the other farms.

The soldier who has worked upon the project will be given the preference in the selection of the farms, and a payment of 5 per cent of the value fixed is to be paid at the time the farm is allotted. Assuming the average value of \$5,000 or \$6,000 per farm, this would require an initial payment of \$250 to \$300, a sum which the soldier could save in anticipation of the projects during the period of the development of the project, which would be from one to three years.

After the farms have been allotted assistance is to be given the soldier in the making of his improvements, the maximum loan provided for this purpose being \$1,500 and not in excess of three-fourths of the cost or value of improvements. The soldier's contribution to improvements could, and undoubtedly in the majority of cases would, be in the form of labor. During or in connection with the making of his improvements the soldier could by his personal efforts and work easily contribute his 25 per cent of the total cost.

Provision is also made for loans to the soldier settler for the purchase of necessary live stock and equipment, the maximum of such loans being \$1,200, or 75 per cent of the total cost of necessary live stock and 60 per cent of the cost of equipment. Here again the soldier's obligations under this class of loan could, if necessary, be met by his individual efforts. In fact, while it is assumed that in many cases the soldier would have some savings which he could utilize in getting a start, it is

believed that a man starting at the beginning of one of these projects without any capital could through industry and frugality earn and save enough to meet his initial and other payments as they become due.

APPROVED BY PUBLIC SENTIMENT.

The late President Theodore Roosevelt advocated the soldier settlement policy as proposed by Secretary Lane in the last article which he wrote for the press. President Wilson has urged it upon Congress in two messages. The governors of 27 States have appointed commissions to cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior, and all of these commissions have expressed their earnest interest in legislation of this character.

One of the strongest endorsements of the bill in its present shape has come from the officers of the Eastern States Agricultural Industrial Exposition, which has its headquarters at Springfield, Mass., but represents 10 Northeastern States—the six States of New England and New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and Delaware. This organization represents some of the strongest business interests in the country, who have inaugurated great plans looking to the systematic renewal and restoration of a prosperous agriculture throughout the northeastern part of the United States. They have discovered the very intimate relationship between industrial and agricultural prosperity and find that the existing condition under which, in the State of Massachusetts, for example, 92.8 of their entire population lives in cities, a very serious menace to their welfare. They are seeking, through the instrumentality of a permanent exposition at Springfield, to demonstrate that farming can be made a paying business and that it is possible to create more attractive conditions of rural life. These gentlemen have discovered that their work exactly parallels the policy embodied in the soldier settlement plan and have come to believe that the soldier will do as great a work for his country at home as he did abroad, while at the same time achieving an independence for himself. Hence they are urging the support of the measure by all the Members from their 10 States.

DOES THE SOLDIER WANT IT?

The most vital question that can be asked in regard to this policy is this: Does the soldier want it? The answer is: He does. The American Legion has officially indorsed the bill after a careful consideration of its provisions. Up to the present writing 112,088 soldiers have made formal application for opportunities of employment and home getting under the terms of this bill. The number, which is increasing every day, ranges all the way from 6,752 in Illinois to 80 in Delaware.

The most impressive evidence in respect to the soldiers is contained in letters from commanding officers with the American Expeditionary Forces in Germany. Maj. Gen. Mark L. Hersey, for example, in command of the Fourth Division, American Expeditionary Forces, was requested, among others, by Secretary Lane, to ascertain the feeling of his men. He states that he went into the matter "with a view to determining in actual figures the number of men in this division that would not only be interested in farming, but interested with sufficient definiteness to take up the work should the plan be put into effect." He reports in detail upon each regiment, the net result being as follows:

"Present strength, officers and enlisted men, 23,363."

"Number interested in soldier settlement plan, 4,595."

Gen. Hersey expresses his own opinion as follows:

"The men who are returning to America from the European battle fields have given to their country the best they have. They have paid their debt to America; not in full perhaps, but in full up to the present time. It is up to the United States to take care of them; to exercise over them a proper degree of paternalism; to make them feel that what they have given up in order to come to the war will be made good by the Government. These men are coming with a higher respect for American institutions and for constituted authority than they ever had before. They are thoroughly good citizens who need only the ties that bind them to the land, that give them a sense of proprietorship in the soil, that impel each man to establish his own home and to rear his own family. All these your proposed plan should furnish. I am heartily in favor of it. I hope you may push it to a successful conclusion. Several of the division staff officers have received letters similar to the one that was sent to me. I might say that this letter voices their sentiments as well as my own."

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
New York City, September 5, 1919.

The honorable Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, Washington, D. C.

Sirs: The attention of the joint national executive committee of the American Legion has been called to misrepresentations made to Congress with respect to the legion's attitude toward the soldier settlement bill (H. R. 487). The committee particularly refers to a letter inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 2, 1919, appearing on page 4624 thereof. In order that Members of Congress may be correctly advised as to the attitude of the American Legion toward H. R. 487, the soldier settlement bill, the following is respectfully submitted by the national executive committee of the American Legion:

"The American Legion has never gone on record in favor of H. R. 487 or any other specific land legislation now before Congress. The following resolution was adopted at the St. Louis caucus of the American Legion, held May 8, 1919, on this particular subject:

"Whereas the reclamation of arid, swamp, or cut-over timber lands is one of the great constructive problems of immediate interest to the Nation; and

"Whereas one of the questions for immediate consideration is that of presenting to discharged soldiers and sailors an opportunity to establish homes and create for themselves a place in the field of constructive effort; and

"Whereas one of the purposes for which the formation of the American Legion is contemplated is to take an energetic interest in all constructive measures designed to promote the happiness and contentment of the people, and to actively encourage all proper movements of a general nature to assist the men of the Army and Navy in solving the problems of wholesome existence; and

"Whereas the Department of the Interior and the Reclamation Service have been engaged in formulating and presenting to the country broad, constructive plans for the reclamation of arid, swamp, or cut-over timber lands; Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the caucus of delegates to the American Legion in convention assembled in the city of St. Louis, Mo., That we indorse the efforts heretofore made for the reclamation of lands, and respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States the adoption at an early

date of broad and comprehensive legislation for economic reclamation of all lands susceptible of reclamation and production."

Preliminary to carrying out this resolution, the joint national executive committee of the American Legion at its headquarters, No. 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York City, on July 8, 1919, adopted a resolution authorizing the chairman to immediately appoint three members of the legion to devote the necessary time to a thorough study of the subject and to cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior in effectuating the resolution of the St. Louis caucus indorsing the principle of land development.

The above action was taken after a representative of the Secretary of the Interior had appeared before the national executive committee of the American Legion in order to explain the provisions of the soldiers' settlement bill. The Secretary of the Interior had requested this privilege and the courtesy was, therefore, extended to his representative. It was definitely decided, however, that pending the results of the study to be made of the committee of three, appointed to consider the subject of land legislation, the American Legion would take no action on the Mondell bill, or any other specific legislation of this kind. It is the intention now, however, to take no action on this subject until the first annual convention of the American Legion, which is to be held in Minneapolis on November 11, 1919.

It is not the policy of the American Legion to attack or oppose other veteran societies; therefore, the insinuations cast against the American Legion in the letter which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are not discussed as they have no bearing on the subject matter of this letter.

Very respectfully,

HENRY D. LINDSLEY,
Chairman National Executive Committee.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, I have been very much impressed with the illuminating contributions which have been made for the last three hours to Senate bill 2472, but at this time I should like to offer three amendments which I consider more germane to the subject.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, in order to carry out the ordinary procedure of the Senate, at this particular time I should like to ask the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] how long he thinks the hearing to which he has referred will probably last and from what sources have come the requests for such hearings?

Mr. SMOOT. If the Senator from New Jersey will not object, I can state in a very few minutes from just what sources the objections come.

Mr. EDGE. I will be very glad to yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. SMOOT. The objections to what is known as the soldiers' settlement bill come from the following sources—I will not mention them all: First, there is an organization in the United States, with headquarters in New York, which has started a propaganda for the purpose of securing a direct appropriation from the Congress of the United States of \$500 for every soldier who served in the war with the Central Powers.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Does the Senator wish to hear them?

Mr. SMOOT. They have asked to be heard, and I think it would be better to give them a hearing. There is another class which wants a direct appropriation or else a direct loan of \$2,000 to each soldier and officer who participated in the war. There is another propaganda, headed by some very eminent men and women in New York, having headquarters also at Chicago, Ill., who are opposed to the passage of the bill in its present form and desire to present a plan which they have laid before the Public Lands Committee in the past and which they claim can be worked out by individuals in the United States who are at present prepared to advance the money to reclaim the lands.

Then there is another class of western soldiers who object to the passage of this bill on the ground that they entered lands before they joined the Army. They went to France and fought alongside of the other soldiers, and now when they come back and go upon their lands, under the bill they can get no assistance whatever.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. That could be easily cured by an amendment, I take it.

Mr. SMOOT. I am merely rehearsing some of the objections to the bill. A great many of the western people feel that if we pass this bill it will interfere greatly with the completion of the reclamation projects now under way, claiming that with a fifty million dollar direct appropriation they could complete all the reclamation projects now under way and give more land and earlier relief to the soldiers than can be afforded under the provisions of this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. I assume the Senator does not think that is practicable.

Mr. SMOOT. I am only reciting the objections of some of those who have appealed to me and the reasons why they want to be heard.

Mr. President, there are about a half dozen other organizations that are directing opposition to the bill, but their objections seem so trivial to me that I do not wish to put them in the RECORD.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Mr. President, the point I was trying to make was that it would save the record and save the time of the committee—although personally time is not so valuable a consideration to me just now, perhaps, for I find I shall probably have to leave the city for a week or two—if all the theories and opinions as to what ought to be done from every source on earth were not exploited before the committee. The Senator from Utah, the Senator from Iowa, and other Senators who have been considering this question for 25 years are already thoroughly familiar with the subject; and to have developed the theories of some gentlemen in New York, Chicago, and other places as to the disposition of the public lands and the proper way to reclaim them would probably impose a tax upon the patience of the Senator from Utah and the other members of the Committee on Public Lands. I hope he will not exercise too much of that peculiar characteristic in dealing with those who are apparently interesting themselves in matters in which they have very little concern.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from New Jersey.

The SECRETARY. On page 7, line 19, before the word "citizens" it is proposed to strike out the word "the," and in line 20, after the word "States" to strike out the words "or of a State thereof," so that it will read:

chartered under the laws of the United States or of a State of the United States, or by firms or companies, the controlling interest in which is owned by citizens of the United States.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, after the very delightful discussion of a very good bill between the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] and the Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHBURST], I wish to revert just for a moment to the speech of the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER].

I desire to say—

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Mississippi yield to the Senator from New Jersey?

Mr. HARRISON. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. EDGE. Do I understand that I have lost the floor?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did not know that the Senator from New Jersey had the floor.

Mr. EDGE. I was recognized, and introduced some amendments.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator introduced them.

Mr. EDGE. If the Senator from Mississippi is recognized to speak on the amendments, I presume I will lose the floor.

Mr. HARRISON. I will say to the Senator that I thought he had yielded the floor when he offered his amendments. I shall only take up two or three minutes of time. It is to discuss a matter that I am sure will convince even the Senator from New Jersey.

If the treaty of peace, with the league of nations covenant included, shall be adopted, the merciless murder of men will be minimized, the wanton destruction of property stopped, the heavy burdens of enormous taxation lightened, and the stability, peace, and happiness of the world made secure.

I am strengthened in that conviction when I recall that the total battle deaths of all nations in this war were greater than all deaths in all the wars in the previous 100 years.

The total battle deaths amounted to 7,450,000.

From 1793 to 1914 the battle deaths amounted to 6,000,000.

The American battle losses in this war were 50,000 killed and 236,000 wounded.

The Russian battle losses were 34 times greater, the German losses 32 times greater, the French 28 times greater, and the British losses 18 times greater than those of the United States.

The direct cost of the war to the United States up to the end of April, 1919, amounted to \$21,500,000,000.

The figure is twenty times the prewar national debt. It would have paid the entire cost of our Government from 1791 up to the outbreak of the war.

Our expenditure in this war was sufficient to have carried on the Revolutionary War continuously for more than 1,000 years at the rate of expenditure which that war actually involved.

From April, 1917, to April, 1919, the war cost the United States more than \$1,000,000 an hour.

Treasury disbursements during that period reached a total of \$23,500,000,000.

The pay of the Army during the war cost more than the combined salaries of all the public-school principals and teachers for a five-year period immediately preceding the war.

The total direct war cost amounted to around \$186,000,000,000. It is to prevent the recurrence of these incidents and these conditions that a league of nations is desired.

FOREIGN FINANCIAL OPERATIONS.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 2472) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE].

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Jersey offers a further amendment, which will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, line 13, in the proposed amendment of the committee, where the committee proposes to insert certain words after striking out, beginning with the word "notwithstanding," it is proposed to strike out all down to and including the word "section," at the end of line 23.

Mr. GRONNA. On line 13?

The SECRETARY. On line 13, beginning with the word "notwithstanding," it is proposed to strike out down to and including the word "section," at the end of line 23.

Mr. EDGE. I will say, Mr. President, that that is half of the amendment of which the Senator from North Dakota was going to introduce the other half.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator that the amendment which I propose to offer strikes out all of that page.

Mr. EDGE. Yes; but, if I may explain, there are two objects in that amendment. One, as I understand the amendment suggested by the Senator from North Dakota, to provide for a double liability and the other to strike out this section which the amendment I have just offered strikes out. I am not prepared to accept the first part, on the question of double liability; but I am entirely prepared to accept the elimination of lines 13 to 23, which was discussed by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] in the debate on Saturday, so I have offered the amendment to eliminate that, leaving the single question in which the Senator from North Dakota is also interested to be determined by the Senate.

Mr. GRONNA. Very well; I have no objection.

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

Mr. EDGE. I yield.

Mr. LENROOT. I had understood from the Senator that he was willing to eliminate, also, all of the section after the word "subscriptions," in line 13.

Mr. EDGE. That is already eliminated.

Mr. LENROOT. That is all right, then.

Mr. EDGE. I think that is eliminated by the adoption of this amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This must be the situation of affairs: As the bill comes from the committee there is a motion to strike out, and a motion to insert in lieu of the matter stricken out. Now, as the Chair understands, in the part to be inserted the Senator from New Jersey wants to strike out, beginning with the word "notwithstanding." Is that right?

Mr. EDGE. That is correct; and, if I may be permitted to draw the attention of the Chair, the part stricken out by the committee was already acquiesced in by the Senate when we passed the committee amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; it was passed over. The question will be on the motion of the Senator from New Jersey to amend the part to be inserted.

The motion was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Now, the question is on the amendment as amended.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I offer the amendment which I send to the desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment to the amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 8, beginning with line 2—

The VICE PRESIDENT. That does not touch this amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. It has the same effect as this amendment. It affects a portion of this amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, may I ask whether the committee amendment has been agreed to yet?

Mr. GRONNA. No; it has not.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It has not been agreed to yet.

Mr. SMOOT. Let me suggest to the Senator from North Dakota that he allow the committee amendment to be agreed to, and then offer his amendment.

Mr. GRONNA. That can not be done, because it will foreclose my right to offer this amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator does not want to touch that.

Mr. GRONNA. Yes; I do. I want to strike out all of page 8 after the word "shareholders," in line 2, down to line 24, and insert the matter which I send to the desk.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, if I may make a suggestion to the Senator from North Dakota, we are entirely in agreement excepting that I am endeavoring to have something stricken out to which there is no objection, and the Senator wants to put in an amendment to a part of it. If the Senator's amendment should be defeated, then the entire matter would be back again. Now I am taking out this part of the section, with the exception of the first four lines, which the Senator wants to change.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This must be the parliamentary situation, as the Senator understands it:

The committee made a report to strike out, beginning at line 5 with the word "extent."

Mr. SMOOT. Line 4.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Line 5.

Mr. SMOOT. It is line 4 on my copy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is line 5 in the bill that the Chair has; beginning on line 5 with the word "extent," and going down to the word "such," in line 12; and the committee offered to insert in place of it "extent of their unpaid stock subscriptions. Notwithstanding," and so on. That is a proposition to strike out and insert. Now the Senator from New Jersey moves to amend the portion to be inserted by striking out all after the word "Notwithstanding." That leaves the pending question, then, to strike out all of lines 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, and 12, and to insert "extent of their unpaid stock subscriptions." Now the Senator from North Dakota wants to strike out everything from line 2, the entire page, and insert "shareholders in any corporation organized under the provisions of this section." The Chair thinks that is an entirely different motion to strike out and insert from the one that is now pending before the Senate, and this must be the parliamentary situation:

Senators have in their possession the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota. If they are in favor of the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota, they should vote "no" on the committee amendment to strike out and insert, which will then leave the House text, and thereupon the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota will be in order.

Mr. GRONNA. Very well, that is satisfactory.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment of the committee.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, may I ask a question, in order to understand clearly how I should vote? Are we voting now on the amendment to the amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; you are not voting on that at all. The Chair tried to explain that there is a motion now to strike out all from lines 4 to 12, inclusive, and insert a few words. If that motion is carried, the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota will not be in order.

Mr. EDGE. If that prevails—

The VICE PRESIDENT. If that prevails, the amendment of the Senator from North Dakota will not be in order.

Mr. GRONNA. I do not think it is the intention of the Senator from New Jersey to have that happen, because he has agreed to have at least a portion of my amendment adopted.

Mr. EDGE. The Senator is entirely correct.

Mr. GRONNA. It was for that reason that I intended to ask the parliamentary question if my amendment would still be in order if the amendment offered by the Senator from New Jersey were adopted.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It can not be in order if the committee amendment is adopted.

Mr. EDGE. That is the reason, Mr. President, why I suggest to the Senator from North Dakota that he withhold the introduction of his further amendment until we strike out the balance of the section to which there is no objection, and then that he offer to amend the one portion of the section which refers to the double liability, on which I desire to say a word.

Mr. LENROOT. But the Chair says it will not be in order.

Mr. GRONNA. The Chair holds that it will not be in order.

Mr. EDGE. As I understand the Chair, then, we must discuss both amendments in one.

Mr. LENROOT. May I suggest to the Senator from New Jersey that he move to strike out all of the section after the word "subscriptions" in line 4, and that will leave the original text open to amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. In line 5. There are two prints of the bill.

Mr. EDGE. I think that would meet the situation, because it would leave the wording referring to the unpaid stock subscriptions open to further amendment. If I may withdraw the amendment offered, I will move an amendment that we strike out from page 8 of my bill, starting with line 5, down to line 23, inclusive; that that be stricken from the bill.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, a parliamentary question. If that motion prevails—

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair seems to be unable to be understood about the parliamentary situation, and he will repeat it.

The committee reported an amendment striking out lines 5 to 12, inclusive, and offering to insert certain matter running down to the end of line 23. That presented to the Senate the question of a motion to strike out and a motion to insert, each of which, under the rules of the Senate, is amendable before the final vote is taken, and not divisible. Now, the Senator from New Jersey has moved to strike out all after the word "subscriptions" in line 13. That leaves the committee amendment to strike out lines 5 to 12, inclusive, and insert the words on line 13, to wit, "extent of their unpaid stock subscriptions."

The Senator from North Dakota is not proposing to amend the text of the part to be stricken out. He has an entirely different motion. He is moving to strike out all after line 2 and to insert entirely different matter.

There are two ways to reach it. One would be for the Senator from New Jersey, if he has authority to do so, to withdraw the entire committee amendment, and then the text would be open to amendment by the Senate. The other would be to defeat this amendment, in which event the House text would stand, and the Senator from North Dakota could move to amend it.

Mr. GRONNA. This is a very important amendment, and I suggest the absence of a quorum.

RECESS.

Mr. EDGE. I move that the Senate take a recess until 12 o'clock to-morrow.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 47 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Tuesday, September 9, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, September 8, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Rev. William Couden, late chaplain of the Second Division, American forces in Germany, offered the following prayer:

Every day is a fresh beginning, every morn is the world made new. Be with us, O God, as we enter upon another week of work. Help us in our efforts to serve our dear country and all humanity. Lead us with Thy wisdom, sustain us by Thy strength. And be to us as the shadow of a mighty rock within a weary land. We ask this in Jesus' name. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. RAMSEYER. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. RAMSEYER. I wish to ask unanimous consent for my colleague [Mr. STEENERSON], chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, for leave to extend his remarks on a bill which he has introduced to-day, an act to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States." Mr. STEENERSON is with the joint committee in New York, and for that reason he asked me to present this request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] may extend his remarks on the subject indicated. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent, after the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] shall have addressed the House, that I may speak for 20 minutes on the subject of the league of nations.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that he may address the House for 20 minutes on the league of nations after the gentleman from Illinois. Is there objection?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would say to the gentleman that there are several other bills of considerable importance to come up to-day. I hope that the gentleman will not for the time being make that request. It may be that we can not get through with those bills to-day, and it is very important that they should be passed. If the gentleman will reserve his request until later—

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. I shall withdraw the request, Mr. Speaker, for the present.

SPECIAL ORDER.

The SPEAKER. Under the special order the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MASON] is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend and revise his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, I also ask unanimous consent, in view of the fact that I expect to discuss a legal question, for 10 minutes' additional time without stopping to ask for it, and then I shall endeavor to finish.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent that his time may be extended for 10 minutes so that he may have 25 minutes instead of 15 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, some months ago I introduced a resolution to ascertain the reason why American troops were sent to Siberia. From that time until the present the condition has been aggravated rather than bettered. The President of the United States, as I shall show, in absolute usurpation of his power, not only sent our troops, in connection with Japan, into Siberia, but since the armistice was signed he has continued to keep our troops there and now announces through the War Department—for the Secretary of War was before the committee of which I am a member and stated that he did not intend to return the troops from Siberia until volunteers were found to take their places. In view of the fact that for the last nine months they have been giving out direct and indirect statements that our boys were to be returned from Siberia, I asked the Secretary of War why it was necessary to censor their letters. He said that he did not know that they were censored, and I should not speak of this except it was in open session before the committee. I then told him that they were censored, and I have received letters showing that they have been censored. He then said that that was very right; that in times of peace men ordered to police duty in foreign countries and against which country we had never declared war our boys should have their mail censored. I say to you that our boys are not properly fed and cared for, and I have no desire to apologize for taking your time, for 4,000 out of the 8,000 in Siberia are all American citizens who live in my district, and they are there without any right and in absolute violation of the constitutional limitations upon presidential power. I purpose in a minute to read to you from the President's own book, which shows where he makes his first great mistake. It shows that he started upon the wrong track when considering executive power and considering the constitutional limitations of executive power. His proposition that we read from his lectures and from his book published since he has been President, and evidently delivered while he was president of a college, says this:

One of the greatest of the President's powers I have not yet spoken of at all: His control, which is very absolute, of the foreign relations of the United States. The initiative in foreign affairs—

I ask you now to observe this—

which the President possesses without any restrictions whatever, is virtually the power to control them absolutely.

I purpose to put in deadly parallel with those two propositions the opinion of the Supreme Court of the United States, of Mr. Webster, of Mr. Clay, and of Mr. Rawle, whom every lawyer agrees was a great writer on the constitutional limitations of the President of the United States. Now, no man who has written since Rawle has disagreed with him upon the fundamental rules laid down in his great work upon the Constitution of the United States.

The President makes two propositions: "The initiative in foreign affairs" the President possesses without any restrictions whatever. It is absolutely false; it is not well grounded in law; and his conduct in sending troops to Russia shows that he is following his false construction which he gathered while he was a professor of a great school, and which is in violation of the law of this land. Rawle says:

The legislature, indeed, possesses a superior power, and may declare its dissent from the Executive in the recognition or refusal to recognize a nation.

THE DEADLY PARALLEL.

Woodrow Wilson: I have power to "initiate in foreign affairs without any restriction whatever."

Wilson: I have "power to control them absolutely." Virtually. When I complete a treaty "the Government is virtually committed."

Rawle on Constitution:

The legislature possesses a superior power.

The Constitution:

"By and with the advice and consent of the Senate."

Webster and Clay while Members of the House both introduced resolutions—see Life and Speech of Clay and Web-

ster—to recognize other Republics, Clay for Buenos Aires and Webster for Greece, in 1823. The argument in each case sustains Rawle and is in direct conflict with Mr. Wilson. Another marked precedent. In 1836 Andrew Jackson was President and refused to recognize the independence of the Republic of Texas. He sent a message to Congress insisting that it was his business and Congress had nothing to do with it. The Senate immediately passed a resolution recognizing the independence of the Republic of Texas. The House passed a resolution making an appropriation for a representative to Texas from the United States. Old Hickory changed his mind and appointed a minister and received one from Texas to the United States.

If at any time before the President acted the question of the existence of the Republic of Texas had been raised the Supreme Court would have recognized that republic by reason of the action of Congress.

The recognition of a nation in its inception is the initiative in foreign affairs. The President says he possesses that power without any restriction. Let me read you what the Supreme Court of the United States says, and I will insert some things here so as to save time:

3 Wheaton. Mr. Justice Marshall says:

The judiciary can take no notice of a new government until either—the Congress, that is—the legislative or the executive has acted.

As a matter of fact, the theory of President Wilson in regard to his control of foreign affairs is not only wrong in law but wrong in precedent, and I intend to insert here the opinion of Mr. Webster when he introduced a resolution declaring in favor of the Republic of Greece about 100 years ago, when he gave as his argument—and I ask those of you who wish to be students in a public sense to read his opinion. He insisted, and truthfully, that the legislature had power to recognize foreign States, and that it was not purely an executive function but it was a governmental function, in which the initiative might be taken either by the executive or legislative branch. And Mr. Webster in his learned debate and argument cites his authority and offers his resolution recommending that an appropriation be made, for representatives from the United States to Greece, and this authority is in the House of Representatives.

Mr. Clay offered a resolution asking for an appropriation to give to the people a diplomatic corps to Buenos Aires. He gives as his argument that the recognition of a foreign nation is not purely an executive function; that it is a governmental function.

And let me say just in passing, and fearing any of my colleagues on this side of the House, or, rather, in this House of Representatives, shall fear that you are invading the sanctity of senatorial power, let me say to you that the House of Representatives is a part of this Government, and, according to Mr. Webster and Mr. Clay both, even if the Senate ratified a treaty, the House of Representatives must be consulted, and if we fail to make the appropriation necessary the treaty may fail, for the very reason that we hold the purse strings, and there is an appeal to the conscience of this Government through the House of Representatives, whose Members come newest and freshest from the people, and if we fail to do our duty the people have the final say.

And I will simply say in passing that so far as I am concerned, I do not care what treaty is ratified in the Senate of the United States, I never will vote for an appropriation that establishes a superstate, and gives one of the superstates six judges to our one. [Applause on the Republican side.] I will never vote for an appropriation—I do not care whether the Senate passes it or not—which guarantees that this country shall prevent the birth of a new republic anywhere and furnish men in uniform and under the American flag to fight under the direction of anybody in the world but that man who is constituted the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States. [Applause on the Republican side.]

It will be interesting to know, you who are students of law, the reason given by the Supreme Court and Mr. Rawle that the President has not the power and the Congress has, and if you will permit me—

Mr. DEWALT. Will the gentleman allow me just one moment in pursuit of his argument?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. DEWALT. Does not the word "initiative" contemplate the action by one party in the first instance?

Mr. MASON. I do not think we have any dispute about what the word "initiative" means. The President of the United States says he has absolute and unrestrained power, and I say that he is wrong. The Supreme Court says he is wrong, and Mr. Rawle says he is wrong, that he has not the monopoly of the power of initiative.

Mr. DEWALT. I grant you that that is true, possibly, but—

Mr. MASON. The gentleman will pardon me. This comes out of my time. I will be very glad to give the gentleman the time if I can get only five minutes more.

Mr. DEWALT. It was only in pursuit of your argument.

Mr. MASON. I must pursue it in my own way and in my own time. I recognize the gentleman intends to be fair, but you know how we are fixed in this body.

And so you get the reason for the rule that the initiative is not wholly an executive function, but is a legislative one as well; and the reason given by the great writers and students of this act is that the war-making power is here and that the President can not make war without a declaration of war by Congress. Therefore, in the exercise of our power which may create war or be a *casus belli*, the executive power is inferior to that of the legislative power of the United States.

The President of the United States entered into an arrangement with Japan to send troops to Siberia. I speak advisedly as to what was done. Japan and the United States afterwards invited the other Allies to participate. This was done upon the pretext that we had property to protect in Archangel. The pretext is a pretext and is not true and never was true. When the Secretary of War was before the committee the other day in open session—and there is nothing secret or executive about it—he said that they were there to guard a railroad. Now, the questions is, Whose railroad is it? I charged here a month ago that we were sacrificing boys in Siberia as collection agencies, and they are there ostensibly to guard a railroad; they are performing the duty not only of policemen but of laborers; and there are 4,000 of them from my district who are there, and they are not being properly fed, and they have no business there. The President of the United States has assumed to declare war against a friendly people. It is a declaration of war. He sends our soldiers there. We do not send soldiers under the American flag, wearing the American uniform, either for policemen on the Rhine or watchmen in Silesia or scavengers in Siberia. We ought not to do it, but that is what you are doing, and the Congress is silent.

Here is a poster issued by the War Department. The Secretary of War said the other day that they were enlisting men who volunteered to go to Siberia. I do not care whether they volunteered or not. You might just as well take a million volunteers to go to Ireland and help Ireland without any action of Congress. Says the poster:

Notice the large type.

"War is not yet finished in Russia." A few white men with previous service only are wanted in the United States Army. "Do your full duty now."

Here are the places where they are expected to enlist: In Brunswick, Ga.; Greenville, S. C.; Charleston, S. C.; Columbia, and Florence.

WAR IS NOT FINISHED IN RUSSIA.

A few white men with previous service only are wanted in the United States Army for service in the Infantry and Medical Department for immediate service in American Expeditionary Forces in Siberia.

Do your full duty now.

Apply for enlistment at 35 Barnard Street, Savannah, Ga.; post-office building, Brunswick, Ga.; 2021 North Main Street, Greenville, S. C.; 1481 Morgan Square, Spartanburg, S. C.; 177 Meeting Street, Charleston, S. C.; 1522 Main Street, Columbia, S. C.; post-office building, Florence, S. C.

Since August 16, 100,000 recruits—1,034 expressed willingness to go to Siberia. (RECORD, p. 4899.)

War is not yet over in Russia. Whose war is it? Who declared war in Russia? Was not Russia our ally? Is she not our friend? The President of the United States declares war. He takes the boys from my district, without any right, without any let or hindrance, without any authority from Congress. By the newspaper I read 23 were killed last week in Siberia. I do not know whether it is true or not. It is a delayed dispatch. I have just asked Gen. Harris about it, and he said he would let me know. They do not have official information as to this last battle. Four hundred and eighty were killed in the Archangel sector. War in Siberia! Whose war is it? Have you voted for a declaration of war? Do you believe under the Constitution of the United States that the President has the power to take the boys of this country and send them into a peaceful nation to take part in a civil war there in progress? I am not for the Bolsheviks, and I am not for the spawn of the Czar under Kolchak. Neither one of them is under my flag. Neither of them wears the uniform of my country. But 4,000 boys from my district are there, not the sons of rich men. I want to say if the President had a boy there, even if the son-in-law of the President were among them—in the Y. M. C. A. business—it would not take him long to take them out of Siberia and start them home. [Applause.] That is the truth about it. They are my constituents. They are in my office when I am there. They are in my house when I am there. Their petitions come in, hour by hour, and this morning comes a dispatch saying that 26 of the

Yankees were killed. Killed by whose order? That of the President of the United States, who, believing that he was right when he was a professor and wrote that the President had the right of initiative and the right to control the power of all initiative—I have quoted his words—that the President of the United States has virtually the power to control absolutely the foreign affairs of the United States. Acting upon that, he assumes to declare war; acting upon that, he is recruiting men for service in Siberia, where we have not declared war, where we are using our boys as a collection agency.

The Secretary of War told us it was to defend a railroad. Whose railroad, in the name of God, is it? Have you stock there? Are you willing to fight for it? Then go and fight for it, but do not take my boys over there to fight for your dirty stock and your dirty bonds and your dirty railroads. [Applause.] Four hundred million dollars, I believe, of American money from one bank of the Standard Oil has gone to the Archangel railroad. Do you see any connection between the blood of the boys of Illinois and the railroad bonds and stock in Siberia? Eight thousand men are left in Siberia to control and organize and reorganize a country where there are 180,000,000 people.

What military asininity is it to send 15,000 American boys there in an attempt to control the affairs where, if any one of these dirty factions agrees with the other, if the Bolsheviks should meet to-morrow the Kolchaks and, after they had got all the money they can get out of the United States, should come to an agreement, they would turn and murder your boys and mine as quick as they would kill a cat or a dog. And you know it, and I want them to come out of there, and they have got to come out of there. [Applause.]

The resolution which I have offered cites the fact that the Congress of the United States has power to make rules and regulations—I will not attempt to quote it with verbal accuracy, but you can read it—the Congress of the United States has the right to make rules and regulations governing the Army and Navy and the armed and naval forces of the United States. You have the power to bring them out. I ask you by this resolution to order them out. Do not be afraid, in the name of God, to exercise the power of the legislator when the Executive usurps your power.

I do not care for the money that has been stolen. I do not care for the \$150,000 which the President handed to Barney Baruch over there in the peace conference. It is dirt. But the blood of the boys of the United States cries to you. They are blood of our blood and bone of our bone. They are American boys. They are poor boys. They are the sons of poor parents. You told me that the sons of rich men were going into the draft. The rich man's sons are not over there. Those who are over there are the sons of the poor people, among them those whom I represent. You have no right to keep them there and starve them and kill them to gratify the whims of the President of the United States, who seeks to make himself king of the United States, and not President. [Applause.]

Here is the account of the 23 that were last murdered. Who is going to answer? Are you a Member of Congress? The Constitution gave you power to make rules. For God's sake let us make a rule and bring back all the American boys to this side that still live out of the countries with which we are at peace. That means Russia. We never declared war there. Kolchak and that crowd have got a box car. They telegraph for more money. Why, the Secretary of War stated the other day before the committee in this open meeting—and if it was executive I should not repeat it—said they had not declared war on Russia, but they were sending arms and ammunition and supplies to Kolchak—Kolchak, the scum of the Czar. It is a shake of the dice between him and Lenin and Trotsky. There is no difference. It is a good, fair fight between that class of men. Why in the name of God do you want to put American boys over there? Why do you want to stain the American uniform? Why do you want to starve them along the Siberian road and be silent, when I tell you that the Constitution gives you power to act? [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, how many minutes have I left?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has three minutes remaining.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does the gentleman know how many Japanese allies we have fighting with our men in Siberia?

Mr. MASON. The Japanese got us into it. The Japanese agreed with the United States—those two—to go in. They, the United States and Japan, invited England and Italy and France to go in. Japan agreed to send only the same number of men as the others, totaling about 15,000. Japan, in her usual way of keeping treaties and agreements, and violating her agreement

with the President of the United States, sent 60,000 or 70,000 men there for the purposes of conquest. They are the people that got us into this dirty work.

A MEMBER. Seventy-five thousand.

Mr. MASON. Seventy-five thousand. Here is a sample of the way the money is being spent. Here is a whole-page advertisement asking us to recognize the Omsk government. If we would recognize it, I might not complain. It is possibly an improvement on Lenin and Trotsky. I do not think so. I do not know and you do not know. There are 40 factions there, fighting like a lot of cats and dogs; and I say to you, Mr. President Wilson, you had better conserve your resources. If the President has a good friend in this House, let him say to the President, "We have stood everything in the world. We are complaining of but one thing now. You had better conserve your resources." He can say what he wants to about the Senate or the "contemptible quitters" or the "unscrupulous quitters." I do not know just what that means. He uses some poker language that I do not understand. He got poker and euchre mixed up, but Barney Baruch could set him right; and when he put \$150,000 into Barney Baruch's hands over there, I think Barney had had a bad night with the boys the night before. [Laughter.]

All I have got to say is this: My boys are over there. They are bone of my bone and blood of my blood, as they are of yours, just as much your constituents as mine. They have a right to come out. They can not even write to their fathers and mothers. Occasionally they will slip a letter through by some friend coming over. I have a box full of letters where half the letter has been cut out. They are starving; they are dying. They have the uniform of your country, the uniform of an American soldier. My God, what does it mean? It means that they march in uniform under the flag in the defense of American ideals, and one American ideal is that we will never declare war against a nation until the people of the United States have spoken through the Congress of the United States. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WINGO. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman have one minute to answer a question. I want to get some information.

Mr. HAMILTON. Give him more than one minute.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Illinois be extended one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINGO. Assuming that the gentleman is correct about that one proposition, that Congress alone can declare war and that Congress may by appropriate action recall troops, I infer that the gentleman has a resolution before the Committee on Military Affairs to withdraw the troops from Russia. Is that true?

Mr. MASON. Yes.

Mr. WINGO. Now, the gentleman's party is in power. Why does it not bring that resolution out here and give us a chance to vote on it? Why does not the gentleman move to discharge the committee? I will say that, as far as I am concerned—and I think I can speak for this side—we are ready to vote on that proposition. Get your committee that is in charge to give you favorable report on your resolution, with the facts. Then we can act intelligently. Give less talk and more action. [Applause.]

Mr. JUUL. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. JUUL. The question is whether we are capable right here and now of voting that resolution out of that committee and putting it on its passage now? [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. That is not in order.

Mr. MASON. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Arkansas very generously gave me a minute and then took it away from me. Now I ask for another.

Mr. WINGO. I ask that the gentleman have a minute to answer my question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. I ask that the gentleman have five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman only asked for one minute. Is there objection?

Mr. MASON. I want to say that the Committee on Military Affairs have only had this resolution for the past three or four days. I did not introduce it until after the Secretary of War had stated that they did not intend to bring my boys home until they could get volunteers to take their places. I looked it up, and I found from the statement made by the chairman of the Military Affairs Committee of the Senate that 100,000 boys have enlisted, and 1,000 have agreed to go to Siberia; so I made up my mind

that I do not want my boys to wait for volunteers to go there. I have no desire to be discourteous to the Committee on Military Affairs. On the contrary, if the resolution is not reported within the time specified by the rules of the House, I give notice now that I intend to move, under the rules of the House, to discharge the committee and place the resolution upon its passage. [Applause.]

Where you going to get the soldiers and the money for Silesia, Armenia, and Siberia?

I set out here the clever statement of Hon. JOHN N. TINCHER, a Congressman from Kansas.

SEPTEMBER 8, 1919.

MY DEAR EDITOR: Recently I have had many letters regarding the league of nations. Some think, as a Congressman, I have a vote on it, which, of course, I have not, but being here perhaps I can give your readers a little inside on it.

There are three classes of Senators on the league:

First. Those that are for it.

Second. Those that are for it with reservations.

Third. Those that are against it.

During this last week the second class have gained from the first class, and this is true of men changing from the first to the second class who belong to the same party as the President.

Now, this will seem strange to some, especially so in view of the fact that the President has received great ovations and kind treatment everywhere he has stopped.

I am going to explain to you why these changes. They are not due to anything the President has said or done on the trip.

Everyone, of course, understands that there has not been any discussion yet by Congress as to the permanent peace policy for our Army and Navy. Before the President left here he, with his departments, outlined their policy, and the bills were introduced in both the Senate and House by the respective committees. These bills cover 42 pages of printed matter. They were prepared by the General Staff, and the day the President left here Gen. March testified that they were absolutely in accord for this bill—that is, President Wilson, Secretary Baker, Gen. March, and on down the line. On page 26 of this bill the size of the enlisted army is fixed at about one-half million. On page 32 of this bill is the compulsory military training provision for all boys at the nineteenth birthday, and on page 40 is the provision for each boy remaining a part of the Army in a way for two years. After the two years he can not be called without his consent in peace time, but during that two years he could be called by the President for any duty.

Under existing law there is no such provision; that is, the President alone could not send American boys abroad without a declaration of war by Congress.

However, within 10 days they have sent 5,000 boys to Silesia; this they claim they have a right to do, as peace has not been declared.

The 19-year-old boys, they claim, will average 600,000 a year, or it would give the United States 1,200,000 subject to the call of the President at all times.

There are 20 wars now raging in foreign countries concerning the merits of which there is not one man in 50,000 knows one thing.

These bills have been hinted at a long time, but the details and the administration's attitude were not fully known until this week. So don't be surprised if more Senators change from the first to the second class.

All are agreed that they want to keep out of war, but they disagree as to how to keep out.

As I said in the beginning, I have no vote on the league, but I will have a vote on this Army bill, and I will never vote for such a bill; also permit me to add that these bills will never pass, and I doubt if they ever get out of committee.

The expense of maintaining the Army and Navy under the proposed bills would be about twice the total of prewar operating expense of the Government per annum, in other words, it would cost twice as much for the Army and Navy every year as the total expense of the whole Government was before the war.

The reservations as agreed to by the Senate committee will, they claim, do away with the necessity for all of this and leave it so that we can have an Army like we had before the war.

Yours, truly,

Mr. Wilson, you ask some of the contemptible quitters to offer an improvement on your "league of hallucinations." If you will permit me, I suggest an improvement would be made if you will give us your 14 points.

"Open covenants of peace openly arrived at." You abandoned that doctrine the moment you got your feet under the royal mahogany.

"After which there shall be no private international understandings." You have abandoned that by negotiating treaties which you decline to furnish even to the Senate.

You say there shall be "absolute freedom of navigation upon the seas." You have consented to a treaty which makes more binding forever the song you sang as a child in your English home, "Rule, Britannia, Rule the Seas."

You demanded the removal of "all economic barriers." By your treaty if the United States fails to submit the Monroe doctrine to arbitration we would be commercially outlawed by all the world.

Your point to "reduce national armaments" has resulted in a request by you for the largest standing Army and Navy we have ever had, and every nation in the world is increasing its armament. And you want a million and a half of men to carry out your league to establish peace.

Your point in regard to "self-determination" has been wickedly abandoned by you, and you have entered into a treaty whereby no new republic shall ever be born, and pledge the

faith and honor of the United States that should such a child be born, we, a free people, agree to strangle it.

How does your self-determination read in Shantung, South Africa, Egypt, India, and Ireland?

You demand in the next point the "evacuation of all Russian territory." All except the Russians have evacuated, except you and the Mikado, and you are freezing and starving our sons there by usurpation of Executive power, to protect the capital invested in the railroads and to force the people to guarantee to pay the ancient debts of Russia.

You demand as your fourteenth point a "general association of nations." You have abandoned that, sir, by making a "special" association, which is an alliance to promote war and not a league to promote peace.

Five hundred American boys are buried in Russia or Siberia by the usurpation of power by you, and if you could look into the faces of the unhappy mothers and wives of these dead soldiers, if you could walk by their open graves and see the result of your work, you might have a better conception of your duty toward the American youth and eventually get into your mind that the Constitution of the United States limits the power of the President.

Mr. BOIES. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman rise?

Mr. BOIES. I ask to address the House for 15 minutes to-morrow morning after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table on the question of what, it seems to me, was unjust criticism by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] in accusing me of putting matter into the RECORD that amounted to nothing.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent that to-morrow morning, immediately after the reading of the Journal and the disposition of business on the Speaker's table, he be allowed to address the House for 15 minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. KITCHIN. I understand the gentleman wishes to reply to the speech made by the minority leader [Mr. CLARK of Missouri]?

Mr. BOIES. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. I suggest that he wait until the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CLARK] comes back. I understand he will be here to-morrow.

Mr. BOIES. He will be here to-morrow? All right; I will be glad to wait until the gentleman from Missouri is present.

Mr. KITCHIN. Then the gentleman had better wait until he is here.

EXPENSES OF MILITARY AFFAIRS INQUIRY.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Clerk's desk a privileged resolution from the Committee on Accounts.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois presents a privileged resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 279.

Resolved, That there be appropriated out of the contingent fund of the House the sum of \$2,500, or so much thereof as it may be found necessary for the expenses of the subcommittee of the Committee on Military Affairs, appointed to visit and inspect designated camps, cantonments, and aviation fields with a view to considering the feasibility of their purchase by the Government.

The expenses that may be incurred by the said subcommittee shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House of Representatives on vouchers signed by the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs, or the chairman of the said subcommittee, and approved by the Committee on Accounts, evidenced by the signature of the chairman thereof.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, this resolution was introduced at the request of the Committee on Military Affairs, who have appointed a subcommittee to visit cantonments, camps, and aviation fields. I am informed, at the request of the War Department, with a view to ascertaining which of them, if any, are feasible for purchase and rebuilding and which should not pass into the hands of the Government, many of them being now held on lease. Now, if there is no question or any debate, I move the adoption of the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman that in the first line there is obviously an omission.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to amend the resolution by inserting the word "may" and also inserting the word "be."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 1, after the word "there" insert the word "be," and in line 3 strike out the word "many" and insert the word "may."

The amendment was agreed to.

The resolution was agreed to.

COMPILER OF HINDS' PRECEDENTS.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I present another privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 273.

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided for by law, compensation at the rate of \$4,600 per annum, payable monthly, to Clarence A. Cannon for his services as editor and compiler of the Precedents of the House of Representatives.

With a committee amendment as follows:

Resolved, That the Speaker of the House be empowered and authorized to appoint an editor and compiler of Hinds' Precedents of the House of Representatives, to revise, extend, and continue said work to the present date, at a salary not to exceed \$4,600 per annum, payable monthly, and that such sum is hereby appropriated out of the contingent fund of the House for this purpose.

Provided, That such work shall be completed within the period of one year from the date that such appointment is made, and that compensation for the services of such editor and compiler shall cease with the expiration of that date.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, unless there is some debate on the question I move the adoption of the resolution.

Mr. GARD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. GARD. What was the date of the last compilation?

Mr. IRELAND. Nineteen hundred and seven. I think we are down to that date now.

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

JANE A. LEWIS.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I present the following privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 255.

Resolved, That there shall be paid, out of the contingent fund of the House, to Jane A. Lewis, widow of Hugh Lewis, late an employee of the House of Representatives, a sum equal to six months of his compensation as such employee, and an additional amount, not exceeding \$250, to defray the expenses of the funeral of said Hugh Lewis.

The resolution was agreed to.

J. M. M'KEE.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following privileged resolution.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 232.

Resolved, That there shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House, until otherwise provided by law, additional compensation at the rate of \$500 per annum, payable monthly, for services of J. M. McKee, foreman of the folding room, House of Representatives.

With the following committee amendment:

In line 3, after the word "of," strike out the figures "\$500" and insert in lieu thereof "\$300."

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, will there be any opportunity to debate the resolution?

The SPEAKER. The time is in the control of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. IRELAND. I will yield to my colleague.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, I asked the gentleman to withhold the consideration of this resolution until to-morrow until I had my data from the office, but it is very apparent from the method adopted by this gentleman in the folding room that his salary ought not to be, in all fairness, increased. The gentleman has made a practice, having been here a long time, of diverting Government publications that belong to the allotments of different Members to other Members and otherwise distributing them and then notifying the Member that his supply is exhausted.

I do not know whether any other Members of this House have had a similar experience, but I understand the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. MONTAGUE] lost 1,500 yearbooks. I know I have lost 1,500 yearbooks, and I would like any other Members on the floor of the House who have lost similar publications through this method to get up and express themselves. It is possible that I may be the only man that has been injured in that way. But time after time, day after day and month after month, publications in that department disappear and are not available to the membership, and before I would ever vote to increase this gentleman's salary I would like to have some report on that subject by a committee.

Mr. IRELAND. Mr. Speaker, I will say that I brought that matter to the attention of the committee, and I would like to ask the gentleman if it is not true that only a small proportion of the full allotment of yearbooks are printed at a time and the entire amount placed to the credit of each Member? If he does not use them within a certain time, those books are not taken from the press.

Mr. KING. I will say to the gentleman that it may be true that perhaps not the full quota has been printed, but after a Member is advised on a printed card that he is entitled to 1,500 yearbooks he is entitled to have them until the day he goes out of Congress, and the trouble with this gentleman down there is that he disposed of those 1,500 yearbooks without serving any notice on the membership that he intended to dispose of them, and he has never answered the question as to what he did with the 1,500 yearbooks.

Mr. IRELAND. I agree with the gentleman entirely, but is not the system wrong rather than the employee?

Mr. KING. But he has no right to dispose of my yearbooks and give them to somebody else. I do not have to stand for the default of the Printing Office.

Mr. IRELAND. Certainly not, but is that the fact? Did he place the gentleman's books to the credit of some other Member?

Mr. KING. He certainly took them away from me without notice. Every man is entitled to notice in this country. You can not take a judgment against a man in any court without notice, and even God Almighty, in the Garden of Eden, went out and first served notice on Adam before he took judgment against him by saying, "Adam, where art thou?"

Mr. IRELAND. That is certainly a wonderful comparison.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. IRELAND. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. I will say that I lost my yearbooks in a similar manner.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. And I lost mine, and I expect two-thirds of this membership has done the same thing, and the foreman is doing this in violation of law and in violation of the office that he is holding.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Illinois tell us how the gentleman in the folding room disposed of these yearbooks? I do not think he disposed of any yearbooks. They were not printed.

Mr. KENDALL. They should have been printed.

Mr. BROWNING. But they were not.

Mr. IRELAND. I asked the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. KING] to appear before the committee this morning, and he failed to do so. If he had, I would have called the employee in question.

Mr. BROWNING. Will the gentleman give me two or three minutes?

Mr. IRELAND. Certainly; I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I have known Mr. McKee for a number of years. He has been here as long as I have, and many years, in all probability, before I came, and, in my opinion, a more painstaking and better man for the position can not be found in the United States. He has been retained by both Democrats and Republicans. I do not believe he has ever disposed of a single book excepting under the law. There is only one instance that I know of in respect to yearbooks, so far as I am concerned, where I have failed to get all that was coming to me. These yearbooks are not disposed of by the foreman of the folding room. They are not printed at the Government Printing Office.

Mr. KING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNING. Yes.

Mr. KING. I do not accuse this man of it, but how is it that you can purchase yearbooks and all other kinds of Government publications from every Tom, Dick, and Harry around the Capitol?

Mr. BROWNING. For the simple reason that city Members who have them, who do not use them, give those people the right to sell them. I have to get them myself. I beg from Members, because I have not nearly enough of my own quota to go around.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BROWNING. Yes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. As I understand it, when there is a certain publication of yearbooks, whatever number may be published, they are distributed equally to the membership pro rata.

Mr. BROWNING. Yes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Some of the Members, those who take theirs and take them to their offices immediately, get all their quota, while those who wait until there is a demand for them and then send in their order blanks are the ones who have not been able to get them. Here is the trouble, here is where they have been showing favoritism, in not keeping the quota assigned to each Member until he exhausts it.

Mr. BROWNING. It may be that the quota was not kept; but it could not be kept, because the books have not been printed.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. They have been printed.

Mr. DOWELL. Why are they given credit for them if they are not printed?

Mr. BROWNING. Because they are given credit from the quota that you are supposed to have.

Mr. DOWELL. Does he not check up when he receives the books, so that he knows how many he has received?

Mr. BROWNING. I do not know that he checks up the books.

Mr. DOWELL. He ought to check up from the books received, or there ought to be a man there to take his place who will do it.

Mr. BROWNING. I doubt very much whether you can find a more competent man in the United States for the place.

Mr. DOWELL. I want to say that he does not check up at all.

Mr. KING. When there is a shortage, why should it be taken off two or three Members?

Mr. BROWNING. I do not think they are.

Mr. KING. Why should they not be prorated?

Mr. BROWNING. I had only one shortage in all my experience here.

Mr. KING. Does not the gentleman think that it is evidence of inefficiency and reason for not giving this man additional salary, because he does not keep track of the yearbooks?

Mr. BROWNING. I do not agree with the gentleman; I do not think he is inefficient. I know he is very efficient.

Mr. KING. He has been there too long.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The fact of the matter is, as I get the information, if a certain number is printed, and you are lucky enough to ask for your quota, you get it. The foreman of the folding room does not know that the Printing Office is going to let down on printing yearbooks. After you have your books another man may come along and he can not get his. The fault is not in the folding room; it is with the Printing Committee and the amount appropriated. That is where the trouble comes in in this matter, and it is not fair to jump on the foreman if it is a condition over which he has no control. There is a superintendent in charge of the folding room.

Mr. IRELAND. I quite agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. BOX. If the gentleman pleases, it is not confined to the yearbook. I would state that I had an allotment of other documents, called for them within 60 days, have had none of them, and was advised that my supply had been exhausted or that the supply had been exhausted.

Mr. KING. Without notice?

Mr. IRELAND. Those were Farmers' Bulletins?

Mr. BOX. Yes, sir.

Mr. BEE. How long has this gentleman been in that office?

Mr. IRELAND. Thirty-six years, I believe.

Mr. BOX. He does not belong to this side of the House, then.

Mr. KING. That side of the House ruined him. [Laughter.]

Mr. GALLAGHER. The foreman of the folding room does not control Farmers' Bulletins.

Mr. IRELAND. Complaint was made of some nature—

Mr. GALLAGHER. It is a different matter altogether.

Mr. DOWELL. I desire to inquire if the committee have made any investigation to ascertain if these books have been printed by the Government Printing Office?

Mr. IRELAND. The Doorkeeper informs me that they have not, but we were unable to get in touch with the chairman of the Committee on Printing, who is out of town at present.

Mr. DOWELL. Does the gentleman believe that it is possible when a certain order is made with the Public Printer that he does not furnish the quota that is ordered by Congress?

Mr. IRELAND. I believe unofficially they endeavor to indulge in some economy when the quota is not demanded by some Members, and probably without the right to do so.

Mr. DOWELL. But on the question of the yearbooks there should certainly be no question about the printing of the number wanted. Certainly there ought to be no question that they should be printed up to the quota given Members of Congress.

Mr. IRELAND. That seems to be proper.

Mr. DOWELL. And then I want to know how they can be taken away by this officer except by some other act rather than his own?

Mr. IRELAND. So far as the committee was able to understand they do not condone the system in vogue at all. We did not think the employee guilty himself of a time-honored practice that should not be indulged in longer. I am very glad this matter

has been brought up. The same thing obtains, I understand, in the publication of the Farmers' Bulletins, and perhaps we may be given some protection in these publications in the future we have not had in the past and perhaps our privileges will not be abused. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. RUCKER].

Mr. RUCKER. A minute or two?

Mr. IRELAND. Certainly.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I have had the same experience mentioned by the gentleman from Illinois and other gentlemen on the floor. My recollection is that it was the yearbook of 1916, or was it 1915?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. 1915 and 1916.

Mr. RUCKER. I made some investigation and the information I obtained was that the appropriation for the printing of the yearbook was inadequate and that the number allotted to Members could not be printed because of the advance in the price of material. The Public Printer used the amount of money available and then ceased printing and hence those of us who had not called for books did not get the yearbooks on those occasions.

Mr. DOWELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. In just a minute I will be glad to yield. The gentleman, whose name I think has not been called but referred to, is the foreman of the folding room, and, as stated a while ago, he does not belong to this side of the House, although after I had been here for 10 years I still thought he was a Democrat, because I found him at all times genial, affable, courteous, and efficient. [Applause.] So, of course, I thought he was a Democrat. I want to stand here as a Democrat and protect him against any accusation of misconduct. [Applause.] My notion, Mr. Speaker, is that it is unbecoming and unfair for the membership of this House to engage any official and then avail ourselves of the freedom of speech in denouncing a man who is as efficient and as honest and as honorable as any man, I think, on this floor. [Applause.] And I say that although I know now to my regret that he is a Republican.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RUCKER. I do.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Is it not a fact that we had the same difficulty with the Farmers' Bulletins?

Mr. RUCKER. Certainly, years ago we had some.

Mr. GALLAGHER. We do now.

Mr. RUCKER. I have enough on hand right now to answer my demands; so I have not had that experience.

But let me say again that if this gentleman is not efficient the Republican Party, which selected and engaged him years ago, made a mistake; the Democratic Party, which retained him, made a mistake; and you who have retained him have made the same mistake again if any mistake has been made. There is an explanation of this matter, a reasonable explanation which ought to satisfy the mind of any man, and I think the whole thing lies in the fact that the appropriations which we have made were not sufficient to print the number of yearbooks which we expected to receive and which heretofore we have been receiving.

Mr. KING. Should not this gentleman have discovered the fact and prorated the list? Why should a few Members of the House stand the whole loss?

Mr. RUCKER. How could he prorate after the books were exhausted?

Mr. KING. Does the gentleman know who got the 1,500—

Mr. RUCKER. I do not know; it is only an estimate. I do not want to make an accusation against you, but I am sure you Republicans must have gotten them. I simply desired to say this much in behalf of the foreman, because I regard him as one of the efficient men around this Capitol.

Mr. IRELAND. I move the adoption of the amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution as amended was agreed to.

HEIGHT OF BUILDINGS IN DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA—ZONING COMMISSION.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, this being District day, I call up the bill (H. R. 6863) to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District of Columbia and to create a zoning commission, and for other purposes; and I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. I do not know of any desire for general debate on this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole. Is there objection? [After a

pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6863) to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District of Columbia and to create a zoning commission, and for other purposes.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the bill be read for amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That to protect the public health, secure the public safety, and to protect property in the District of Columbia there is hereby created a zoning commission, which shall consist of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds of the District of Columbia, and the Superintendent of the United States Capitol Building and Grounds, which said commission shall have all the powers and perform all the duties hereinafter specified and shall serve without additional compensation. Such employees of the government of the District of Columbia as may be necessary to carry out the purposes of this act shall be assigned to such duty by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia without additional compensation.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman of the committee a question. I would like to know, if this bill were included or enacted into law, if there would be any controversy as to authority between the so-called zoning commission and the Fine Arts Commission, which regulates certain buildings, roads, and monuments in the District of Columbia?

Mr. MAPES. My understanding is that the Fine Arts Commission has a different function to perform. It recommends the park system and the general plan of building in the District of Columbia, but this commission would have authority to regulate the use, area, and height of buildings on private property.

Mr. GARD. I recall very distinctly, and therefore I am asking the question of the gentleman, that as late as a year ago there was a great deal of question, to which the public print in Washington gave attention, regarding the erection of some powerhouse buildings in the District of Columbia—I believe at some place down on Fourteenth Street—about which it was argued as to whether or not the Fine Arts Commission had authority to regulate the size of smokestacks. It was claimed that they did have the placing of these buildings of public utility, if not of ornamentation, and I am asking whether there be any conflict of authority between that commission and the zoning commission?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, as I understood it, the Fine Arts Commission had no real control over the buildings that the gentleman speaks of. The members of that commission conducted a campaign throughout the country to get Congress to prohibit placing the power plant where it was. If this bill should pass and be enacted into law, then the zoning commission would have the right to say whether or not any particular piece of property could be used for the purposes of a power plant.

Mr. GARD. Does not the gentleman think that with the almost concurrent authority, and the fact that the Fine Arts Commission has for its purpose a continuing duty in the city of Washington, which is a very beautiful city, and should remain so as the Capital of the Nation, it should have representation upon the zoning commission? I see that the zoning commission is to consist of all the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds of the District of Columbia, and the Superintendent of the United States Capitol Building and Grounds.

Mr. MAPES. The gentleman will realize that this zoning commission will be a working body, and the members will need to be here to take care of their duty. The members of the Fine Arts Commission, as I understand it, are here only occasionally. That commission recommends in a general way the policy for beautifying the District, but it has no real authority.

Mr. GARD. The zoning commission is not going to be very active, because there is no additional compensation carried in this bill. And I question the activity of a commission appointed by the Government unless there is additional compensation to spur them on to endeavor.

Mr. MAPES. Of course the members of the commission will be expected to perform their duty under this act, and it requires them to act within six months after its passage.

Mr. GARD. Does not the gentleman think the bill should be so amended as to include some representation of the Fine Arts Commission in this so-called zoning law?

Mr. MAPES. I do not, because it is merely an advisory body that has the study of the artistic side of these questions. I

do not think any member of that commission should be a member of this one.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MAPES. I yield.

Mr. TREADWAY. I would like to inquire, Mr. Speaker, of the chairman of the committee whether this bill has any direct bearing on the correspondence we find inserted in the Record last week, on page 4825, between various people and the letter from the lieutenant colonel, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, C. W. Kutz, Engineer Commissioner of the District of Columbia. The correspondence has a direct bearing on a new apartment house to be built on Sixteenth Street, and Commissioner Kutz, in his letter, says:

But until an enabling act is passed vesting in the commissioners or in some independent commission the power to promulgate zoning regulations it seems most unwise to make public tentative plans, as every property owner dissatisfied with the proposed lines of demarcation would use his influence to defeat the legislation.

In other words, some one here, to my mind, seems to want authority to establish these zoning systems, and those to whom the authority is to be granted say that it would be very unwise to confide in the public or in Congress what their plans are until they get the authority. That looks to me like telling Congress, "You give us the authority and then we will do as we please with it." I would like to know whether this bill has any direct bearing on the possibility of trying to regulate the so-called apartment house now under construction on Sixteenth Street, about which objection is made as to its height.

Mr. MAPES. My attention had not been directed before to the correspondence to which the gentleman refers, but this bill was introduced and considered by the commissioners, as I understand it, long before there was any talk of an apartment house near the Meridian Hill Park, to which the gentleman refers. If this bill were a law, perhaps the zoning commission would be enabled to take care of that situation without any further legislation. As it is, I have introduced a resolution in the House, and a similar resolution has been introduced in the Senate, limiting the height of this proposed apartment house, which will obstruct the view at Meridian Park if put up as high as the plans now contemplate.

Mr. TREADWAY. Well, of course, it is but fair to state, I think, that the objection being raised to the height of that building, because it will obstruct the view from Meridian Hill Park, is only the partial reason for objection. Quite likely the main reason for the objection comes from owners of other property in the neighborhood.

Mr. MAPES. The Fine Arts Commission has taken it up, and I do not think the members of that commission are interested in any private property around there, and they think that it would be very unwise and very unfortunate to have the apartment house put up to the height that it is contemplated.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is it not a fact that there must be a very great demand for apartment houses in this city in view of the enormous rents that are being charged and the effort on the part of real estate owners to increase the rents of people now occupying apartment houses? Is there not a great demand for apartment houses? Why should the esthetic side stand in the way of people getting reasonable rents in the District of Columbia?

Mr. MAPES. Nobody would dispute the fact that there is a great demand for apartment houses here, but I do not think that one or two stories on the top of a 10-story apartment house are going to relieve in any great degree the demand for apartment houses. There are a great many vacant lots in the District of Columbia where apartments can be constructed.

Mr. TREADWAY. Let us return once more to the original question. Is there any connection with the effort to secure this zoning system a desire to limit the height of that particular building, as evidenced by the correspondence to which I have referred?

Mr. MAPES. Not at all. But it is unfortunate that this bill is not now the law, so that the zoning commission could control that situation.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is it not also unfortunate that the commissioner should say that it is unwise to give out what they expect to do in advance of the legislation of Congress?

Mr. MAPES. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that the commissioner, like other people, sometimes writes letters in which he does not weigh his language very carefully, and it may be he was unfortunate in the expression which he used in that letter.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to this bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. GARD. On page 1, line 8, strike out the word "and"; and on line 9, after the word "ground," insert "and the Fine Arts Commission."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARD: On page 1, line 8, strike out the word "and"; and in line 9, after the word "grounds," insert "and the Fine Arts Commission."

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to offer this amendment because of what has been suggested by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] regarding the state of affairs in Washington to-day. We have had for some time a Fine Arts Commission. What its authority has been, it seems, is rather vague, but the purpose of the Fine Arts Commission is to preserve the architectural beauty of the city of Washington, and that, to my mind, is a most desirable thing.

Not long ago there unquestionably arose in the public mind the question of putting up buildings which might not be ornamental, although useful in the city of Washington, and that was brought directly to the attention of the membership of the Fine Arts Commission. Now, from what is stated by the gentleman from Massachusetts, the Fine Arts Commission has again—to what extent I do not know—given attention to these matters, particularly the erection of a building on north Sixteenth Street, somewhere near the Meridian Hill Park. Of course, the Fine Arts Commission would have jurisdiction over the park, at least so far as recommendations to Congress are concerned regarding the upkeep and the general appearance of the park. Whether it now has jurisdiction in regard to the erection of private buildings I do not undertake to say. In fact I would think they would have no authority unless the building itself would trespass upon the utility of the park as a park.

But why not include them? Why not have the zoning system carried out by those who have in hand the practical side of it, such as the Commissioners of the District of Columbia, the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds, and the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds in the District of Columbia, together with the membership of the Fine Arts Commission as well, because there would seem to my mind to be no reason why practicality might not go hand in hand with beauty, why those who have charge of the actual management of affairs here might not take with them the proper consideration in these matters of those who have already been acting upon them in the District of Columbia—or more properly in the city of Washington—for quite some time, and those are the members of the Fine Arts Commission. There would be no additional compensation involved, since the bill says that those who act upon the commission and those delegated by the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall act without additional compensation. It would certainly mean a cooperation between this assembly of men who have due power to act under the bill and the personnel of that commission which for some years has had power to act under general law, as it appears now in chapter 243, established in the Sixty-first Congress; and it is for the purpose of having these two boards—if I may call them boards, if they are established—acting in unity and cooperation that I am offering the amendment that I do.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, the Fine Arts Commission has one purpose. This zoning commission, which is proposed to be created by this bill, has another. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] offers an amendment which proposes to put all the members of the Fine Arts Commission on this zoning commission. The Fine Arts Commission looks to the artistic and aesthetic side, and acts in an advisory capacity.

This zoning commission will be an active body. This bill has been very carefully considered. In the drafting of it the citizens' associations and the board of trade and the local chapter of the American Institute of Architects and the builders and real estate men and the citizens generally of Washington were consulted. It was thought advisable to put on the commission the Commissioners of the District, and then the officer in charge of public buildings and grounds, and the Superintendent of the Capitol Building and Grounds. This will give the United States representation on the commission, as well as the District through the Commissioners of the District, and one of them, as everybody knows, is an engineer officer of the Army.

It seems to me it would be very unwise to put the members of this Fine Arts Commission on this zoning commission. The members of the Fine Arts Commission meet only temporarily. They are not citizens at all of the District. They come here at their leisure and stay as long as they find it convenient, and then go back to their respective homes. It would handicap materially the work of this zoning commission to have the Fine Arts men members of it.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I just desire to be heard a moment. Mr. MAPES. Could not the gentleman get in on another amendment? He has already discussed this amendment once. Mr. GARD. I wanted to reply momentarily to a statement the gentleman has made.

Mr. MAPES. That would not be according to the rule. Could not the gentleman get in at some other time?

Mr. GARD. No. I want to talk about this particular thing. Mr. MAPES. How much time does the gentleman want?

Mr. GARD. Oh, two or three minutes.

Mr. Speaker, in the act creating the permanent Commission of Fine Arts it is provided that "It shall be the duty of the officers charged by law to determine such questions in each case when called for such advice." The advice referred to is the erection of statues, fountains, and monuments in the public streets and parks of the District, the selection of models for statues to be erected under the authority of the United States, and for the selection of artists for the execution of the same.

It further provides that these provisions shall not apply to the Capitol Building of the United States and the building of the Library of Congress, but it is to advise generally on questions of art when requested to do so by the President, or by any committee of either House of Congress, and it seems to me it might well be included in the present bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

The amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That wherever, under the provision of this act, it is required that a public hearing shall be held, notice of the time and place of such hearing shall be published for not less than 10 consecutive days in one or more newspapers of general circulation printed and published in the District of Columbia; and such public hearing may be adjourned from time to time: *Provided*, That if the time and place of the adjourned meeting is publicly announced when the adjournment is had, no further notice of such adjourned meeting need be published.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. In the first place it seems to me the language of section 3 should be made a little more clear by requiring that the meetings should be held in the District of Columbia, although that may be inferred from the language of the section. But what I am particularly desirous of knowing is whether under the language of section 4 and the subsequent and preceding language in the bill there is to be authority on the part of the zoning commission to prescribe a place where manufacturing may be done in the District of Columbia, referring to industrial manufacturing?

Mr. MAPES. As the law is now there is nothing to prevent an individual or a company from putting a manufacturing establishment anywhere in the city, and it is the purpose of this bill to regulate that, so that if any one desires to go into the manufacturing business he shall do it outside of the residence section and in the zone fixed for that purpose by the commission.

Mr. GARD. There is no large industrial manufacturing in the District of Columbia or, properly speaking, within the territorial limits of the city of Washington.

Mr. MAPES. That is true. If the gentleman means to inquire whether or not it is intended by this bill to promote manufacturing industries in the District of Columbia, I will say I have no knowledge of any such purpose, and I do not think that it is the purpose.

Mr. GARD. Not so long ago I read in the Washington newspapers items from certain trade organizations concerning a plan they have to bring industrial corporations and manufacturing concerns to the city of Washington, with the intention of increasing the population of Washington and the District of Columbia. Now, such an idea is entirely foreign to the primary use of the District of Columbia, which is that it shall be the capital residence of the whole of the United States of America, and there should be no entering wedge in this bill or any subsequent bill for the bringing here of industrial manufacturing enterprises. There is plenty of room outside. There are plenty of other places, and this District should be preserved for its primary use as the governmental residence of the United States.

Mr. MAPES. I agree with the gentleman perfectly, and I will say that this bill has no connection whatever with that, so far as I know. Of course, the executive officials of the association of which the gentleman speaks must have something to do. I have seen some statements about the bringing of manufacturing establishments here, but nobody, so far as I know, has any thought that that is going to be accomplished.

Mr. GARD. I refer to that because the gentleman said that those who were heard on the bill were members of the Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association.

Mr. MAPES. Among others they were heard.

Mr. GARD. What is the Manufacturers' Association?

Mr. MAPES. The retail merchants' organization here is misnamed the Merchants' and Manufacturers' Association. As I understand it, that association consists entirely of retail merchants.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That said commission is authorized and empowered to make such orders and adopt such regulations not inconsistent with law as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes and carry into effect the provisions of this act: *Provided*, That no order or regulation so adopted shall require any change in the plans, construction, or designated use of (a) a building for which a permit shall have been issued or plans for which shall be on file with the inspector of buildings of the District of Columbia at the time the orders or regulations authorized under this act are promulgated; or (b) a permit for the erection of which shall be issued within 30 days after promulgation of the orders or regulations authorized or adopted under this act and the construction of which in either of the above cases shall have been diligently prosecuted within a year from the date of such permit and the ground-story framework of which, including the second tier of beams, shall have been completed within said year, and which entire building shall be completed according to such plans within two years of the date of the promulgation of such orders or regulations; or (c) prevent the restoration of a building wholly or partially destroyed by fire, explosion, act of God or the public enemy, or prevent the continuance of the use of such building or part thereof as such use existed at the time of such whole or partial destruction, or prevent a change of such existing use except under the limitations provided herein in relation to existing buildings and premises: *Provided further*, That no frame building that has been damaged by fire or otherwise more than one-half of its original value shall be restored within the fire limits as provided by the building regulations of the District of Columbia; or (d) prevent the restoration of a wall declared unsafe by the inspector of buildings of the District or by a board of survey appointed in accordance with any existing law or regulation.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of obtaining information. What is the reason for the proviso in section 5, especially the proviso marked (b), where reference is made to permits for the erection of buildings which shall be issued within 30 days after promulgation of the orders or regulations authorized or adopted under this act, as well as the provisos (a) and (c), because it seems to me that (a), (b), and (c) might well refer to particular cases. There might be some concealed joker herein with reference to a particular building or buildings. Proviso (c) reads as follows:

Prevent the restoration of a building wholly or partially destroyed by fire, explosion, act of God or the public enemy, or prevent the continuance of the use of such building or part thereof as such use existed at the time of such whole or partial destruction, or prevent a change of such existing use except under the limitations provided herein in relation to existing buildings and premises.

The only restriction being that it must be a frame building. In other words, under this law, if a frame building which it would not be proper to build in the first instance should be partially destroyed by fire, the zoning commission would have no power to prevent restoration in its form existing before the fire. If we create a zoning system at all, and if we confer power on these men to act as zone commissioners and to regulate the height of buildings and the place where they must be built and the character of their construction, why should we not afford them ample power and not restrict them in particular cases? And especially ought we not to leave them free in matters of restoration?

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the matter is that these provisos were put in out of an abundance of caution on the part of the commissioners recommending the bill and particularly on the part of the committee reporting the bill, so that property rights should not be too much interfered with by this zoning commission, and that buildings already constructed or buildings for which plans have already been made should not be interfered with, but that the owners should be allowed to go ahead without interference by the zoning commission.

Mr. GARD. Let me say that if this zoning commission is to have any power, if it is going to do any work at all, you will find that the minute this bill passes, or within a short time thereafter, every man who has a building in contemplation, or any change in contemplation, is going to file an application for a permit under (a) or (b), or is going to try to come outside of the provisions of this proposed law.

It seems to me that the purpose of section 5, or the first part of it, before you get down to the proviso is ample. Where you say—

That said commission is authorized and empowered to make such orders and adopt such regulations not inconsistent with law as may be necessary to accomplish the purposes and carry into effect the provisions of this act.

That is ample, but when you leave that and qualify it by provisions that might apply to particular things, are you not destroying the force of the bill you are trying to create?

I desire to call attention to the condition in the proviso (c), which absolutely places no restriction on a brick building, no matter how unworthy it may have been in an architectural sense or a substantial sense, no matter how illy adapted it may be for its purposes. A brick theater which would be condemned in the first instance under proviso (c) being partially destroyed by fire, the zone commissioners would have no power to prohibit the exact duplication in the restoration of that building. I know the gentleman wants to provide all possible protection to the building because the primary idea of the zone commission is to afford public protection. To say that in a certain locality a certain kind of building shall be erected in such a way for public protection, not the protection of the individual, but for the protection of the public, and therefore I call the attention of the gentleman in charge of the bill to exception (c) and ask him if he does not think that that can be eliminated?

Mr. MAPES. What the gentleman has said about the provisos in the bill appeals to me, but they were put in, as I said before, out of abundant caution. There are in our committee lawyers of a technical turn of mind, whose minds operate, however, differently from that of the gentleman from Ohio. They wanted the right of the zone in a commission to interfere with existing buildings and the rights of owners of property definitely defined, and rather insisted that these limitations be put in.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman will see that if he goes so far as to say there is nothing in the bill to prevent the restoration of a brick building inadequate for its purpose, the use of which in the first instance may have been improper, the bill amounts to nothing.

Mr. MAPES. Well, I would not agree with the gentleman in that statement.

Mr. GARD. This is what I am trying to get at: Suppose a moving-picture theater on F Street, or some other street, and they are all crowded now, has a fire. It is a brick or stone building and partially destroyed. After the fire it develops on investigation by the fire marshal, or whoever makes the investigation, that the building is improperly constructed, that the public benefit to the people who pay the money to go there is not subserved by that class of a building and that it is dangerous to human life. Still, under this bill the man who owns the building may rebuild it the same as he did before, and use it for the same purposes as he did before, although, as a matter of fact, a moving-picture building may be standing in between two other buildings and that is manifestly an improper surrounding for a moving-picture building. That is what I have in mind when I seriously call to the attention of the gentleman that if this bill is to have any benefit for the public, not to exploit somebody else, but if the public is to be protected this zone commission should have the power to see in a half-destroyed building when it is rebuilt that it should be rebuilt in accordance with plans that will contribute to the public safety. If you carry out the provisions of paragraph "c" they could not do it.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, of course, the rebuilding of a building would be under the jurisdiction of the building inspector and subject to the rules and regulations of the building law. But if it was rebuilt it would be in no worse condition than it was before. As far as I am personally concerned, I should have no objection to this provision being stricken out.

Mr. GARD. Then, Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the language on page 5, after the semicolon, down to and including the colon in line 10, after the word "premises."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GARD: Page 5, beginning in line 3, after the semicolon and the word "regulations" strike out the balance of that line and lines 4 to 10, inclusive, up to the colon.

Mr. MAPES. To that I offer a substitute.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 4, after the word "dwelling," strike out the words "wholly or."

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, it might create a lot of unfairness if a building was to be entirely torn down and rebuilt after being partially destroyed. I think this would answer the gentleman's criticism very much better than the amendment he has just offered.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be heard in opposition to the substitute. I know the gentleman desires to act in accordance with what all believe would be the best interest for the public, but I do not believe the mere striking out of the words "wholly or" will meet the cases that I have suggested, because it leaves the language as follows:

or prevent the restoration of a building partially destroyed by fire, explosion, act of God, or the public enemy, or prevent the continuance of the use of such building—

And so forth.

In other words, unless the destruction was entire, if the destruction was three-fourths or seven-eighths, then, under the gentleman's substitute the gentleman can see, I am sure, that the very purpose he now says is a good purpose would be defeated. In other words, if a theater building—to refer to my original illustration—is seven-eighths destroyed and one-eighth remains, the entire building could be rebuilt, because it would come within the purview of the gentleman's words—

or prevent the restoration of a building partially destroyed by fire.

My objection to this language is a very sincere objection, and is based, as I think the gentleman understands, upon a public utility and public protection. In other words, I want this zoning system or this zoning commission to operate for the interest of the public, to prevent fire hazards, the loss of human life by fire, to prevent buildings falling down where great congregations of buildings are. It seems to me that the gentleman, upon reflection, will see that the elimination of the words "wholly or" will not carry out the purposes which he concedes are the true purposes, and that all of this language should be stricken out and that there should be conferred upon the zoning commissioners an honest discretion to investigate, examine, and recommend the rebuilding along proper lines of a wholly destroyed or even a partially destroyed building.

Mr. WOODS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. Yes.

Mr. WOODS of Virginia. I just want to ask the gentleman this: Suppose a building is half destroyed by fire; then you will deprive that landowner of his vested property right there and say to him that he can not use the property as he formerly used it? That is what the committee had in mind in its efforts to protect the individual rights.

Mr. GARD. Not at all. Suppose the gentleman has a theater building and the roof is burned off. It appears that the roof was of improper construction, under the contention which the gentleman himself sanctions: Under this law the man could put the roof on in the same way it was before, the same character of roof, the same identical thing which in the first instance the gentleman concedes is improper construction and dangerous to human life, and that is what I want to avoid. The mere fact that he has half of the building destroyed or the roof destroyed is certainly an increased reason why that same improvement should not be permitted. It ought to be made better. The zoning commission should give its permission before any action is taken.

Mr. WOODS of Virginia. If the restoration of the building is hazardous to human life, the present law protects. He has no right to construct something that is hazardous, but, on the other hand, the committee's thought in this matter was to preserve and protect the rights of individuals as far as consistent with the public interests, and I think the bill does that. If business has built up around this building with reference to the use of the building, with reference to the character of it, then it is no hardship on any abutting property owner that that use shall continue. When we strike out the words "wholly or," so that when a building is destroyed the owner can not rebuild, but allow him the right to repair when it is half destroyed, it seems to me we are doing justice to both the owner and the public.

Mr. GARD. There is hardly an instance where a building is wholly destroyed. Even the most inefficient fire department usually manages to save something, and you can hardly say that a building can be wholly destroyed before the zoning commission could have power in regard to its detail.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TREADWAY). The question is on the substitute offered by the gentleman from Michigan.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON), there were—ayes 22, noes 4.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BLANTON. I did not quite catch the number that was voting.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The substitute motion was agreed to by a vote of 22 to 4. The question now recurs upon the amendment as amended by the substitute.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, in order to have the language uniform, I move that in line 7, page 5, after the word "such" the word "whole" be stricken out, and that the word "or" as it first appears on line 8 be stricken out.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 7, after the word "such," strike out the word "whole," and in line 8 strike out the first word "or."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 28, noes 2.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. REAVIS. A large number of Members on the floor of the House did not vote on this amendment. Are those Members compelled to vote?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, Mr. Speaker, if politics are going to be brought in, to try to camouflage the situation, I make the point of order that there is no quorum, to show that not many more Members are on the floor than did vote.

Mr. BUTLER. Oh, do not do that.

Mr. BLANTON. There are not many more Members on the floor than voted.

Mr. REAVIS. I make the point of order that a parliamentary inquiry is not debatable.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of order of no quorum.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas withdraws the point of order of no quorum.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I offer to amend by inserting a period after the word "Columbia," in line 14, page 5, striking out the rest of the section.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio offers an amendment which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 5, line 14, after the word "Columbia," strike out the semicolon and insert a period and strike out the words "or (d) prevent the restoration of a wall declared unsafe by the inspector of buildings of the District or by a board of survey appointed in accordance with any existing law or regulation."

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, it seems to me that this bill is certainly not intended to carry out the purposes of the public utility in the shape of the language herein. Evidently very few people have read the bill, and very few are now giving it heed, and there are only a limited number who seem to be giving attention to the bill, even as it is read. [Applause.] I do not refer to that in any partisan sense or in any objectionable sense. The bill is not of general import, and Members generally are not interested in it, but this is a proposition of general interest. In this proviso (d) the bill says that nothing shall—

prevent the restoration of a wall declared unsafe by the inspector of buildings of the District or by a board of survey appointed in accordance with any existing law or regulation.

In other words, if a wall is declared unsafe by the inspector of buildings, there is nothing to prevent its restoration, whatever that means. The language of the bill ought to be sufficiently broad to vest power and discretion in the zoning commission, because if a wall is unsafe it should not be restored, whatever that means; but if a wall is unsafe, the wall should be torn down, and if it is to be rebuilt there should be some authority conferred on the zoning commission to say where it should be rebuilt and of what material it should be rebuilt. There should be some regard for the public safety, because the bill is flaunting broadly in the mind of the public the fact that here in the District of Columbia if the inspector of buildings says that a wall is unsafe there is no power in the zoning commission to say that this wall shall not be restored. In other words, an unsafe wall shall be restored—unsafe in the first instance, to be restored to its original character of being unsafe. That surely is not what the gentleman means, and it seems to me that this language should be stricken out and a reasonable degree of discretion lodged in these zoning commissioners if this zoning law is to have any effect at all.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, this law is patterned after the New York and St. Louis zone laws. They have been tested by the courts at different times and are considered by the experts as the most up-to-date and best laws in the United States on the subject. It is possible to rebuild or to reinforce a wall that may be unsafe to-day, and the zoning commission ought not to be given authority to compel the tearing down of the whole building in that sort of a case. It might be entirely unnecessary to do so, and it was the judgment of the committee that the zoning commission ought not to be given the authority to compel it.

Mr. GARD. The fault, I think, is that the bill pays too much attention to the builder and too little attention to the public. This is a public-benefit bill and not a bill for the benefit of the builders. Here in the District of Columbia, here in the Capital City of the Nation, a building zone law should be a model law and for the protection of the people, not of the persons who want to restore unsafe walls. This means exactly what it says, that if the wall has been declared unsafe under this law there

is nothing to prevent that same wall from being restored in the same condition; in other words, it is unsafe now and restored to continue its unsafeness.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. I do.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is taking away authority from the zone commission?

Mr. GARD. Yes; it is limiting the authority of the zone commission, but it is to prevent the faulty construction of buildings and the possible destruction of human life; that is what it does do.

Mr. GALLAGHER. That is the condition all over the city.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON) there were—ayes 12, noes 27.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 6. That any lawful use of a building or premises existing at the time of the adoption of orders and regulations made under the authority of this act may be continued, although such use does not conform with the provisions hereof or with the provisions of such orders and regulations; and such use may be extended throughout the building, provided no structural alteration, except those required by law or regulation, is made therein and no new building is erected. Where the boundary line of any use district divides a lot in a single ownership at the time of the adoption of orders and regulations under the authority of this act the commission may permit a use authorized on either portion of such lot to extend to the entire lot, but not more than 25 feet beyond the boundary line of the use district.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word, to call the attention seriously of those Members who should be considering the bill to the fact. I have offered these suggestions merely for the betterment of the bill. I do not offer them in any other sense. I say that the bill as it is presently written and which we are now considering is so manifestly in the interest of the builder or the property owner and so entirely opposed to the public benefit that it should be most materially amended. I refer again not alone to the action of this committee, whether they understand what they are doing or not, saying unsafe walls may be put back exactly as they were in a building no matter what the public may think about it, but section 6 provides that no matter what the use of the building is at this time that use may be continued for all time without any regulatory action upon the part of the zoning commission even if the character of the neighborhood changed entirely. In other words, if a gasoline station is in a certain place and it becomes necessary to build a church in that particular location and the church is built, the fact that the gasoline station, or some highly hazardous place where the fire risk is great has been once maintained, is always to be maintained under this act, because there can be no interference with any vested rights. I am tired of hearing of vested rights. I am tired of hearing in these bills about the rights of the individual, and I think that something should be done for the rights of the public in whose proper interest these bills should be passed.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. That it shall be unlawful to use or permit the use of any building or premises or part thereof hereafter created, erected, changed, or converted wholly or partly in its use or structure until a certificate of occupancy shall have been issued by authority of said zoning commission.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of asking the chairman a question. Does the bill clearly provide for a change of district by the zoning commission from time to time as the development in the city or the development in the District shall dictate?

Mr. MAPES. I think it does.

Mr. VENABLE. In glancing over the bill I received the impression that it was not very clear as to the authority of the zoning commission to change from time to time buildings in areas as the development and needs of the city should dictate. The chairman is of the opinion that that is taken care of?

Mr. MAPES. I think that is taken care of.

Mr. VENABLE. This proposes to confer that authority?

Mr. MAPES. That is the purpose.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAPES. I do.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Has this zoning commission approved of this bill? Does this commission that is to be established approve of this bill?

Mr. MAPES. The bill was introduced at the request of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia. They appeared before the committee in its behalf.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Has this bill been approved by the zoning commission of the city of Washington?

Mr. MAPES. It is approved by the Commissioners of the District.

Mr. GALLAGHER. The original zoning commission?

Mr. MAPES. The three District Commissioners constitute over one-half of the membership of the zoning commission.

Mr. GALLAGHER. But they did not approve of this bill, did they?

Mr. MAPES. The commissioners did approve of it, and it was introduced at their request.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 9. That buildings erected, altered, or raised, or converted in violation of any of the provisions of this act or the orders and regulations made under the authority thereof are hereby declared to be common nuisances; and the owner or person in charge of or maintaining any such buildings, upon conviction on information filed in the police court of the District of Columbia by the corporation counsel or any of his assistants in the name of said District, and which court is hereby authorized to hear and determine such cases, shall be adjudged guilty of maintaining a common nuisance, and shall be punished by a fine of not more than \$100 per day for each and every day such nuisance shall be permitted to continue, and shall be required by said court to abate such nuisance. The corporation counsel of the District of Columbia may maintain an action in the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia in the name of the District of Columbia to abate and perpetually enjoin such nuisance.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word for the purpose of inquiring of the chairman of the committee whether or not the word "raised," line 22, page 60, is correctly spelled? There are two words spelled differently. I rather suspect the word should be "razed."

Mr. MAPES. I think that correction should be made, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. May I ask the gentleman a question, with the permission of the gentleman from Kentucky?

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. Certainly; I have finished.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Then, for the purpose of making inquiry of the chairman of the committee, I ask to be recognized in my own right. I supposed when reading this section that it referred to a case where a building had been raised in height for the purpose of making its height conform to the street or some regulation of the authorities, or possibly for the purpose of convenience to the owner thereof. It looks to me as if this word was spelled as it should be. Very often parties want to make a change in the height of a building, sometimes by reason of a street regulation or sometimes for their own convenience, and sometimes they want to lift it from its present foundation, and it seems to me they ought not to be permitted to do that without the approval of the zoning commission.

Mr. MAPES. I can see no harm from having both words in.

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky. If the word "elevated" were used there, the meaning would be clear. I think, as the gentleman states, if both words were used there would be no trouble about it.

Mr. MAPES. I move that the word "razed" be inserted after the word "altered" in line 22.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. MAPES: Page 6, line 22, after the word "altered" insert the word "razed."

Mr. GARD. The language as it is at present, I suspect, is intended to cover both definitions of the word—one definition meaning to elevate, the present spelling, and the other definition, "razed," to tear down.

I call attention to subsequent language in the bill, in lines 24 and 25, and especially in line 25. How are you going to accommodate that language with the words "common nuisances"? I think the intention of the framers of the bill is well carried out by the existing language. In other words, that the building is to be built up, put jacks under it and raise it, put a story on top of it, but by using the word "razed" you could not by any construction of law make "razing" a common nuisance.

And if you adhere to the language you have in line 25, then I think you should adhere to the language you have in line 22, because there could be no association of the word "razed" with a common nuisance, because if you tear a building down and demolish it there is not anything that would be a common nuisance. I think the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. JOHNSON] sees the point I am trying to get to the members of the committee, and sees by inference, I think, that I am right.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan withdraws his amendment, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Sec. 10. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall enforce the provisions of this act and the orders and regulations adopted by said zoning commission under the authority thereof, and nothing

herein contained shall be construed to limit the authority of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make municipal regulations as heretofore: *Provided*, That such regulations are not inconsistent with the provisions of this law and the orders and regulations made thereunder. In interpreting and applying the provisions of this act and of the orders and regulations made thereunder they shall be held to be the minimum requirements for the promotion of the public health, safety, comfort, convenience, and general welfare. This act shall not abrogate or annul any easements, covenants, or other agreements between parties: *Provided, however*, That as to all future building construction or use of premises where this act or any orders or regulations adopted under the authority thereof impose a greater restriction upon the use of buildings or premises or upon height of building, or requires larger open spaces than are imposed or required by existing law, regulations, or permits, or by such easements, covenants, or agreements, the provisions of this act and of the orders and regulations made thereunder shall control.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I want to offer an amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. GALLAGHER: At the end of section 10, page 8, line 11, add the following: "*Provided further*, That no buildings over four stories high shall be erected under this law without providing fire escapes thereon."

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. GALLAGHER. What is the point of order? This is a matter that is of vital importance to the people of this city. Nearly all of the four-story buildings here are erected without fire escapes, and I think one of the particular duties of Congress should be to provide fire escapes on all buildings that are at least four stories high. There ought to be some provision for tenants and people occupying four-story buildings, whereby they can escape in case a building catches on fire. I have noticed that all through this city there are three and four story buildings where there is no provision whatever for fire escapes, and in every civilized community they ought to provide fire escapes on four-story buildings. And that is the object of this amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLANTON. If we are going to provide for four-story buildings, why should we not provide for three-story buildings? It is almost as dangerous to jump from a three-story building as from a four-story building.

Mr. GALLAGHER. They ought to be on three-story buildings as well. And I thought if I brought it to the attention of the committee that is considering this matter, they might see the propriety of doing this. That is the reason I offered the amendment.

Mr. MAPES. Of course, Mr. Speaker, there is no disputing what the gentleman from Illinois says. Buildings of four stories ought to be provided with fire escapes, and they no doubt are. That is undoubtedly a part of the building regulations of the District of Columbia. This bill is to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings, and to create a zoning commission. The amendment of the gentleman from Illinois is not germane to this particular bill.

Mr. GALLAGHER. Does not this bill apply to the use of buildings and to secure public safety?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLAGHER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I think the gentleman from Illinois is slightly in error. I lived for several years in a four-story apartment house that had fire escapes on it.

Mr. GALLAGHER. They would not tolerate a building law of this kind in Chicago without looking out for the safety of the public. I notice all over this city there are three and four story buildings that are without fire escapes. There is no provision of law that I know of requiring them to provide fire escapes, or they would be in sight, and I believe that as a matter of justice and decency we ought to provide this protection for the people who live in three and four story buildings.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I am not prepared to dispute the assertion of the gentleman generally, but—

Mr. GALLAGHER. I am sure I am not making a misstatement.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I must except this one building that I have referred to. It had four stories and fire escapes on it. I supposed they were put there in consequence of some city ordinance or regulation.

Mr. GALLAGHER. There ought to be regulations of that kind in this city, and I hope the amendment I have offered will be adopted, so that fire escapes will be required by law.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES] make the point of order?

Mr. MAPES. Yes; I make the point of order.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman can point out to the Chair something in the amendment which applies to the provisions of the bill, the Chair would be glad. This bill simply provides for the height of buildings. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word in section 10.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. GARD. I do this for the purpose of again calling the attention of the chairman of the committee to the seeming inconsistency of the language, as in other sections that I have called attention to. From what has been, I confess, but a cursory analysis of the bill as I have gone over it, it seems to me that the bill in one place writes in something to be done and then in another place, by an additional word or words, tries to nullify it, as I tried to make it appear was written in the proviso in section 5.

Now, in section 10 it provides "That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall enforce the provisions of this act and the orders and regulations adopted by said zoning commission under the authority thereof." It seems if we create the zoning commission, the zoning commission should have power to carry out its own provisions, and not one part of the zoning commission be permitted to enforce the provisions of the act, as this does.

Also I call attention to this statement, that, notwithstanding the commissioners shall enforce the provisions of the act, it provides that—

Nothing herein contained shall be construed to limit the authority of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make municipal regulations as heretofore.

In other words, notwithstanding what this act provides, the Commissioners of the District of Columbia can go along and do just what they did before. Then they provide again—

Provided, That such regulations are not inconsistent with the provisions of this law and the orders and regulations made thereunder.

Now, what is the meaning of all this curious jumble of language?

Also, I call your attention to page 8, lines 1, 2, and 3—

This act shall not abrogate or annul any easements, covenants, or other agreements between parties.

Then you say—

Provided, however, That as to all future building construction—as it appears on line 3, if something greater is required by such easements, covenants, or agreements, the provisions of the act and the orders and regulations thereunder shall control. In other words, you say in two sentences that nothing shall abrogate or annul any easement, covenant, or other agreement between parties, and then you provide that if future building construction makes it any different, the easements, covenants, or agreements shall be null or abrogated. I call the attention of the Members of the House, and especially those who have had to do with the construction of the bill, to the fact that while I believe, as it is written, the bill has for its object what is no doubt a very excellent purpose, yet it is now but a curious jumble of words.

Mr. MAPES. Of course, Mr. Speaker, we are glad to have the opinion of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] on the bill. He reads it with a peculiar attitude of mind, however, as it seems to me. The Commissioners of the District of Columbia have charge of the enforcement of all the laws and regulations pertaining to the District of Columbia, and this bill does not propose to change their authority and their right in that respect. It leaves to the Commissioners of the District of Columbia the authority to carry out this law and the regulations made by the zoning commission.

The gentleman from Ohio criticizes the following language in this bill:

This act shall not abrogate or annul any easements, covenants, or other agreements between parties.

Of course, that means any existing agreements or covenants. It is not really necessary to put the word "existing" in. Anybody who understands the English language knows that it applies to them. The proviso is perfectly proper in going on and making provision that in the future agreements can not be made which are inconsistent with or limiting this act. It seems to me the language is perfectly clear and perfectly proper.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 10. That the Commissioners of the District of Columbia shall enforce the provisions of this act and the orders and regulations adopted by said zoning commission under the authority thereof, and nothing herein contained shall be construed to limit the authority of the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to make municipal regulations as heretofore: *Provided*, That such regulations are not inconsistent

with the provisions of this law and the orders and regulations made thereunder. In interpreting and applying the provisions of this act and of the orders and regulations made thereunder they shall be held to be the minimum requirements for the promotion of the public health, safety, comfort, convenience, and general welfare. This act shall not abrogate or annul any easements, covenants, or other agreements between parties: *Provided, however*, That as to all future building construction or use of premises where this act or any orders or regulations adopted under the authority thereof impose a greater restriction upon the use of buildings or premises or upon height of building, or requires larger open spaces than are imposed or required by existing law, regulations, or permits, or by such easements, covenants, or agreements, the provisions of this act and of the orders and regulations made thereunder shall control.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves the previous question on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division on the vote.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded on the motion for the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. A division, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. A division is demanded.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 47, noes 0.

On motion of Mr. MAPES, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARD. There were some slight amendments added from time to time. Were they included in the gentleman's motion?

The SPEAKER. They were passed by the House.

NORMAN LEE MOLZAHN.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill H. R. 333, a bill providing for the disinterment and removal of the remains of the infant child, Norman Lee Molzahn, from the temporary burial site in the District of Columbia to a permanent burial place. That is on the Private Calendar. Is it necessary to ask unanimous consent to have it considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole?

The SPEAKER. It can be considered in Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. KINKAID. This bill was reported by the Committee on the District of Columbia, and hence the chairman of that committee calls the bill up. Is it necessary, this being District day, to ask unanimous consent to take this bill up for consideration?

The SPEAKER. He does not ask unanimous consent to take it up. He asks unanimous consent to consider it in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (H. R. 333) providing for the disinterment and removal of the remains of the infant child, Norman Lee Molzahn, from the temporary burial site in the District of Columbia to a permanent burial place.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the health officer of the District of Columbia, and he hereby is, authorized to issue a permit to A. J. Molzahn to disinter and remove the remains of his infant child, Norman Lee, who died of diphtheria, from its temporary burial site in the District of Columbia to such lot or place in the District of Columbia or elsewhere as the father may choose for a permanent burial place, the body having been embalmed and contained in a copper-lined casket, but such permit shall not be issued unless there has been filed in the health department of the District of Columbia a permit from the proper governmental authorities at the place where the reinterment is to be made, authorizing said interment there of the said remains.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I suggest to the gentleman in charge of the bill that he offer an amendment in line 6, page 1, where the name of the child is stated to be Norman Lee, by inserting the word "Molzahn," as that was the child's name.

Mr. MAPES. I will accept the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. GARD. I do not offer it, but simply suggest it to the gentleman.

Mr. MAPES. I do not think it is necessary, but if the gentleman wants to offer it I have no objection.

Mr. GARD. I think it should be done, because the child's name was Norman Lee Molzahn.

Mr. MAPES. I ask unanimous consent that the name be inserted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 6, after the word "Lee," insert the word "Molzahn."

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the bill to final passage.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. MAPES, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. GARD. Would it be in order now to move that the same bill, which is on the Private Calendar, be stricken from that calendar, this bill having been passed?

The SPEAKER. That will be done automatically.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. MINAHAN of New Jersey, for Tuesday, September 9, on account of important business.

To Mr. CRISP, for 10 days, on account of important business.

ADMIRALS OF THE NAVY.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report from the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York presents a privileged report from the Committee on Rules. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, to which was referred H. Res. 267, submit a privileged report on said resolution, with the recommendation that the resolution be agreed to.

House resolution 267.

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into a Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 7767, being a bill authorizing the President to appoint two admirals of the Navy; that there shall be one hour of general debate, one-half to be controlled by the gentleman from Maine [Mr. PETERS] and one-half by the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. VENABLE]; that at the conclusion of the general debate the bill shall be read for amendments, whereupon the bill shall be reported to the House with the amendments, if any; that the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and all amendments to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to present a rule which makes in order a bill that has for its purpose the recognition of the distinguished services of two of our great admirals of the Navy. Every American is proud of the Navy and of the work that it has done during the last two years. Probably that branch of our fighting machine was better prepared to do its work than any other, and as far as we are able to learn it did the work that it had to do in the most satisfactory and pleasing manner, and to-day is deserving of the generous approbation of the American people. I believe that it is especially fitting at this time that we should pass this bill and recognize these two admirals and thus show our appreciation of their services.

I am also informed by the gentleman in charge of the bill [Mr. PETERS] that it is necessary to have speedy action, because one of the gentlemen referred to will retire very soon on account of the age limit. I hope there will be no opposition to the rule or to the bill and each will receive the unanimous vote of the House.

As far as I know, there have been no requests for time on the rule from either side. Unless there are some requests, I will move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman moves the previous question on the adoption of the resolution.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON), there were—ayes 52, noes 1.

Accordingly the previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the resolution.

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. BLANTON), there were—ayes 56, noes 1.

Accordingly the resolution was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. According to the provision of the rule, the House resolves itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 7767, and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] will please take the chair.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. FESS in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of a bill which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (H. R. 7767) to appoint Admiral William S. Benson, United States Navy, and Rear Admiral William S. Sims, United States Navy, as permanent admirals in the Navy.

Mr. PETERS. I ask unanimous consent that the first reading of the bill be dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maine?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine [Mr. PETERS] is recognized for 30 minutes.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. LONGWORTH having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CROCKETT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 100) making Tuesday, September 16, 1919, a legal holiday in the District of Columbia.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendments the bill (H. R. 6810) to prohibit intoxicating beverages, and to regulate the manufacture, production, use, and sale of high-proof spirits for other than beverage purposes, and to insure an ample supply of alcohol and promote its use in scientific research and in the development of fuel, dye, and other lawful industries, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

WILLIAM S. BENSON AND WILLIAM S. SIMS.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, the effect of the bill, with the assured action of the President to follow, is to give Admiral William S. Benson and Rear Admiral William S. Sims the permanent rank of admiral, which is now held by Benson temporarily as chief of operations, and which was held by Sims during the last part of his service in Europe.

It preserves their present relative seniority and makes them senior to other officers who are holding the rank of full admiral temporarily, like the commanders of the Atlantic and the Pacific Fleets, whose commissions might be prior in date.

It gives the new admirals full pay for life instead of three-quarters upon retirement, but as against that it provides that they may be called upon for any active duty even in peace time after retirement.

They are obliged to retire upon reaching the age limit as now provided by law instead of having the option themselves of retiring or not, as was the case when Dewey was made the Admiral of the Navy.

No new office is created in the sense that there will be any more officers in the Navy. These two men whose permanent rank is that of rear admiral, both of whom have held the rank of full admiral temporarily, will simply continue in the service until the retiring age as admirals instead of rear admirals. Upon their deaths the vacancies shall not be filled.

As to compensation, Congress in 1870 provided that the pay of a general in the Army should be \$13,500. In 1908 it was provided that the pay of the corresponding rank in the Navy, being admiral, should be the same. It would seem rather nigardly of Congress in conferring the honor to cut down the pay, and so we have left it the same, although the pay of a temporary admiral is somewhat less. No allowances are provided for in addition to salary, and none would be drawn after retirement, which in the case of both these distinguished officers is regret-

ably near in date, Admiral Benson retiring September 25, 1919, and Admiral Sims October 15, 1922.

Legislation concerning the grade of admiral in the Navy occurs in the last three war periods of our history.

CIVIL WAR LEGISLATION.

Prior to 1866 we had no grade of admiral. A rear admiral was the highest rank in the Navy. By the act of July 25, 1866, Congress provided—

that the number allowed in each grade of line officers on the active list of the Navy shall be 1 admiral, 1 vice admiral, 10 rear admirals, 25 commanders, 50 captains—

And so forth.

In pursuance of this legislation Farragut was appointed admiral, and upon his death in 1870 Porter succeeded him. By the act of July 15, 1870, the salary was increased as follows:

That from and after the 30th day of June, 1870, the annual pay of the officers of the Navy on the active list shall be as follows: The admiral, \$13,000.

In 1873 a law was passed abolishing the grades of admiral and vice admiral upon the first vacancies occurring.

That was the end of legislation affecting the office of admiral during that period.

SPANISH WAR LEGISLATION.

At the close of the Spanish War legislation was passed to give Dewey the highest possible place in the Navy. The act of March 2, 1899, provided:

That the President is hereby authorized to appoint, by selection and promotion, an admiral of the Navy, who shall not be placed upon the retired list except upon his own application; and whenever such office shall be vacated by death or otherwise the office shall cease to exist.

Under this act, as was expected, the President appointed Dewey "the Admiral of the Navy" and he continued such till his death, when the office expired again.

During this period, as during the period succeeding the Civil War, it was the purpose of Congress to place one man at the head of the Navy. Dewey was not "an admiral." He was not "Admiral in the Navy." He was "the Admiral of the Navy." There could be no other.

PRESENT WAR LEGISLATION.

When it became necessary in 1915 and 1916 to make plans for the possible entry of the Navy into the war on a scale not previously dreamed of it was evident that a tremendous expansion of the Navy in men and ships and our probable association with the navies of the Allies would necessitate a certain enlargement of the personnel in the higher grades. It became imperative to carry nearer the top the pyramid of officers which was previously cut off several steps from the peak.

We first pushed the office of chief of naval operations into the place of first importance and made that officer the professional head of the Navy. This was in 1915. In 1916 we provided that—

Hereafter the chief of naval operations * * * shall have the rank and title of admiral, to take rank next after the Admiral of the Navy—

And so forth.

By act of May 22, 1917, it was provided—

That the President be * * * authorized to designate six officers of the Navy for the command of fleets or subdivisions thereof and, after being so designated, from the date of assuming such command until relinquishment thereof, not more than three of such officers shall each have the rank and pay of an admiral, and the others shall each have the rank and pay of a vice admiral, and the grades of admiral and vice admiral are hereby authorized and continued for the purposes of this act, * * * Provided, That when an officer with the rank of admiral or vice admiral is detached from the command of a fleet or subdivision thereof * * * he shall return to his regular rank in the list of officers of the Navy and shall thereafter receive only the pay and allowances of such rank.

In the act of July 1, 1918, was a clause to the effect that—officers of the Navy holding the rank and title of admiral and vice admiral in the Navy while holding such rank and title shall receive the allowances of a general and lieutenant general of the Army, respectively.

Under existing law we may have, and, as a matter of fact, now do have, four officers holding the rank and title of admiral—the chief of operations and the three officers in command each of a fleet, at present the Atlantic, the Pacific, and the Asiatic Fleets.

With the passage of this bill we would have, during the lives of these distinguished officers, six admirals, four holding the rank temporarily and two during their lives, as a partial expression of the gratitude of the country for eminent and effective service rendered in the greatest war we ever undertook.

No longer may there be one man occupying a lonely pinnacle at the very top of the Navy, immune from involuntary retirement, but, for the present, six, each holding the rank

but not the title of Dewey, four of them necessary to the business of our great Navy, and two of them honored for great accomplishment in the past.

There is good and sufficient reason for granting this honor to both these officers. It may be that others also should be recognized in some signal manner. Everybody knows the distinguished services rendered by Admiral Mayo in command of the Atlantic Fleet; by Admiral Wilson in France, where he represented the Navy and his country with unparalleled success; and by Admiral Rodman, in command of the battleships in the North Sea; by Admiral Gleaves, in command of the cruiser and transport force; and by Admiral Strauss, in command of the mine-laying force; but the President in his message has well said that Benson and Sims are the men upon "whom the principal responsibilities devolved for achieving the great results which our incomparable Navy accomplished," and when we honor them we recognize the whole Navy, which has come out of this war with the well-deserved reputation of having shown itself the most competent naval force in the world.

In selecting the two foremost men of all those responsible for the successful result of our naval operations and promoting each of them to the rank of full admiral, we offer a small return for the brilliant, patriotic, and effective service that has been rendered by each of them—a return less than has been given by Great Britain for distinguished service of the same kind—but a return customary, expected, and adequate considering the traditions and history of the Republic. The honor, unfortunately, can not be enjoyed by Admiral Benson to its full extent for more than a few days at most, as he retires this month by operation of law.

Mr. TILSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERS. Yes.

Mr. TILSON. Would it interrupt the gentleman's remarks if I reverted to a statement earlier in his remarks in regard to the pay of the admirals?

Mr. PETERS. Certainly not.

Mr. TILSON. Two days ago we passed a resolution conferring the authority upon the President to appoint Gen. Pershing a general. Under the retirement laws he will retire with three-quarters pay, the same as other officers, whereas under the provisions of this resolution these two admirals will receive full pay during their lives.

Mr. PETERS. That statement is correct.

Mr. TILSON. Would the gentleman think it wise under these circumstances to make that discrimination?

Mr. PETERS. That is for the committee and the House to decide. But this should be said: While the bill authorizing the President to make Gen. Pershing a full general provides by implication that he retires on three-quarters pay when he reaches the retirement age, and this bill provides expressly that both officers shall receive full pay for life, in this bill the admirals are denied any allowances, while in the military bill Gen. Pershing would have the full allowances.

There is much reason, it seems to me, why both the admirals and the general should receive full pay for life. It is a small consideration considering the wonderful services they rendered. In Great Britain this compensation would be laughably small. They have made large grants to their officers in Great Britain who have performed no more difficult or heroic service than ours.

Mr. DEWALT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERS. Yes.

Mr. DEWALT. Does the gentleman know what the full pay of a general is?

Mr. PETERS. Thirteen thousand five hundred dollars—the same for a general and an admiral. It has been at this figure for some years, and besides we ought not to lose sight of the fact that the value of a dollar has greatly lessened. Also, it might interest the gentleman to know that at the present time there are negroes working in the Newport News shipyards on piece work who get approximately \$10,000 a year. I believe that we ought to pay the admirals as much as we pay negroes in the shipyards. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEELE. Does the gentleman know what the allowances for a general are?

Mr. PETERS. I do not; perhaps the gentleman from Connecticut can give the details in regard to that.

Congress declared war in April, 1917, but the Navy declared war a long time before that. Admiral Benson became Chief of Naval Operations in May, 1915, under a mandate giving him the widest powers. In the language of the act of March 3, 1915, he was—

charged with the operations of the fleet and with the preparation and readiness of plans for its use in war.

By the act of August 29, 1916, it was provided that—

all orders issued by the Chief of Naval Operations in performing the duties assigned him shall be performed under the authority of the Secretary of the Navy and his orders shall be considered as emanating from the Secretary and shall have full force and effect as such.

As the professional head of the Navy from that time till now Admiral Benson had the responsibility of directing all strategic and tactical matters as well as the organization, maneuvers, drill, and training of the fleet. How well he carried out his mandate to get ready the fleet and make plans for war is shown by the fact that from the day the first armed guard limbered up its gun on the deck of a merchant ship to the surrender of the German Navy in Scapa Flow to the American and British fleets our Navy never "missed a trick." [Applause.]

His breadth of mind and soundness of judgment were manifested soon after we entered the war when the British and French sent naval representatives to Washington to inform us confidentially that the submarine situation was desperate and that they must have help. They asked for a few destroyers. Admiral Benson rose to the occasion. He sent every available vessel to Europe, the ultimate object being, not to keep our vessels safely in our own ports, but to win the war.

In October, 1917, Admiral Benson went to Europe for an important conference with the Allies and to bring about greater unity of action. His propositions were largely adopted by Admiral Jellicoe and his visit had the most important and far-reaching results. It was during this visit that it was agreed to send a division of American battleships to the grand fleet, and the plan of putting a barrage across the North Sea was decided upon. The actual completion of this barrage of mines wholly across the North Sea from Scotland to Norway, carried deep enough to prevent any submarine going through, was perhaps the greatest naval material activity of the whole war. It was the boldest, most hazardous, and best executed enterprise of the kind ever attempted—and it was successful. [Applause.]

In fact, wherever his duties called him, whether directing from headquarters in Washington, planning with the Allies in Europe, or supervising operations at the front, he got results.

The training and operating of the great force under his command was one of the prime factors in winning the war.

A mere statement of its size compared with the Civil War force and the Spanish War force shows the magnitude of the work.

Our total number of men in the Navy at the close of the Civil War was 51,500. The greatest number of ships was 1,176. Farragut, at New Orleans, had 47 ships and not over 20,000 men; at the Battle of Mobile Bay he had 18 ships and less than 5,000 men.

Our total personnel in the Spanish War, officers and men, was 24,000.

Our total ships were 196.

At the Battle of Manila Bay, which is reckoned a glorious day for the American Navy, Dewey had 2,500 men and 7 ships.

When this war practically closed in November, 1918, the naval forces carrying on the fight in various parts of the world under the general direction of Admiral Benson were 529,500 officers and men and 2,202 ships, with 629 more under construction.

Under the immediate command of Admiral Sims in European waters, included in the above figures, were 81,000 officers and men and 373 ships.

This great force of free-born Americans, voluntarily rushing to the defense of their country in its time of danger, constituting, with its fine professional nucleus, the American Navy, met every expectation, lived up to all traditions, justified our confidence, and in less than two years repaid us tenfold for every dollar we had spent upon it from the beginning of the Government. [Applause.]

The country expects and demands that we shall recognize this service in no ungenerous way.

We declared war in April, 1917. The Navy entered, to all intents and purposes, some months previously, but Admiral, then Lieutenant, Sims got in about 1901.

The Navy Department had been asleep for some years. Moreover, it was blind. Soggy with self-complacency as a result of our successful operations against poor old Spain, it was deaf to anything except praise. Sims was one of the few officers who had an acute idea of the relative value of our fleet. He had been observing and comparing. In November, 1901, ignoring official channels, where his revolutionary reports had been pigeonholed, he wrote directly to President Roosevelt, pointing out some dreadful defects in the fleet. Writing this letter meant a probable court-martial, but Sims never cared much for court-

martial when he knew he was right. He grazed them pretty close several times in his career. This letter referred to various reports Sims had made, without apparent result, and gave as his judgment "that the protection and armament of even our most recent battleships are so glaringly inferior, in principle as well as in details, to those of our possible enemies, and that our marksmanship is so crushingly inferior to theirs, that one or more of our ships would, in their present condition, inevitably suffer humiliating defeat at the hands of equal numbers of our enemy's vessels of the same class and displacement."

Mr. STEELE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PETERS. Yes.

Mr. STEELE. A moment or two ago the gentleman referred to the allowances made by Great Britain to its generals and admirals. Can the gentleman state what they are?

Mr. BUTLER. Fifty thousand dollars a year.

Mr. PETERS. In some instances large grants of money were made to the British admirals in addition to salaries.

This letter that I refer to from Sims to Roosevelt started something. Principally it started Roosevelt. Through him Sims was placed in a position to make good. Largely as a result of his efforts, when we entered the war our gunners could shoot with deadly accuracy and our ships were the equal of any in the world.

Sims is a man of vision as well as of action. In 1910, after first-hand observations abroad, he submitted a report which declared that the European war could not be delayed longer than four years. He also said that England and France would be allies, and that Italy would subsequently join them. In his famous London speech he had previously predicted that the United States would be found fighting side by side with Great Britain.

Inevitably Sims was the man sent abroad March 28, 1917, to be on the spot and take charge in foreign waters when our naval forces should arrive to take their place in the greatest of all wars.

His appreciation of the military situation was quick and accurate. He reported that Great Britain and her allies were in a desperate situation and were being slowly but surely whipped. The submarine was winning the war for Germany. Great Britain was being strangled, and the blood-thirsty Hun would then turn his attention to us. A wise judgment as to the disposition of our forces at that moment was vital. Sims was responsible for the degree and character of our cooperation. A smaller man might have operated our forces as an independent unit. With rare judgment, he adopted a policy, which he steadfastly adhered to, of treating the United States forces as reserves being brought to the front. With extraordinary tact he brought about a most cordial and wonderfully effective cooperation between the British and American forces. Last year members of the Naval Affairs Committee were told by people in Queenstown that as soon as the American destroyers got down to work with the British vessels at that base the number of refugees previously brought in every day from torpedoed ships showed a marked decrease, and our destroyer commanders operating with the British told us that sometimes when the wonderful little vessels went out, as they did every day, regardless of weather, they were under a British and sometimes under an American flotilla commander, whichever happened to be senior. The British and American fighting men were working as one, and that combination could not be "licked."

Admiral Sims was put in command of our destroyer force April 28, 1917. On May 25 he was made vice admiral and ordered "commander United States naval forces operating in European waters."

On November 20, 1917, he was given additional duty as naval attaché, and on November 27, 1918, he was given the temporary rank of admiral. No short synopsis can give an adequate idea of the important and complicated duties assigned to and brilliantly performed by Admiral Sims. His record is well known. He made good in every position he occupied. He amply justified the confidence of his superiors. He interjected his force of character and judgment into a situation which was worse than critical and contributed impressively to the great result. While every naval officer did his duty, Sims was preeminently the right man in the right place. His achievements inspire the respect, admiration, and gratitude of his countrymen.

The Navy has never failed the American people, and the American people rejoice in the opportunity to make some small return for brilliant service modestly performed. [Applause.]

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT].

Mr. DEWALT. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the House, I would not undertake to address the House on this subject at all were it not for the fact that I, with every other American

citizen who knows the history of the American Navy, must have unbounded pride therein. When I think of a David Paul Jones, when I know of a Perry, when I remember the deeds of a Farragut, and of a Dewey in Manila Bay, and then couple them with the heroic and patriotic services of Benson and Sims I think I would be lax in my duty if I were not to utter some words from Pennsylvania favoring the passage of this measure. There are no more glorious pages in the history of the American Government than those that inscribe the deeds of our heroic sailors. Their duty in the first place is perhaps more perilous than even that of the soldier, but, be that as it may, there never has been an occasion in all the long history of the country when the sailor boy has not met the full measure of his duty. I know that we are proud of our Army, and I am confident that every American citizen is equally proud of the Navy, and when you take into comparison the deeds performed by the American sailor boys and their commanders in this war we need not be ashamed of that record as compared with the record of the great British Navy. For years past—yes, almost for a generation, and perhaps before that time—Great Britain, the British Empire, has been styled the mistress of the seas. The American people, however, have had no ambition in that direction, no ambition to control the highways of the ocean, but the American people have always had the desire to retain unblemished and unsullied the record of the past, and that record, commencing in the days of 1812, and even before that time, remained unblemished and unsullied during all the period of the Civil War, and then the Spanish War, and now again remains untarnished through the record of this great struggle that we have just finished, and it seems to me all this is worthy of commemoration by the passage of this measure.

You have had called to your attention the fact that Great Britain and the English Government have rewarded their admirals. I saw in the newspapers the other day that Mr. Lloyd-George had said that the debt of Great Britain now was \$200,000,000,000—at least that the war had cost the British Empire \$200,000,000,000. We know that the war has cost us in round numbers perhaps \$21,000,000,000. If we, having only one-tenth of the expense that Great Britain has had in financing this war, are we not able to afford the paltry sum of \$13,500 a year for life to these gentlemen, then it seems to me we will be very lax in our idea of the patriotism and honorable service that these gentlemen have rendered. [Applause.]

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. BUTLER].

Mr. BUTLER. Mr. Chairman, what we do here, let us do at once, and willingly and cheerfully. I would not withhold this great distinction from these gentlemen for one minute if it were not that I desire to add a word of commendation to their enviable records. I have been associated with them 25 years in this great effort which has been completed successfully. This common cause in which I have taken an interested but unimportant part—a preparation for the great day—moves me to say just a word. I have known these two men of the deep sea many years—Sims and Benson. Both of them taught the Navy to float, and one of them taught the Navy to shoot, and both of them led when the Hun cast his shadow before us. My friends, there never has been a time in the consideration of any measure of importance, whether affecting either men or things, but which concerned the Navy when both were not called for their counsel, and there never has been a time when that counsel was not accepted, because those who listened felt that they heard the words of great leaders devoted to a Nation's cause; our confidence in them was not misplaced nor our confidence in their great ability misjudged. When our fleets took to the sea we knew who would command; so did every man in the Navy know. You men who know me know that I am not a fresh-water sailor; that I am not in favor of hanging decorations on men unless those decorations are earned. Benson organized and directed the operation of this fleet, and for years has been instrumental in its construction. Benson pointed the way; Sims followed it to a conclusion. Gentlemen will recall this. These two men, one at the head of the force and the other upon the high seas all the time, carried all of these troops abroad without the loss of a man, caught the submarine, and compelled our enemies to ask for terms.

Under the direction of Sims our naval forces laid a barrage across the North Sea that cost this Government \$46,000,000, and in which the Germans themselves admit that seven of their submarines were caught. If the Germans had been able to sink the commerce, our cause would have failed. Benson and Sims, with the aid of the service they had prepared, stood in the way.

These men are not the only men who deserve great distinction; but, my friends, let us do what we propose to do sponta-

neously and with a generosity that starts in the heart, and do it unanimously and graciously, and hand to these old dogs of the sea this recognition of merit. It belongs to them and to the whole Navy because of service well done.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. DEWALT] says it is only a pittance. He speaks sensibly. In a few days one of these men retires and the other will be on the active list only three years longer and then the grade dies. The Navy asks this to be done. The men of the service have picked these men for this honor, and the country will be gratified if you are satisfied to so distinguish them. [Applause.]

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. HICKS].

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes additional to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Chairman, the achievements of the Navy in the Great War were unique and incomparable in our history. They form a brilliant record of accomplishment; of cooperation and coordination; of judgment and foresight; of determination and courage, unsurpassed in the annals of the sea.

The scope of action was without precedent—the performance without parallel. When before has any Navy been confronted with such gigantic tasks as those which confronted our Navy in the spring of 1917? And when in all history have problems only approaching them, been solved with such complete success? The magnitude of the numbers to be transported across the danger-infested ocean presented a situation unknown in any war, ancient or modern—a problem so difficult that the German high command considered it utterly impossible, and yet the American Navy, bidding defiance to its enemies, accomplished the impossible. One million men sent across in American ships, with 4,000,000–6,000,000 more to follow if the call had come. How many were lost? Of all that mighty host who sailed under the American flag, not a man—to the everlasting glory of the Navy—not a man was lost. [Applause.]

Think of the strategy necessary to surmount the dangers encountered. And what were those perils? To the ordinary hazards of the sea were added in an hundredfold the danger of hidden mines, of lurking submarines, of risk of collision from convoy formation when our ships, without lights or beacons, braved the darkness and the dangers of the storm-swept Atlantic.

Recall the vastness of the field of operation. Where is there a page of history that tells of any nation defending 3,000 miles of coast line, protecting its vast commerce, transporting its armies to a foreign soil, and waging a victorious war thousands of miles across the seas? This was the call for genius as well as for daring, for plodding service as well as for unflinching courage, for organization as well as for sacrifice.

And how did the Navy respond in the hour of need?

At home, by building new ships, not by the score but by hundreds; reconstructing German liners left broken wrecks; procuring supplies in unheard-of quantities; producing munitions—enough to shatter the loftiest mountains; patrolling our harbors and ports and sweeping our coasts. That record will endure forever.

On the seas, by manning the merchant ships; hunting submarines; locating mines; conveying the fleets of cargo vessels on whose safety depended the lives not only of our own soldiers but those of our allies as well; and conveying our troops to the war zone. What more perilous service has ever come to mariners since first a boat was launched upon the deep? Did a single man falter before dangers that appalled the stoutest hearts? No, not one! [Applause.]

On foreign soil, by cooperating with the British fleet in perfect harmony, united with them in strength as well as in purpose; constructing across the tempestuous North Sea in waters 350 to 1,050 feet in depth the greatest mine barrage ever conceived, considered by many too chimerical to be within the range of possibility; laying a pipe line across Scotland, 137 miles in length; erecting 33 air stations and equipping them with barracks and shops; furnishing the Army the heaviest mobile guns on the line; building hospitals and docks; constructing storehouses; perfecting systems to detect submarines and devising methods to overcome them. But, above all, bringing to our struggling allies the hope and confidence inspired by the moral as well as the physical force of a nation that marshaled its full power of blood and treasure and sacrifice for the single purpose of victory. [Applause.]

These were the deeds of the Navy to be passed down, unstained heritages for those who come after. Where in all the conflicts of the human race—where is there a record that will compare with this?

To the constructive endeavor, the constancy of purpose, the fertility of resource, and the heroic bravery of officers and men

of the service, no higher tribute can be paid than by the simple words, "All was well with the Navy."

For those whom this bill seeks to honor, little need be said. They were potent factors in the onward sweep to victory. Their names are known and honored by their fellow countrymen. Both are men of noblest character, both are officers of brilliant attainments, each deserving of the highest honors and the unstinted praise of a grateful country. Their work is done. Their services were rendered, not in the roar of guns or the shriek of shells, not in the spectacular setting of broken masts or sinking ships, but in that earnestness of willing cooperation, tireless effort, skillful management, and steadfast determination, which achieved a triumph, absolute and complete.

The Navy honors itself and the Nation it serves when it adds to the brilliant galaxy of admirals—Jones and Farragut, Porter and Dewey—the names of Benson and of Sims. [Applause.]

MEMORANDUM OF LAWS CONCERNING THE ADMIRAL OF THE NAVY, THE CHIEF OF NAVAL OPERATIONS, AND FLEET AND VICE ADMIRALS.

By special act approved March 2, 1899, the President was authorized to appoint, by selection and promotion, an Admiral of the Navy, who was not to be retired except upon his own application. The naval act approved March 3, 1899, provided that the pay and allowances of the Admiral of the Navy should be the same as those received by the last General of the Army. George Dewey was commissioned as Admiral of the Navy on March 2, 1899, and the office ceased to exist on the date of his death, January 16, 1917.

The naval appropriation act approved May 13, 1908, established the following rates of pay for officers of the Navy, viz:

Admiral	\$13,500
Rear admiral, first nine	8,000
Rear admiral, second nine, or commodore	6,000
Captain	4,000
Commander	3,500
Lieutenant commander	3,000
Lieutenant	2,400
Lieutenant (junior grade)	2,000
Ensign	1,700

In addition to their pay, officers are allowed by law, where public quarters are not provided, commutation of quarters, heat, and light; and while at sea or on foreign shore duty they receive, in lieu of said allowances, 10 per cent additional of their base pay plus longevity pay, the law providing that there shall be allowed and paid to each commissioned officer below the rank of rear admiral 10 per cent of his current yearly pay for each term of five years' service, putting a limitation, however, on the increase which might be derived from this source. From July 1, 1918, to October 1, 1919, officers on sea duty having dependents are entitled to quarters for their dependents, or commutation therefor.

The naval act approved March 3, 1915, provided that—

There shall be a Chief of Naval Operations, who shall be an officer on the active list of the Navy appointed by the President, by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, from among the officers of the line of the Navy not below the grade of captain, for a period of four years, who shall, under the direction of the Secretary of the Navy, be charged with the operations of the fleet and with the preparation and readiness of plans for its use in war. *Provided*, That if an officer of the grade of captain be appointed Chief of Naval Operations, he shall have the rank, title, and emoluments of a rear admiral while holding that position.

During the temporary absence of the Secretary and the Assistant Secretary of the Navy the Chief of Naval Operations shall be next in succession to act as Secretary of the Navy.

This act also created the positions of three fleet admirals and three fleet vice admirals, naming the fleets specifically, and providing that the pay of a fleet admiral should be \$10,000 per annum and of a fleet vice admiral \$9,000 per annum. As by this provision the fleet admirals and fleet vice admirals ranked the Chief of Naval Operations, who the law charged with the operations of the fleets and with the preparation and readiness of plans for its use in war, the following remedial provision was carried in the naval appropriation act approved August 29, 1916, viz:

Hereafter the Chief of Naval Operations, while so serving as such Chief of Naval Operations, shall have the rank and title of admiral, to take rank next after the Admiral of the Navy, and shall, while so serving as Chief of Naval Operations receive the pay of \$10,000 per annum and no allowances. All orders issued by the Chief of Naval Operations in performing the duties assigned him shall be performed under the authority of the Secretary of the Navy, and his orders shall be considered as emanating from the Secretary of the Navy, and shall have full force and effect as such. To assist the Chief of Naval Operations in performing the duties of his office there shall be assigned for this exclusive duty not less than 15 officers of and above the rank of Lieutenant commander of the Navy or major of the Marine Corps: *Provided*, That if an officer of the grade of captain be appointed Chief of Naval Operations he shall have the rank and title of admiral, as above provided, while holding that position: *Provided further*, That should an officer, while serving as Chief of Naval Operations, be retired from active service he shall be retired with the lineal rank and the retired pay to which he would be entitled had he not been serving as Chief of Naval Operations.

The special act of May 22, 1917, in effect repealed that portion of the act of March 3, 1915, which related to the designation of specific fleets to which fleet admirals and fleet vice admirals were to be assigned, and provided—

That the President be, and he is hereby, further authorized to designate six officers of the Navy for the command of fleets or subdivisions thereof and, after being so designated from the date of assuming command until relinquishing thereof, not more than three of such officers shall each have the rank and pay of an admiral, and the others shall each have the rank and pay of a vice admiral. * * *

The Naval appropriation act approved July 1, 1918, provided—

That hereafter the Chief of Naval Operations shall receive the allowances which are now or may hereafter be prescribed by or in pursuance of law for the grade of general in the Army, and the officers of the Navy holding the rank and title of admiral and vice admiral in the Navy while holding such rank and title shall receive the allowances of a general and Lieutenant general of the Army, respectively. * * *

The following are the names of the men who filled the positions of admiral and vice admiral at different times during the war period:

Admiral: A. M. Knight, F. F. Fletcher, W. B. Caperton, H. T. Mayo, Wm. L. Rodgers, Wm. S. Sims, H. B. Wilson, and Hugh Rodman.

Vice admiral: Dewitt Coffman, Albert Gleaves, A. W. Grant, W. S. Sims, C. S. Williams, H. B. Wilson, and H. P. Jones.

The following are the names of the men now filling the positions of admiral and vice admiral:

Admiral: H. B. Wilson (commanding Atlantic Fleet), Hugh Rodman (commanding Pacific Fleet), and Albert Gleaves (commanding Asiatic Fleet).

Vice admiral: H. P. Jones (Atlantic Fleet), C. S. Williams (Pacific Fleet), and Wm. L. Rodgers (Asiatic Fleet).

MEMORANDUM OF LAWS RELATING TO THE NUMBER OF OFFICERS OF THE LINE AND VARIOUS STAFF CORPS OF THE NAVY.

Excerpts from naval act approved August 29, 1916:

Hereafter the total number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Navy, exclusive of commissioned warrant officers, shall be 4 per cent of the total authorized enlisted strength of the active list, exclusive of the Hospital Corps, prisoners undergoing sentence of discharge, enlisted men detailed for duty with the Naval Militia, and the Flying Corps: *Provided*, That the total number of commissioned line officers on the active list at any one time, exclusive of commissioned warrant officers, shall be distributed in the proportion of 1 of the grade of rear admiral to 4 in the grade of captain, to 7 in the grade of commander to 14 in the grade of lieutenant commander, to 32½ in the grade of lieutenant to 41½ in the grades of lieutenant (junior grade) and ensign, inclusive.

The total authorized number of commissioned officers of the active list of the following staff corps, exclusive of commissioned warrant officers, shall be based on percentages of the total number of commissioned officers of the active list of the line of the Navy, as follows:

Pay corps, 12 per cent; Construction Corps, 5 per cent; Corps of Civil Engineers, 2 per cent; and that the total authorized number of commissioned officers of the Medical Corps shall be sixty-five one-hundredths of 1 per cent of the total authorized number of the officers and enlisted men of the Navy and Marine Corps, including midshipmen, Hospital Corps, prisoners undergoing sentence of discharge, enlisted men detailed for duty with the Naval Militia, and the Flying Corps.

On and after June 30, 1920, no captain, commander, or lieutenant commander shall be promoted unless he has had not less than two years' actual sea service on seagoing ships in the grade in which serving or who is more than 56, 50, or 45 years of age, respectively: * * *

Provided further, That captains, commanders, and lieutenant commanders who become ineligible for promotion on account of age shall be retired on a percentage of pay equal to 2½ per cent of their shore-duty pay for each year of service: *Provided further*, That the total retired pay shall not exceed 75 per cent of the shore-duty pay they were entitled to receive while on the active list.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, September 4, 1919.

For: Congressman HICKS.

Subject: Shore activities in Europe during the war.

The activities of the Navy on shore in Europe during the war consists principally of the following:

Construction of mine bases at Invergordon, Inverness, Scotland, and Bizerta, Tunis. At the time of the armistice there was a total of 60 officers and 2,222 men at these bases.

CONSTRUCTION OF THE NORTH SEA BARRAGE.

From the time of the entrance of the United States into the war it was the opinion in the Navy Bureau of Ordnance that the most effective way of combating the submarine would be to establish an antisubmarine barrier across the North Sea, which would prevent the submarine from reaching the Atlantic. The bureau made an intensive study of various types of barrage, including nets, nets with mines, and mines alone. It soon became apparent that only the mine was practicable, and no mine then in existence was entirely satisfactory for the purpose. The distance across the North Sea was 250 miles and the depth of water was very great, in some places reaching a depth of 1,100 feet. Mining in such depths of water had never before been carried out, and the length of the barrage also offered great difficulties. In fact, the British admiralty believed that such a project was altogether impracticable.

A new type of mine was developed by the Bureau of Ordnance during the summer of 1917, which was especially adapted for use against submarines, since it would be exploded by the close approach of a vessel, as well as by the actual contact of a ship with the mine case. This feature of the mine gave it a larger effective radius and so reduced by about two-thirds the number of mines necessary for a given area.

After the development of this mine had progressed sufficiently to give assurance of its success, the Navy Department submitted plans for a

North Sea barrage to the British admiralty, which were accepted by them in modified form. According to the plan finally agreed upon, certain portions of the mine field were to be mined by the United States with United States mines and certain other areas were to be mined by the British with British mines.

The North Sea barrage project was formally approved by the Governments of the United States and Great Britain the latter part of October, 1917. The Bureau of Ordnance was directed to proceed with the procurement of the necessary material for 100,000 mines, the number it was estimated would be required.

To secure the required high rate of production of mines that was necessary, and also to preserve the secrecy of the new mine, the work of manufacture was divided among a large number of contractors—140 principal contractors and over 400 subcontractors. Partial assembly of parts into groups took place in this country at plants of principal contractors and at the points selected for shipment of mine material overseas, and complete assembly was made at the advanced bases in Scotland. The total cost of the 100,000 mines amounted to \$25,150,000.

The majority of the mines were loaded with T. N. T.—300 pounds to each mine—at the mine-loading plant, St. Juliens Creek, Va. This plant, consisting of 22 buildings, was constructed during the winter of 1917-18 and was designed to be capable of receiving, loading, and shipping 1,000 mines a day of 24 hours. When necessary, however, more than this number could be taken care of, the number on one occasion reaching a total of 1,530, an average of better than one mine a minute in the 24-hour period. A total of 73,000 mines, involving the melting and handling of 22,000,000 pounds of T. N. T., were loaded at the mine plant, and, in addition, about 17,000 mines were loaded by contract with a large explosive company near the place of manufacture of the mine case.

The mine carriers were 23 cargo vessels, each of about 3,000 tons capacity, which were allocated to the Navy Department for exclusive mine-carrying use. As many as four carriers were loaded at one time, and the record time for completely loading a vessel was 22 hours.

Two advanced mine bases for the inspection and assembly of mines were established on the eastern coast of Scotland, one at Invergordon and the other at Inverness. The first mine carriers bringing mine material arrived in April, 1918, and assembly began soon after. The work of assembling the mines was a highly organized process, developed in accordance with the present standards of manufacturing efficiency. It had been estimated originally that the two bases could assemble and inspect 500 mines a day, but this number was greatly exceeded and the highest number assembled in a day was 1,340.

Before the North Sea barrage project was decided on the mine force of the United States Navy included two mine layers. When it became necessary to enlarge the force for the planting of the barrage eight merchant ships were taken over and converted into mine layers, making a total of 10.

The mine squadron sailed in May, 1918, and the first American mine-laying operation in the North Sea took place on June 8. There were in all 13 such excursions of the United States mine squadron in the laying of the North Sea barrage, the last operation being completed on October 26, 1918. The maximum number of mines laid on any one excursion was 5,520, requiring less than four hours altogether. Though the barrage was composed of both British and American mines and was established jointly by mine layers of both Navies, 56,611 mines, or 80 per cent of the 70,263 mines planted in the barrage, were American mines and were laid by the American mine squadron.

The barrage when completed extended from Norwegian territorial waters to within 10 miles of the Orkney Islands, the 10-mile passage being heavily patrolled. When submarines began to use Norwegian territorial waters to reach the open sea, the Norwegian Government announced its decision to mine Norwegian waters, and this had the effect of closing that gap.

The exact number of submarines destroyed by the barrage will never be known, but it appears from information obtained from German sources that 23 were so lost. The main purpose and result of the barrage, however, was to prevent the U-boats from attempting to reach the Atlantic, and by doing this it caused the failure of the submarine warfare. Without doubt the North Sea barrage had a very considerable part in ending the war, and it may rightly be considered one of the most important naval operations undertaken by the United States.

Aviation construction work involved in establishment of 33 stations, at a total cost of over \$11,000,000, including the following facilities: Seaplane, dirigible, and kite balloon hangars; runways; piers; platforms; barracks; mess halls; galleys; storehouses; hospitals; repair shops; garages; power houses; recreation buildings; administration buildings; roads; water tanks; gasoline tanks; telephone and water lines.

These 33 stations covered 2,620 acres. The cubic contents of all buildings was over 110,000,000 cubic feet, or fifteen times the volume of the Woolworth Building. The barracks totaled 1,325,000 square feet. The water-front improvements involved 60,000 square feet of piers and 180,000 cubic yards of dredging. Five hundred and twenty-three miles of telephone lines were constructed, 232,000 square feet of hospitals, and a total tank storage capacity for water of 2,700,000 gallons and for gasoline of 348,000 gallons. Twenty-five radio stations were built, storehouses totaling 782,000 square feet, and hangars totaling 2,765,000 square feet.

A Navy radio station was built at Bordeaux under the supervision of the Navy. This included the construction of 8 steel towers, each 820 feet high.

Fuel-oil stations were constructed at Brest, Fort La Pallice, and L'Orient.

A fuel-oil pipe line across Scotland was authorized by the Secretary of the Navy April 1, 1918, with the idea of securing a continuous and adequate supply of fuel oil in the North Sea for the British Navy, with a minimum risk of interference from enemy submarines.

This line is 137 miles long and constructed of 8-inch pipe. It follows the course of the Clyde and Forth Canal, the starting point being at Old Kilpatrick, on the outskirts of Glasgow, and the terminal at Grangemouth. Construction was started June 1, 1918, and completed October 30, 1918. The line was constructed under the supervision of an American naval unit.

BUREAU OF MEDICINE AND SURGERY,
Washington, D. C., September 8, 1919.

[Memorandum for Mr. HICKS, Committee on Naval Affairs, House of Representatives.]

The following data is submitted in compliance with request transmitted. It is, at best, very incomplete, as returns and reports covering activities and expenditures have not yet been received in many cases. Expenditures from the \$1,000,000 appropriation for "Overseas hospital construction" were made as required by Admiral Sims, and will, of

course, be duly accounted for. Whenever possible buildings for hospital and dispensary use were obtained by donation, the only expenses being those of remodeling and upkeep. At other places buildings were leased, and at others we made use of portable buildings, mostly shipped from the United States. In some cases, as, for instance, at Queenstown, Ireland, by turning the buildings over to an allied government at cost, the expenditure will be largely reduced.

United States naval hospitals and dispensaries abroad.

Name and location.	Capacity (beds).	Type.
<i>Naval base hospitals.</i>		
No. 1, Brest, France.....	500	Rented buildings.
No. 2, Strathpeffer, Scotland.....	700	Do.
No. 3, Leith, Scotland.....	800	Buildings evacuated by British Army medical department.
No. 4, Queenstown, Ireland.....	200	Portable buildings and temporary construction.
No. 5, Brest, France.....	700	Rented building.
<i>Naval hospitals.</i>		
L'Orient, France.....	75	Rented building.
Paulliac, France.....	100	Do.
London, England.....	75	Taken over from Red Cross.
Gibraltar.....	75	Rented building.
Cardiff, Wales.....	75	Remodeled buildings.
Plymouth, England.....	75	Rented buildings and portable houses.
Genoa, Italy.....	50	Building taken over from Red Cross.
Corfu, Greece.....	100	
<i>Naval dispensaries.</i>		
Naval air stations.....	8-16	Portable buildings.
Naval bases.....	8-50	Do.
St. Nazaire, France.....		
Ponta del Gada, Azores.....	75	
Bordeaux, France.....		
Invergordon, Scotland.....		
Inverness, Scotland.....		
Rochefort, France.....		
Plymouth, England.....		

W. C. BRAISTED,
Surgeon General, United States Navy.

TRANSPORT SERVICE.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
OFFICE OF NAVAL OPERATIONS,
Washington, September 3, 1919.

HON. FREDERICK C. HICKS, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. HICKS: In compliance with your request in regard to the operation of transports, I submit this information in regard to their operation.

At the beginning of the war the transports were operated by the War Department, with the Navy Department in charge of placing vessels in convoy, and responsible for the security and defense of these vessels at sea. A naval officer was placed on board each vessel for this purpose. It was found that through lack of discipline of the merchant crews that the safety of these transports was endangered while passing through submarine-infested waters. It was, therefore, decided that the Navy would man all troop transports carrying troops through the war zone.

The Navy was then charged with manning, operating, and escorting these vessels, and the regulation of the interior discipline. The Navy moved the ships to the ports designated by the Army. The Army had charge of the loading of the vessels, assignment of transportation, and controlled the docks at which the vessels were berthed.

Very truly, yours,

W. S. BENSON,
Admiral, United States Navy, Chief of Naval Operations.

NAVY DEPARTMENT,
BUREAU OF SUPPLIES AND ACCOUNTS,
Washington, D. C., September 4, 1919.

HON. FREDERICK C. HICKS, M. C.,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. HICKS: In response to your inquiry, the following information is submitted in connection with the operation of troop transports and cargo vessels by the Navy for the account of the War Department.

On June 1, 1919, there were 111 commercial vessels with a troop-carrying capacity of 326,041 men operated by the Navy for Army account as troop transports. On these vessels all expenditures (except charter hire) are paid by the Navy, and reimbursement is requested from the War Department, except for the pay, allowances, and subsistence of the Navy personnel on board.

Charter hire on these vessels is not paid by the Navy, this being left for adjustment between the War Department and the Shipping Board.

In addition to the above-mentioned commercial vessels, 19 battleships and cruisers with a troop-carrying capacity of 24,914 men have been engaged in bringing troops home. On these vessels all expenses are borne by the Navy except the subsistence of Army officers and troops and the cost of installing and removing standees and special fittings required for transporting troops. The cost of the standees and special fittings installed on these vessels is also charged to the War Department, and after its removal the material is turned over to that department. No charge is made for charter hire on these vessels, the only expense to the War Department being the cost of subsistence of Army personnel and of special fittings, as stated above.

Besides troop transports there have been 239 cargo ships, 3 colliers, 2 tankers, and 11 refrigerator ships operated by the Navy for Army account. These were all commercial vessels and have been operated along the same lines as the troop transports, i. e., all expenses (except charter hire) are paid by the Navy, and the Army is billed for the total cost, after deducting the pay, allowances, and subsistence of the Navy personnel on board.

Sincerely, yours,

C. J. PEOPLES,
Acting Paymaster General of the Navy.

American troops carried by ships of each nation.	
British ships, 49 per cent.....	1,027,000
United States ships, 45 per cent.....	927,000
Italian ships, 3 per cent.....	65,000
French ships, 2 per cent.....	47,000
Russian ships (British control) 1 per cent.....	20,000
	2,086,000

(Page 47, House Document No. 174, Sixty-sixth Congress.)

"No American troop transport was lost on its eastward voyage. For this splendid record the Navy, which armed, manned, and conveyed the troop transports, deserves the highest commendation."

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. GREEN].

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Chairman, I join most heartily with everything that has been said in commendation of our Navy and what it has done in this war. It has shown itself worthy of its high traditions in the past, and nothing higher than that can really be said with reference to it. So far as the individual operations proper are concerned they seem to have been beyond all criticism, but there is one matter in connection with the management of our Navy personnel that I wish to call to the attention of the House at this time.

Everyone knows that a large number of our young men enlisted in the Navy for the duration of the war. All the Members of this House know that although the war has to all intents and purposes ceased, it is nearly impossible to get a young man out of the Navy, no matter how important his needs or necessity.

I wish at this time, in the few minutes that are allotted to me, to call attention of Members to one instance which is a fair example of the situation prevailing in the Navy. It has a hospital for tuberculosis patients at Fort Lyon, Colo., an important hospital, and nominally there are some 600 patients in attendance at that hospital. As a matter of fact a large number of these patients are out on leave, a large number awaiting discharge, and a large number convalescent, so that they are able to do work on the hospital grounds. There are actually 114 bed patients at that hospital, men who are in need of constant attention. The number of men being kept there to attend these 114 is 99, and as I understand and am informed they need only about 40 to attend to these patients. A number of those who are kept there as a part of the Navy to attend these patients in the capacity of hospital attendants are young men who wish to go on with their schooling, young men who have important matters that are suffering by reason of their detention, young men who will in many instances lose a whole year out of their career so far as their life work is concerned if they are detained there into the next winter.

Now, the Navy Department has issued an order forbidding the discharge of any more of those men.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes, if I have the time.

Mr. RAKER. I was down at the Navy Department this morning, and is it not a fact that they are trying to get the boys out of the service so fast from the various hospitals that they are really endangering the lives and health of those that are in there? The Navy Department is advising the public that that is the fact, that they have not the men there to take care of them.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I have just pointed out that they have at that hospital more than twice the number that there is any necessity for at this time, and I feel sure that there can not be any valid claim that so many men are needed there. The reason why they are detained is simply because the Navy Department has issued a sweeping order that no more of these men can be discharged. There is no necessity in any event for keeping those men there. One reason why they are there is because the Navy Department insists on running merchant vessels with the naval organization, when the work is done by them better, cheaper, and more expeditiously and far more satisfactorily than by the ordinary merchant personnel. Another is that the new recruits are not assigned to such places.

Mr. BROWNING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I will.

Mr. BROWNING. Did the gentleman say that there has been a sweeping order issued by the Navy Department that no more of these men should be discharged?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. At that particular hospital at least.

Mr. BROWNING. That is what I am talking about.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Well, that is my information.

Mr. BROWNING. I never heard of it at all, and I know very recently a young man I interceded for got out of there.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I would say that my information is a letter I received from the commandant of the hospital this very day. Does not the gentleman think that is proper authority?

Mr. BROWNING. I never heard of it.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, I yield three minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Chairman, there have been several references made on the floor of the House about the position of the American Legion toward the soldier's settlement bill (H. R. 487). As long as a letter from another representative organization has been read before the House, I would ask the Clerk to read this letter in the remainder of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the letter will be read.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

THE AMERICAN LEGION,
NATIONAL EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE,
New York City, September 5, 1919.

The honorable Members of the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States, Washington, D. C.

Sirs: The attention of the joint national executive committee of the American Legion has been called to misrepresentations made to Congress with respect to the legion's attitude toward the soldiers' settlement bill, H. R. 487. The committee particularly refers to a letter inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of September 2, 1919, appearing on page 4624 thereof. In order that Members of Congress may be correctly advised as to the attitude of the American Legion toward H. R. 487, the soldiers' settlement bill, the following is respectfully submitted by the national executive committee of the American Legion:

The American Legion has never gone on record in favor of H. R. 487 or any other specific land legislation now before Congress. The following resolution was adopted at the St. Louis caucus of the American Legion held May 8, 1919, on this particular subject:

"Whereas the reclamation of arid, swamp, or cut-over timberlands is one of the great constructive problems of immediate interest to the Nation; and

"Whereas one of the questions for immediate consideration is that of presenting to discharged soldiers and sailors an opportunity to establish homes and create for themselves a place in the field of constructive effort; and

"Whereas one of the purposes for which the formation of the American Legion is contemplated is to take an energetic interest in all constructive measures designed to promote the happiness and contentment of the people, and to actively encourage all proper movements of a general nature to assist the men of the Army and Navy in solving the problems of wholesome existence; and

"Whereas the Department of the Interior and the Reclamation Service have been engaged in formulating and presenting to the country broad, constructive plans for the reclamation of arid, swamp, or cut-over timberlands: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the caucus of delegates to the American Legion in convention assembled in the city of St. Louis, Mo., That we indorse the efforts heretofore made for the reclamation of lands, and respectfully urge upon the Congress of the United States the adoption at an early date of broad and comprehensive legislation for economic reclamation of all lands susceptible of reclamation and production."

Preliminary to carrying out this resolution, the joint national executive committee of the American Legion, at its headquarters, No. 19 West Forty-fourth Street, New York City, on July 8, 1919, adopted a resolution authorizing the chairman to immediately appoint three members of the legion to devote the necessary time to a thorough study of the subject and to cooperate with the Secretary of the Interior in effectuating the resolution of the St. Louis caucus indorsing the principle of land development.

The above action was taken after a representative of the Secretary of the Interior had appeared before the national executive committee of the American Legion in order to explain the provisions of the soldiers' settlement bill. The Secretary of the Interior had requested this privilege and the courtesy was, therefore, extended to his representative. It was definitely decided, however, that pending the results of the study to be made of the committee of three, appointed to consider the subject of land legislation, the American Legion would take no action on the Mondell bill or any other specific legislation of this kind. It is the intention now, however, to take no action on this subject until the First Annual Convention of the American Legion, which is to be held in Minneapolis on November 11, 1919.

It is not the policy of the American Legion to attack or oppose other veteran societies; therefore the insinuations cast against the American Legion in the letter which appeared in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD are not discussed as they have no bearing on the subject matter of this letter.

Very respectfully,

HENRY D. LINDSLEY,
Chairman National Executive Committee.

Mr. VENABLE. Mr. Chairman, I have no further requests for time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the President is hereby authorized to appoint Admiral William S. Benson, United States Navy, and Rear Admiral William S. Sims, United States Navy, permanent admirals, and they shall retain their present seniority as between themselves and shall be senior to officers temporarily appointed to the grade of admiral: *Provided*, That said permanent admirals shall not suffer any reduction in

pay when retired for age, pursuant to the provisions of the existing law, and the President is authorized, in his discretion, upon or after retirement, to assign them to active duty: *Provided further*, That the pay of said permanent admirals shall be that prescribed in the act making appropriations for the naval service and for other purposes, approved May 13, 1908: *And provided further*, That whenever the appointments made pursuant to the provisions of this act shall be vacated by death or otherwise the resulting vacancies shall not be filled: *And provided further*, That nothing herein contained shall create any vacancy in any grade in the Navy or increase the total number of officers authorized by law.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen of the committee, it is not my purpose to detract one word from what has been said in honor of Admiral Sims and Admiral Benson. I wish that we might honor all of those who are so well entitled to honor by reason of their heroic deeds and the part that they have respectively played during this war. I do think, however, that while we are paying honor to these men in high places we should take a little bit of time to discharge a duty which we owe to the private. I wish again to call the attention of this House to a condition which should not be and which I think is a blot on the fair escutcheon we have been extolling so highly here to-day. I refer again to the sending of the Fifth and Fiftieth Regiments to Europe. It was stated the other day, in answer to a remark that I had made, that these were new men being sent over there for the purpose of taking the place of old men who have been there for a number of months so as to permit them to come home. That is not correct. More than 75 per cent of the Fiftieth Regiment now assembled at Camp Dix are reenlisted men who were induced to reenlist because the promise was made that they would not be sent out of this country, that they would do duty in this country, if you please, during these troublesome labor conditions, and that they would be given a chance to learn a trade within a year, so that when discharged at the end of their year's enlistment they would be the better prepared to care for themselves in the civil walks of life. More than 75 per cent of them, after they had come from victory won upon the other side of the sea, are now being sent back over there, not to do the honorable duty of a soldier but to do the duty of a policeman. In doing what? Guard duty, if you please, in Silesia, or worse still perchance to be numbered with the 10,000 other soldier sons of America in faraway Siberia.

I have before me a letter here, which I shall make a part of my remarks, from one man in the Fiftieth Regiment who believed that the country for which he offered his all and gave so much would do something for him to rehabilitate him within the next 12 months. But now he is facing toward the other side, and unless Congress does something in a week he will be again in far away Europe. The Fifth Regiment is in like condition, and I have before me here a pitiful letter from a widow down in Tennessee praying that something will be done to send her boy back to her. He was wounded in the Argonne, once slightly and the other time severely, reenlisted for a year in the Fifth, and now is at Camp Taylor, but they are leaving that camp to be assembled at Camp Meade, where they are to be joined with the Fiftieth and within 20 days sail across the sea; and I say it is a blot upon our fair escutcheon, it is a dishonor to the honor that we are giving to these men to-day who so richly deserve all we are giving them. In doing something for these men I believe it is the duty of this Congress to voice a protest against sending any men across the seas again, and especially those who have been enlisted as these men have been enlisted. Seventy-five per cent of them were promised, if you please, by the agents of the United States that they would not be sent out of this country again.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will.

Mr. CONNALLY. I am very much interested in the statement the gentleman is making, and I would like to know by what authority or information the gentleman says 75 per cent of these men voluntarily reenlisted on information and these promises? What information or proof has the gentleman of that?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I have it on the written statement of a number of these men themselves, one of which I have here before me.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is that the only proof? As to 75 per cent voluntarily reenlisting on this information, you have the statement of one man.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I do not have the statement of 75 per cent, but I take it that this man and the others—and I dare say the gentleman does not wish to discredit them—say that they know that 75 per cent of the Fiftieth enlisted with that understanding. Besides that, I have a circular, posted at Camp Dix, from which this inference can be fairly drawn.

Mr. CONNALLY. Is that all the proof the gentleman has?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Is not that sufficient?

Mr. CONNALLY. I wanted to see the information the gentleman has that would lead him to make a statement concerning 75 per cent of them, based on a letter from one soldier.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. There is more than one letter from one soldier. There is also, if you please—and I will make it a part of my remarks, with the permission of the House—a notice showing that these men were induced to believe that if they volunteered for a year they would be engaged all the time within the confines of these large cities of the East, where they would have free access to the advantages of these cities and the recreations and amusements, if you please, and posted by an agent of the Government of the United States.

Mr. VENABLE. Does the gentleman state—and of course if he does, he states it seriously and on his responsibility as a Member of the Congress—that the recruiting officers of the Regular Army are telling men that when they enlist in the Regular Army of the United States that they will not be sent out of this country?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. May I have three minutes more?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent for three minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. VENABLE. How many cases of that character does the gentleman know about?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I know of at least a dozen cases; and I will put in not only the written word that comes from the man whose letter I have here but I will put in the circulars themselves, posted, if you please, by these recruiting officers as agents of the United States.

Mr. VENABLE. What does the circular say?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The circular says, among other things:

An excellent opportunity is offered to you to enlist in the Regular Army under the new act of Congress governing voluntary enlistments. The following is quoted for your timely information:

You will not be required to serve in the reserve after expiration of your enlistment.

You will not forfeit your bonus of \$60 by reenlistment in the Regular Army.

You can get a furlough immediately upon reenlistment to visit your parents, relatives, or friends.

Instead of getting a furlough on their reenlistment they are getting an order to move across the sea.

The circular says, further:

The Fiftieth United States Infantry has vacancies in practically all grades of noncommissioned officers and specialists, and therefore offers to you an excellent opportunity for advancement.

Considering the fact that, in addition to the above-stated inducements, this regiment is stationed in such close proximity to the largest cities and recreation centers in the East, offering an unlimited source for personal recreation and amusement, makes this an opportunity you should not neglect.

And it says to apply for further information, and so forth.

Mr. VENABLE. What is in there now about a pledge that they will not be sent abroad, or in other service they will not leave the United States?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Is it not a pledge to say to them that during the entire enlistment they will be adjacent to a large city in the East?

Mr. VENABLE. Does the gentleman say that circular says during the entire enlistment?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I think such an inference may be fairly drawn.

Mr. VENABLE. Does the gentleman take the position—

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. It says:

Considering the fact that, in addition to the above-stated inducements, this regiment is stationed in such close proximity to the larger cities and recreation centers in the East, offering unlimited source for personal recreation and amusement, makes this an opportunity you should not neglect.

Mr. VENABLE. Now, the gentleman states that in his judgment that statement would mislead a soldier to believe that if he joined that regiment, under no set of circumstances would he be sent out of the United States?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I say that would mislead Congressmen here; it would even mislead the wise gentleman from Mississippi when used with the other fair promises of the United States enlisting officers. These men had already done service across on the other side of the sea. They were led to believe they would be given some consideration for that, and then, in addition to that, to receive the promises that they would be permitted to have the opportunity set forth in this circular, taken all together, was sufficient to make any man believe that he would not again be sent overseas. That these alluring advertisements and fair promises made by recruiting

officers did cause these men to reenlist is amply evidenced by the following letter:

TRENTON, N. J., September 7, 1919.

Representative Wood:

Greeting: In looking over the papers I see you, at least, have foresight enough to put up a fight against the Fiftieth and Fifth Infantry from going to Siberia.

But do you know that the men that are to be sent overseas are nearly all ex-A. E. F. men, who reenlisted at the "request" of recruiting teams, to tide them over the "awful" labor conditions that are prevailing or are supposed to prevail, that a permanent post in the States was offered them.

That they were told on reenlisting for one year they would not go out of the States only on a three-year enlistment.

That they were to be the "guests" of Uncle Sam for one year, being overseas men.

That they could learn a trade and at the end of the year they could go out of the Army better fitted for civil life.

That three-fourths of the Fiftieth Infantry, maybe a higher percentage, are reenlisted men for one year.

That there are men with as much service as 22 months in France, wearing wound stripes, and not back in the United States 6 weeks and ordered to go overseas.

That England is afraid to send soldiers to Russia, because very probably the soldiers would refuse to go.

That I think Secretary of War Baker does not know the true facts of so many overseas men in the Fiftieth.

That in E Company, Fiftieth Regiment, about 110 or more out of 125—110 out of 125—are one year reenlisted guests of Uncle Sam.

I myself had the "Overseas men of Dix protest against order" piece, published myself.

Get some action, and d—n quick. Heroes of the battle fields to be sent back to police Silesia! Get after it.

If you want to know who I am, well, I am only a buck private in the Fiftieth. Formerly a Twenty-ninth Division man.

One year overseas; 29 months' service in khaki.

I have intentionally omitted reading the name of this soldier into the RECORD; to do so would in all probability subject him to the fury of a "Hard boiled" Smith or some similar officer ever anxious to use his power, and besides, these poor soldiers will have trouble enough before they are free men again. Yet we are told by our President that we entered this war to make the world safe for democracy. It now begins to look like we got into it to furnish policemen for the world.

Here is another letter from a good mother down in Tennessee:

DICKSON, TENN.,
September 3, 1919.

Representative Wood,
Washington, D. C.

HONORABLE SIR: I appeal to you to use your influence in obtaining the release from the Army service of my son, Pvt. Homer S. Richardson, Company E, Fifth Infantry, now stationed at Camp Taylor, Louisville, Ky. I am informed that the Fifth Infantry has been ordered to Europe on September 7. Beg leave to ask your kind consideration in regard to my son. He has seen foreign service; was one of the first to be sent to Europe after America entered the war; was wounded twice, first time slightly, last time seriously; has a good military record.

I beg leave to say further that I am a widow woman with three small children. My health is broken down and I am unable to do any kind of work. My son is the only support I have, and that the salary he earns in the Army is insufficient to feed and clothe us.

Please, sir, I will be very thankful if you might lend your help in obtaining his release.

Very truly,

Mrs. ANNIE RICHARDSON.

No doubt there are hundreds of other mothers throughout the land who have sons in one or the other of these regiments who are in the same distressed condition that this poor woman is. Will we hear the prayers and petitions of these good women and then turn a deaf ear to them, or will we do all that lies in our power to do, namely, protest in their names and in the name of all the people as their Representatives against the consummation of this outrage. That if the President as commander in chief of the Army persists in sending their boys to Europe to do police duty his will be the blame and not ours.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I have a committee amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine offers a committee amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Committee amendment:

Strike out all after the word "appoint" in line 3, page 1, down to and including the word "they" in line 6, said page, and insert the following:

By selection and promotion two permanent admirals in the United States Navy, the said admirals, when so appointed—

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, the purpose of this amendment is to make the bill conform to the precedents, which are that the name of the officers promoted shall not be used in the bill, the reason obviously being that under the Constitution the President has the sole appointive power in the naming of officers. It also makes the bill conform to the military bill recently enacted, to make Gen. Pershing the general of the Army. His name was not

mentioned in the bill, as will be recalled. It also conforms to the precedent set in President Arthur's time, when Congress passed a bill restoring Fitz John Porter to his previous rank and the President vetoed the bill on the ground that it would infringe on his constitutional prerogative. Therefore the committee believe that the amendment should be adopted.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Chairman, a division.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 73, noes 9.

So the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. PETERS. Should the title of the bill be amended now in committee or later in the House?

The CHAIRMAN. After the passage of the bill.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine moves that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with the amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken, and the Chairman announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. A division, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. A division is demanded.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 77, noes 0.

So the motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. Fess, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7767) to appoint Admiral William S. Benson, United States Navy, and Rear Admiral William S. Sims, United States Navy, as permanent admirals in the Navy, had directed him to report the same back to the House with an amendment, with the recommendation that the amendment be agreed to and that the bill as amended do pass.

The SPEAKER. Under the rule the previous question is considered ordered upon the bill and amendment. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill as amended.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the passage of the bill.

Mr. BLANTON. A point of order, Mr. Speaker. I think this bill should be passed by a quorum. I therefore make the point that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] No quorum is present. Therefore automatically the doors are closed, and the Sergeant at Arms will summon the absentees, and the Clerk will call the roll. Those who favor the passage of the bill will, when their names are called, answer "yea"; those opposed will answer "nay."

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 245, nays 9, answered "present" 1, not voting 175, as follows:

YEAS—245.

Ackerman	Burroughs	Dickinson, Mo.	Goodwin, Ark.
Alexander	Butler	Dickinson, Iowa	Goodykoontz
Anderson	Byrns, Tenn.	Domnick	Gould
Andrews, Nebr.	Caldwell	Doughton	Graham, Ill.
Aswell	Campbell, Pa.	Dowell	Green, Iowa
Ayres	Cannon	Drane	Greene, Mass.
Baer	Caraway	Dunbar	Greene, Vt.
Bankhead	Carrs	Dupré	Hamilton
Barbour	Casey	Eagan	Hardy, Colo.
Bee	Chindblom	Echols	Hardy, Tex.
Begg	Cleary	Elliott	Harrison
Bell	Coady	Elston	Haugen
Benham	Cole	Esch	Hawley
Bland, Mo.	Collier	Evans, Mont.	Hays
Bland, Va.	Cooper	Evans, Nev.	Hernandez
Blanton	Copley	Fairfield	Hersey
Boies	Crowther	Fess	Hersman
Booher	Currie, Mich.	Fisher	Hickey
Box	Curry, Calif.	French	Hicks
Brand	Dale	Gallagher	Hoch
Briggs	Darrow	Gandy	Holland
Brinson	Davey	Gard	Houghton
Brooks, Ill.	Davis, Minn.	Garrett	Howard
Browning	Davis, Tenn.	Godwin, N. C.	Hudspeth
Buchanan	Dent	Good	Hull, Iowa
Burdick	Dewalt	Goodall	Hull, Tenn.

Hutchinson	MacCrater	Rayburn	Swope
Igoe	MacGregor	Reavis	Taylor, Tenn.
Ireland	Mapes	Reber	Temple
Jefferis	Martin	Reed, N. Y.	Tillman
Johnson, Ky.	Mays	Reed, W. Va.	Tilson
Jones, Pa.	Merritt	Rhodes	Timberlake
Juhl	Michener	Ricketts	Tincher
Kearns	Miller	Rodenberg	Tinkham
Keller	Minahan, N. J.	Romjue	Towner
Kelly, Pa.	Monahan, Wis.	Rouse	Treadway
Kendall	Montague	Rose	Vaile
Kinkaid	Moore, Ohio	Rubey	Venable
Klecza	Morgan	Rucker	Vinson
Knutson	Neely	Sanders, Ind.	Volstead
Lampert	Nelson, Mo.	Sanders, N. Y.	Walters
Lanham	Nelson, Wis.	Schall	Watkins
Lankford	Newton, Mo.	Sells	Watson, Pa.
Larsen	Nolan	Shreve	Weaver
Layton	O'Connor	Siegel	Webster
Lee, Ga.	Oldfield	Sims	Welling
Leshner	Oliver	Sinnot	Welty
Little	Osborne	Slomp	Whaley
Lenergan	Overstreet	Smith, Idaho	White, Kans.
Longworth	Padgett	Smith, Ill.	Williams
Luce	Park	Smith, Mich.	Wilson, Ill.
Lufkin	Parrish	Smithwick	Wilson, La.
Luhning	Pell	Snell	Wilson, Pa.
McAndrews	Peters	Stedman	Wingo
McClintic	Phelan	Steele	Winslow
McCulloch	Pou	Stevenson	Wood, Ind.
McDuffie	Purnell	Stiness	Woods, Va.
McFadden	Radcliffe	Strong, Kans.	Wright
McGlennon	Raker	Summers, Wash.	Young, N. Dak.
McKinley	Ramsey	Summers, Tex.	
McLaughlin, Mich.	Ramseyer	Sweet	
McLaughlin, Nebr.	Randall, Wis.		

NAYS—9.

Almon	Garner	Johnson, Miss.	Quin
Blackmon	Huddleston	Jones, Tex.	Thompson, Okla.
Connally			

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—1.

Moon

NOT VOTING—175.

Andrews, Md.	Fields	LaGuardia	Robinson, N. C.
Anthony	Fitzgerald	Langley	Rossion, Ky.
Ashbrook	Flood	Lazaro	Rowan
Babka	Focht	Lea, Calif.	Rowe
Bacharach	Fordney	Lehibach	Sabath
Barkley	Foster	Luthicum	Sanders, La.
Benson	Frear	McArthur	Sanford
Black	Freeman	McKenzie	Saunders, Va.
Bland, Ind.	Fuller, Ill.	McKeown	Scott
Bowers	Fuller, Mass.	McKinley	Sealy
Britten	Gallivan	McLane	Sears
Brooks, Pa.	Ganly	McPherson	Sherwood
Brown	Garland	Madden	Sinclair
Brunbaugh	Glynn	Magee	Sisson
Burke	Goldfogle	Maher	Small
Byrnes, S. C.	Graham, Pa.	Major	Smith, N. Y.
Campbell, Kans.	Griest	Mann	Snyder
Candler	Griffin	Mansfield	Steagall
Cantrell	Hadley	Mason	Steenerson
Carew	Hamill	Mend	Stephens, Miss.
Carter	Haskell	Mondell	Stephens, Ohio
Christopherson	Hastings	Mooney	Strong, Pa.
Clark, Fla.	Hayden	Moore, Pa.	Sullivan
Clark, Mo.	Hellin	Moore, Va.	Taylor, Ark.
Classon	Hill	Moore, Ind.	Taylor, Colo.
Costello	Hulings	Mott	Thomas
Crago	Humphreys	Mudd	Thompson, Ohio
Cramton	Husted	Murphy	Upshaw
Crisp	Jacoway	James	Vare
Cullen	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nicholls, S. C.	Vestal
Dallinger	Johnson, Wash.	Nichols, Mich.	Voigt
Dempsey	Johnston, N. Y.	O'Connell	Wash
Denison	Kahn	Ogden	Wason
Donovan	Kelley, Mich.	Olney	Watson, Va.
Doelling	Kennedy, Iowa	Palge	Webb
Doremus	Kennedy, R. I.	Parker	Wheeler
Dunn	Kettner	Porter	White, Me.
Dyer	Kless	Rainey, H. T.	Wise
Eagle	Kincheloe	Rainey, J. W.	Woodyard
Edmonds	King	Randall, Calif.	Yates
Ellsworth	Kitchin	Riddick	Young, Tex.
Emerson	Kraus	Riordan	Zihlman
Evans, Nebr.	Kreider		
Ferris			

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. GARLAND with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.
 Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. SCULLY.
 Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas with Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado.
 Mr. HASKELL with Mr. LAZARO.
 Mr. DENISON with Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia.
 Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania with Mr. WATSON of Virginia.
 Mr. FOGHT with Mr. RANDALL of California.
 Mr. DUNN with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.
 Mr. CLASSON with Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas.
 Mr. GRIEST with Mr. McKEOWN.
 Mr. DALLINGER with Mr. SEARS.
 Mr. BRITTEN with Mr. WEBB.
 Mr. HADLEY with Mr. LEA of California.
 Mr. ELLSWORTH with Mr. RIORDAN.
 Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania with Mr. MCKINTY.

Mr. DYER with Mr. SABATH.
 Mr. CRAGO with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.
 Mr. BROWNE with Mr. THOMAS.
 Mr. FORDNEY with Mr. JOHN W. RAINEY.
 Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. SULLIVAN.
 Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. YOUNG of Texas.
 Mr. JAMES with Mr. KINCHELOE.
 Mr. EDMONDS with Mr. ROWAN.
 Mr. CRAMTON with Mr. STEAGALL.
 Mr. BACHARACH with Mr. WISE.
 Mr. HULINGS with Mr. KITCHIN.
 Mr. EMERSON with Mr. MOONEY.
 Mr. LANGLEY with Mr. FIELDS.
 Mr. WALSH with Mr. CARTER.
 Mr. WASON with Mr. McLANE.
 Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio with Mr. UPSHAW.
 Mr. PAIGE with Mr. BYRNS of Tennessee.
 Mr. McPHERSON with Mr. MAJOR.
 Mr. MAGEE with Mr. LINTHICUM.
 Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania with Mr. SHERWOOD.
 Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota with Mr. FLOOD.
 Mr. FOSTER with Mr. ROBINSON of North Carolina.
 Mr. FULLER of Illinois with Mr. ASHBROOK.
 Mr. FREAR with Mr. O'CONNELL.
 Mr. EVANS of Nebraska with Mr. SISSON.
 Mr. BLAND of Indiana with Mr. SMALL.
 Mr. WHEELER with Mr. MAHER.
 Mr. OGDEN with Mr. CRISP.
 Mr. YATES with Mr. CULLEN.
 Mr. STRONG of Pennsylvania with Mr. MOORE of Virginia.
 Mr. KING with Mr. HASTINGS.
 Mr. MASON with Mr. EAGLE.
 Mr. MAXN with Mr. FERRIS.
 Mr. MURPHY with Mr. CANDLER.
 Mr. STEENERSON with Mr. NICHOLS of South Carolina.
 Mr. SANFORD with Mr. BABKA.
 Mr. KREIDER with Mr. GRIFFIN.
 Mr. PARKER with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.
 Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan with Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina.
 Mr. MORIN with Mr. CAREW.
 Mr. SYNDER with Mr. SMITH of New York.
 Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. HUMPHREYS.
 Mr. PLATT with Mr. BLACK.
 Mr. MOORES of Indiana with Mr. DOREMUS.
 Mr. MADDEN with Mr. FITZGERALD.
 Mr. WHITE of Maine with Mr. DOOLING.
 Mr. ROWE with Mr. BARKLEY.
 Mr. SCOTT with Mr. OLNEY.
 Mr. KRAUSE with Mr. HAMILL.
 Mr. KAHN with Mr. JOHNSTON of New York.
 Mr. McARTHUR with Mr. GANLEY.
 Mr. KLESS with Mr. HAYDEN.
 Mr. WOODYARD with Mr. DONOVAN.
 Mr. THOMPSON of Ohio with Mr. MEAD.
 Mr. VESTAL with Mr. CLARK of Florida.
 Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. HEFLIN.
 Mr. MCKENZIE with Mr. GALLIVAN.
 Mr. PORTER with Mr. BENSON.
 Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. JACOWAY.
 Mr. MUDD with Mr. CANTRELL.
 Mr. LEHLBACH with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
 Mr. JOHNSON of Washington with Mr. KETTNER.
 Mr. VARE with Mr. MANSFIELD.
 Until Monday:
 Mr. MONDELL with Mr. CLARK of Missouri.
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.
 The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will unlock the doors.

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment to the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maine offers an amendment to the title, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend the title by striking out all the present title and inserting the following, so that it will read: "A bill authorizing the appointment of two permanent admirals in the Navy."

The amendment to the title was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. PETERS, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

PROHIBITION-ENFORCEMENT BILL.

Mr. VOLSTEAD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the prohibition-enforcement bill, H. R. 6810, be printed with the Senate amendments numbered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent that the prohibition-enforcement bill may be

printed with the Senate amendments numbered. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, is it requested to have the bill printed as it passed the Senate?

Mr. VOLSTEAD. As it passed the Senate, with the Senate amendments numbered.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. CURRY of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of after-the-war readjustment of economic conditions and the high cost of living.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record on the subject of readjustment after the European war. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman whether or not it is on constructive legislation that the gentleman is proposing, now before the House, that he wishes to extend his remarks?

Mr. CURRY of California. It is on constructive legislation, some of it that is before the House, but none, however, that I have presented.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of the league of nations.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] asks unanimous consent to address the House for 20 minutes on the subject of the league of nations. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, when does the gentleman desire to address the House?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Immediately.

Mr. GARD. Is there no further regular business for the day, may I ask the leader of the majority?

Mr. LONGWORTH. So far as I am informed, there is no further legislative business for to-day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will indulge me, is it intended to have any more speeches this afternoon after this one?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Not that I am aware of.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, the letters that have recently passed between the chairman of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee and the President of the United States, in which it appears that the President has declined to acquint the treaty-ratifying branch of the Congress with the provisions of the special agreement of June 16 relative to the Rhine district, brings to the mind of the Congress and the people some of the reasons why the great majority of the citizens of this country have within the past 8 or 10 months changed their position from a majority favoring a league of nations to a great majority urgently opposed to the league of nations which is now before us.

That a considerable majority of the people of the United States eight months ago were in favor of the adoption of a suitable league of nations or some similar provision that would reduce the chances of war to a minimum I believe can be clearly shown. Public opinion has, however, so greatly changed in the past few months that it is perfectly clear to every fair-minded, unbiased person who is keeping in touch with the public pulse that a referendum taken on the adoption of the proposed league of nations without amendment would be defeated by at least a two-thirds majority. Some of us are receiving letters and petitions now from persons urging us to use our influence against the adoption of the league of nations who seven or eight months ago petitioned us very earnestly to use our influence in favor of the adoption of a league of nations.

The question arises, what has occasioned this great change of front on the part of the American people? In brief, the change is a result of the difference between the people's first conception of the ideal of an abstract league of nations and the facts as set forth in the provisions now included in the proposed concrete league of nations. Everybody desires to avoid the horrors of war. There is no difference of opinion on that subject. The difference arises concerning the means to be used to reach the much-desired result.

Prior to the time the definite draft was before the people for consideration the theoretic assumption that a league of nations would keep us out of war was very generally accepted, and public opinion was favorably molded accordingly; but since

the exact draft of the league has been before the people and opportunity has been realized for careful study and discussion of its provisions very serious questions have arisen as to whether or not the provisions of the league when once accepted will not in reality greatly increase rather than diminish the prospects for future warfare. An abstract idea and a concrete plan may differ very greatly. [Applause.]

In the case of the league of nations this difference is almost as wide and marked as the difference between the two magnetic poles. The people have begun to wonder whether in asking for "a fish" they are to receive a "scorpion," whether in their cry "for bread" they have received "a stone," whether in their demand for "a fig" they are to be given "a thistle," whether in answer to their prayer that "knives and swords shall be beaten into pruning hooks and plowshares" they are to see pruning hooks and plowshares beaten into knives and swords. Many are the cases on record where purely innocent people have gone to the medicine case and by mistake taken poison when their purpose was to take a curative remedy.

By way of digression I received an amusing letter from a farmer in the South who says, among other things, that he was now past 60 years of age, that he had spent the most of his life in trying to sing correctly "My country, 'tis of thee," but now he says if this scheme is carried out I will have to spend the rest of my life learning to sing "My countries, 'tis of those." [Laughter.]

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Yes; I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. BLANTON. I take it that the gentleman is in favor of a league of nations to enforce peace, is he not?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. I am in favor of an international court of some kind at which will be settled international disputes.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman spoke of the people of Nebraska swinging away from the document dealing with peace. I want to tell the gentleman that the President is in his State to-day, and after this time he will find his people swinging back to that document. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. I wish to say to the gentleman that the President is pretty well known in that part of the country, and as he goes across Nebraska to-day and makes the statement that if his league is adopted without amendment "the khaki-clad boys of this country will never again cross the Atlantic," the people out there know that he is pouring it out of the same bottle from which formerly came "He kept us out of war" and "Politics is adjourned." [Laughter and applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. AYRES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Yes; with pleasure.

Mr. AYRES. Did not the President keep us out of war as long as any respecting peace President or red-blooded American could keep us out?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. I will say to the gentleman that at the time the President was allowing the claim to be made all over the country that he kept us out of war he knew, and his Cabinet knew, that we were rushing into war. I was one of a number called down here two months after the President's inauguration in May, 1917, with a company of 190 or more educators, and we were told by a member of the Cabinet that they knew a year before war was declared that war was absolutely inevitable, and yet they went clear through the presidential campaign using the slogan "He kept us out of war." [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. I can not yield further now. After I have concluded my remarks, if I have time, I will answer any questions.

Mr. Speaker, the growing opposition to the constitution of the league of nations has been stimulated by two conditions: First, the policy and methods under which the league document conceived its form; and, second, the actual provisions of the document itself. Let us consider, briefly, these two reasons in the order named.

In the first place, the people were led to believe a year ago or less that the treaty-ratifying body of the Congress would be kept in closest touch with the United States Peace Commission throughout all the deliberations at Paris. The people were informed by the President himself that such would be the case, and realizing that the very nature of the world-wide war in which we had been engaged was such that in its settlement provisions of a more or less revolutionary character might be recommended, the public had a right to expect, as a result of these conditions as well as a result of the assurance given them

by the President, that all of the matters under discussion at Paris and the conclusions resulting therefrom would be an open book to the Congress and the country. "Open agreements openly arrived at" was the slogan given out by the administration and quite agreeably accepted by the people.

I might say in passing that when the immortal McKinley was negotiating a treaty at the close of the Spanish-American War he kept members of the Foreign Relations Committee well and constantly informed as to every proposed article of the treaty, and made sure of the fact before giving his sanction to any article that the same would meet with the approval of the men whose constitutional duties required their ratification. [Applause.]

In the present instance one of the first great disappointments that came to the public after the cables and telegraph facilities of the country had been taken over by an Executive order, under the pretext that such action was to insure free and constant communication between the peace commission and the Senate, was to find, to their great regret, that this action was taken for the purpose of withholding and suppressing news rather than conveying the same. Wires were filled more particularly with social events engaged in by members of the peace commission rather than for the purpose of conveying clear information as to the points under discussion. Thousands of earnest parents who desired to cable money to convalescing sons in France who were in great need found that it took from three to four weeks to get cables through, and in many instances were entirely unable to cable at all, while at the same time the newspapers were full of cabled material describing at length the social functions enjoyed by members of the peace commission and the kind and manner of clothes and dress that were worn by members of the party. [Applause.]

The people were also of the impression that the so-called 14 points announced by our Chief Executive were to be the basis of settlement in the negotiations, and that the draft for a league of nations would be presented by Americans. It has gradually developed that the 14 points were given practically no consideration at the peace table, and that the American draft for a league of nations, if there ever was one, was never even presented, but that in place thereof a British draft was presented, and has been accepted almost in its entirety.

Another assurance the people believed they had when the American commission set sail for Paris was that careful and accurate records would be kept of all questions under discussion and finally submitted in their systematic and scientific completeness to the people of the country for their enlightenment. As one chief encouragement to this end we were informed through the press that our peace commissioners had taken with them 1,300 or more experts, historians, economists, accountants, and so forth, who had the latest and most accurate knowledge of all of the conditions existing in all of the various countries of the world as to Government boundaries, economic conditions, and so forth. It was but a natural inference to conclude that when the President returned from Paris, in the event that such detailed information as might be expected from such a well-composed commission had not been furnished the people in advance, the President would bring with him in complete and systematic files the detailed results of all of the expert help and advice he had received from this great army of specialists at Paris, whose entertainment will cost the Government several million dollars.

In view of these facts, it was a distinct shock to the American people to read the following letter which appeared in the Associated Press late last month, written by the President, in answer to an inquiry made by the Foreign Relations Committee:

MY DEAR SENATOR: In response to your letter of July 22, requesting me, on behalf of the Committee on Foreign Relations, to send the committee the agreement referred to in article 237 of the treaty with Germany, in the event that such an agreement has been determined upon by the allied and associated Governments, I would say that so far as I know such an agreement has not yet been reached. As I recollect the business, an attempt was being made to reach such an agreement, but I have not yet learned of an agreement having been arrived at.

May I not add, with regard to other requests which I have received from the committee for papers and information of various sorts, that I was not able to bring from Paris a complete file of papers. I brought with me only those which happened to be in my hands when I left France. These alone constitute a considerable mass of papers, and I have been going over them as rapidly as time and my engagements permitted, and must beg the committee's indulgence for the delay in informing them which I can supply them with.

Very sincerely, yours,

WOODROW WILSON.

You will note in this letter the President uses the expression, as he recollects the business, and so forth, answering entirely from memory, and then adds that when he left Paris he brought with him only those papers which happened to be in his hands. The question logically arises in the mind of an earnest, clear-reasoning public, why, after going to the expense of taking an army of experts to Paris, should the President on his return

hurriedly grab up a few promiscuous papers and not even know on his return home what these few papers contain?

It has further developed in the negotiations of the last six weeks that the final draft of the treaty of peace was furnished to commercial interests of New York and other sections of the country before the same was furnished to the treaty-ratifying body of Congress. It later developed that the President agreed specifically with the authorities of France to present the special agreement with the French Republic at the same time the general treaty was presented. The special agreement with France was not presented at the time the treaty of peace was referred to the Senate and was not presented for a considerable time thereafter; in fact, this specific agreement was forced from the hands of the President after this country was advised by information from Europe that the President had not complied with his special agreement to present both pacts at the same time. It has also developed that a number of provisions necessary for the proper understanding of the treaty itself have been withheld from the Foreign Relations Committee and have only been reluctantly and meagerly supplied under pressure.

It was a further source of disappointment when the President in presenting the peace treaty on July 10 to the treaty-ratifying body of the Congress made no explanation whatever of the provisions of the treaty, but indulged in an eulogy of the American soldiers and entered into a wordy, idealistic discourse almost entirely apart from the provisions of the league itself. The provisions of the treaty were passed with the following single reference:

In one sense, no doubt, there is no need that I should report to you what was attempted and done at Paris. You have been daily cognizant of what was going on there.

Now, put by the side of this statement the fact that authentic news of the development at Paris was withheld from Congress and the people all the time, and that the only news we received was that which merely leaked through from unofficial sources.

THE SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

MR. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended 10 minutes.

THE SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent that his colleague's time be extended 10 minutes. Is there objection?

MR. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman if he intends to give the text of the league covenant that he would be in favor of and would represent the league of nations that he says that he and his people want. Can the gentleman give us the text? He has been talking about something else. Now, does the gentleman intend to give us the text of the proposed league which he favors?

MR. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. The gentleman knows full well it would be impossible for anyone to cover the text of a new league of nations in 10 minutes, but I wish to say to the gentleman I do desire—

MR. WINGO. The gentleman could say what is wrong with the present text.

MR. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. I expect to do that.

THE SPEAKER. The question is, Is there objection?

MR. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, does this request meet with the approval of the leader of the majority? Does it conflict with the tentative plan of recognizing the other gentleman from Nebraska?

THE SPEAKER. Is there objection?

MR. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman—

MR. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

THE SPEAKER. The regular order is, Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MR. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, in the light of these facts which are now common knowledge, it occurs to me that the criticism of the few who are now charging that those sincere, patriotic statesmen who are seeking to go to the bottom of the league of nations document which has been inseparably connected with the peace treaty will find their criticisms falling on deaf ears.

Just before the President set sail for Paris the second time he declared in his Boston speech, referring to the opposition of certain men to the proposed league of nations—

I should welcome no sweeter challenge than that. I have fighting blood in me, and it is sometimes a delight to let it have scope, but if it is a challenge on this occasion it will be an indulgence.

Putting it all together, the people are warranted in reaching the conclusion that the President willfully set himself over against and opposite, if need be, the convictions of Congress and the will of the American people; that he determined to take the bits in his own teeth and push through his own program, everybody else to the contrary notwithstanding. It is therefore

poor judgment and ill-advised conduct for anyone to question or attempt to impugn the motives and deliberations of the Foreign Relations Committee in their sincere, prayerful endeavor to properly interpret the league of nations now under consideration and to safeguard if possible the blood-bought liberties of our people and the sovereignty of our Government. [Applause.]

The American people are wholly justified in raising a great question mark, both as to the fairness and the propriety of our peace commission enshrouding the league of nations and the peace treaty from the beginning of the deliberations down to the present time in mystery and uncertainty. It is no wonder that public opinion has swung about until we are now faced with almost unanimous objection to the league of nations.

In the second place, a study of the text of the league itself reveals the fact that several of its provisions when once agreed to may prove to be a very serious handicap to this Government and will in all probability result in aggravated and almost constant warfare instead of promoting the era of peace for which we are all praying. The League for the Preservation of American Independence has published—

TWENTY-FOUR REASONS WHY THE UNITED STATES SHOULD NOT ENTER THE PROPOSED LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

(1) Because the covenant of the league of nations, as proposed, was, in substance, written by Gen. Smuts, an Englishman, for England, indorsed by powerful English propaganda, to secure world-wide English dominion, and not by an American for America.

(2) Because in these days of foreign propaganda in the American press neither Congress nor the public can reach a deliberate, unbiased judgment upon the questions involved in the proposed league of nations, which are so vital to the existence of American independence.

(3) Because it places the United States Government under alien rules without the consent of the people governed, the covenant declaring that the league shall be governed by an assembly consisting of one vote from each nation, and a council, or executive committee, of five (which may be increased to nine), and in which the United States can not vote upon any matter in which it is interested.

(4) Because under the covenant a state of war exists, ipso facto, whenever any nation refuses to obey orders of the league, or whenever any nation engages in war or invades the territories of another nation, and this may mean a constant state of war.

REQUIRES THAT OUR NATION MAINTAIN ARMIES ABROAD.

(5) Because in these wars to which the United States will be a party in every instance this Government will be required to maintain permanent armies upon foreign soil, where the blood of Americans will be spilled to promote foreign interests.

(6) Because it pledges the lives and property of the American people to uphold and enforce the domination of England over her vast possessions in Ireland, India, Africa, Australia, Canada, and other parts of the world.

(7) Because it pledges the lives and property of Americans to perpetuate the stranglehold of Japan over 10,000,000 people of Korea, and over 40,000,000 of Chinese, with whom we are at peace, and other territorial grants and powers in China of unknown extent.

(8) Because it guarantees the lives and property of Americans to enforce the recently acquired domination of Italy over various peoples and countries east of the Adriatic and in the Tyrol.

(9) Because it pledges the lives and property of Americans to maintain the territorial possessions of all the members of the league.

(10) Because it does not limit the armaments of England upon the oceans, nor her ships of war, nor her fortresses upon and around the coasts of the United States.

MENACES OUR PROTECTION OF PACIFIC OCEAN.

(11) Because it menaces our protection and control in the Pacific Ocean by conceding to Japan islands of the Pacific formerly owned by Germany.

(12) Because under the agreements set forth in the covenant, the United States can no longer protect the United States borders against Mexico and the marauding bands of that country without the consent of European, Asiatic, and African powers.

(13) Because it destroys the Monroe doctrine. It submits to the league all questions at issue between the United States and any foreign country, or in which it is even claimed that the question is international in character or likely to provoke war, and leaves to the United States no authority or power to protect the interests of Americans, which we have struggled for a century to maintain.

(14) Because upon the principles set forth in the covenant the United States will lose control of the Panama Canal.

(15) Because under the covenant of the league the United States will lose control over restriction of immigration from Japan, China, and other foreign countries.

AS MANY VOTES FOR LIBERIA AS FOR UNITED STATES.

(16) Because in the council of five, which may be increased to nine, there will be four or eight votes, as the case may be, to the one vote of the United States, whereas the United States has the wealth, productive capacity, and progressiveness of all those nations combined.

(17) Because the covenant grants to England and her colonies, which have half the wealth and resources, and, counting only whites, little more than half of the population of the United States, six votes in the assembly of nations, and grants to the United States and her 48 sovereign States, all combined, but one vote in the assembly.

(18) Because it grants to the little half-baked countries of Liberia and Haiti, Siam, Hedjaz, and numerous others, of South America and Europe, the same representation in the assembly as has been given to the United States.

(19) Because it grants to South America, including Cuba and Haiti (with much less than half the wealth of the United States), 16 votes in the assembly of nations as against the single vote of the United States.

(20) Because the covenant violates the United States Constitution by depriving Congress of the power to declare war.

(21) Because it violates the Constitution by incurring pecuniary obligations for an indefinite period, which is solely vested in Congress.

ENORMOUS WAR POWERS GIVEN THE PRESIDENT.

(22) Because it places in permanent bondage all the peoples of the earth under the domination of a comparatively few people of western Europe and the British Empire.

(23) Because in times of war it will be claimed that the guarantees of the United States Constitution and of the State constitutions are suspended by the war power, and the constant condition of war in which we will have entered as parties to every controversy and dispute between different nations of the earth, will maintain in perpetuity those arrogated powers. The importance of this point is well illustrated by the fact that more than 20 wars are being waged at this time.

(24) Because the enormous war powers of the President will thus become permanent. He already has the appointing power. He has the veto power over acts of Congress, equal to one-third of both Senate and House. He is Commander in Chief of the Army and of the Navy. Under the league of nations and a perpetual condition of war in which we are bound to engage, these war powers will become paramount in perpetuity. The President of the United States, subject only to the league of nations, will become our permanent dictator.

EUROPE—15 VOTES.

Composed of—	Population by millions.
(1) Netherlands.....	6
(1) Belgium.....	7
(1) Switzerland.....	3
(1) Denmark.....	3
(1) Italy.....	34
(1) Norway.....	2
(1) France.....	39
(1) Hellenes.....	3
(1) Poland.....	15
(1) Portugal.....	5
(1) Roumania.....	7
(1) Serbia.....	3
(1) Spain.....	20
(1) Sweden.....	5
(1) Czechoslovakia.....	

ENGLAND—6 VOTES.

(1) British Empire.....	45
(1) Canada.....	6
(1) Australia.....	4
(1) South Africa (6,500,000 blacks).....	8
(1) New Zealand.....	
(1) India.....	

Total population..... 215

SOUTH AMERICA—12 VOTES.

(1) Ecuador.
(1) Peru.
(1) Uruguay.
(1) Argentina.
(1) Chili.
(1) Colombia.
(1) Venezuela.
(1) Bolivia.
(1) Brazil.
(1) Haiti.
(1) Paraguay.
(1) Cuba.

AFRICA—1 VOTE.

(1) Liberia.

ASIA—5 VOTES.

(1) Hedjaz.
(1) China.
(1) Japan.
(1) Siam.
(1) Persia.

CENTRAL AMERICA—5 VOTES.

(1) Nicaragua.
(1) Guatemala.
(1) Honduras.
(1) Panama.
(1) Salvador.

NOTE.—No definite information is available as to the population of these countries.

UNITED STATES—1 VOTE.

Total population..... 110

Referring to that portion of the foregoing statement of the League for the Preservation of American Independence, relating to the protection of the Pacific, the address of Admiral Jellicoe to the New England Club at Wellington, New Zealand, under date of September 2 has a peculiar significance. In considering the subject, "A British Fleet in the Pacific," the admiral, among other statements, included the following:

Without the British mercantile marine, the war would have been over long ago, probably in 1915; and I am unable to say what would have happened to New Zealand. A look around the world shows that the millennium is as far off as ever.

The Pacific is growing daily in importance. It contains great possibilities of trouble which statesmen could better overcome with a strong force behind them. Trade protection requires more vessels than ever, the criterion being not the number of enemy cruisers but the number of our merchantmen, and the value of our trade.

The openly announced purpose of Great Britain to maintain a large fleet in the Pacific probably meets with the approval of the American peace commission, which seemed to agree at Paris that England should be conceded the right to maintain the largest navy in the world, no matter what the future needs or desires of other countries might prove.

The purpose of Great Britain to maintain a standing army of 900,000 men is in entire agreement with her great naval program. Japan also announces that she will soon launch a great navy-building program. Our own Secretary of War is urging a

standing Army of 576,000 men and a system of universal military training which will hold over 600,000 young men in reserve each year. We have already sent a large fleet into the Pacific. All of this program in face of the fact that we are regularly and constantly advised by the friends of the league of nations that it will keep us out of war. Articles 10 to 13 of the league inform us that "league members shall undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league, and that any threat of war, whether immediately affecting any of the members of the league or not, is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole league," and further, that "any dispute likely to lead to a rupture" will be a matter of concern to the league, and so forth. Article 22 provides for the mandatory control of all of the peoples of the world who are deemed by the council of the league to be incapable of self-government. The purpose of the league to guarantee the territorial integrity of all of the nations subscribing to it makes the following article, published in the London Times and the Washington Post under date of August 16, of a special significance. It must be remembered in considering this article that the King of Hedjaz is to be a member of the league. The article is as follows:

KING OF HEDJAZ IN DESPERATE WAR—FIGHTS ARAB PURITANS WHO OPPOSE POLYGAMY AND SMOKING.

LONDON, August 16.

Only scanty information has been published respecting hostilities between King Hussein of the Hedjaz and Ibn Saud of Nejd. They were reported to have arisen from a dispute as to the ownership of the district of Khurman, 16 miles northeast of Taif, but there lies behind them a new puritanical movement of great significance.

Ibn Saud, who defeated the forces under Abdulla, the son of King Hussein, so thoroughly that a march into Medina seemed practicable, is at the head of a reform movement now growing very rapidly in Arabia, and known as the Akhwan brotherhood. Its tenets are like those of the Wahabb movements, which in the eighteenth century also originated in Arabia, and attacking all luxury, loose administration of justice, and laxity against the infidel, shook the world of Islam to its foundation.

Puritanism is now revived in even stricter form under the name of a Khwan. The movement prescribes only one wife, no drink, no smokes, nothing except prayer and the spread of the reformed faith by every means, including that of armed attack when possible on heretic and infidel alike.

Mr. Speaker, if the adoption of this league of nations shall incur even the probability of the Christian forces of the United States entering into war in Asia with the kings and chiefs of the half-civilized tribes of the world, to assist them in continuing their harems and slaves, it is very fortunate for the American people that certain members of the treaty-ratifying body are asking for time to arrive at a complete understanding of the contents of the league document.

When peace lovers in the United States were discussing in recent by-gone days the feasibility of a league of nations they had in mind a league composed of the so-called civilized nations of the world, whereby disputes might be submitted for arbitration to some properly selected international court, but the framers of the present league have gone so far as to include practically the whole earth in their scheme. A tabulation of the populations of the several countries entering into the league reveals the fact that 89 per cent of the constituents of the league will be colored and 11 per cent white. Liberia, for example, has 50,000 people who might be called civilized and 1,950,000 who are uncivilized, a part of whom are in a state of cannibalism, yet Liberia is to have an equal vote with the United States, with her 110,000,000 population. [Applause.] About two-thirds of the people of the earth are yet in either an uncivilized or semicivilized state, and the league of nations proposes that a few of the more powerful nations, who claim to be blessed with civilization, shall force stabilized government and civilized customs upon all the world at the point of a bayonet.

England has a population of about 50,000,000, but her flag floats over 300,000,000 souls, more than half of whom are in a very crude state of civilization. It can easily be understood why England favors the league of nations. In the first place, she is not required by the provisions of the league to surrender anything, and, in the second place, she needs the other nations of the world to help her exercise the strong hand over the 250,000,000 people of the earth who are struggling to wrest from her the privilege of governing themselves in harmony with an inherent desire born into the life of every person and which no condition or government in this world will ever be able to uproot. It might be better were it otherwise, but it is not, and people prefer in every instance to be permitted to evolve their civilization and their government through their own particular processes and not to have such privileges, so called, forced on them from the outside at the point of a bayonet. [Applause.]

When we consider the state of the world as it is to-day, in the light of common sense as well as the light of history, we are led to conclude that any attempt on the part of stronger nations to assume mandatory control of the multitude of weaker nations of the world will result in constant strife. There have been approximately 3,000 years of authentic history, out of which entire time the world has seen only 60 years of peace—not consecutive years, but 60 years all told.

If the stronger nations attempt police control of the heathen and uncivilized portions of the earth it will require the largest standing armies the world has ever seen, with even heavier burdens of taxes and increased public debts that will ultimately bankrupt all the countries undertaking the program.

Mr. Speaker, I find myself in pretty thorough agreement with that plank in the Democratic platform of 1900 which states, "We are unalterably opposed to seizing distant lands to be governed outside the Constitution and whose people can never become citizens." Of course, there are those who say that the objections to the league are impertinent and far-fetched, and that such difficulties as we seem to see will not materialize; but I submit that it is "a condition and not a theory that confronts us." The very fact that so many leading jurists differ as to the interpretations of the league warns us that our only safe course is to abide by the language itself in the several articles, and if this language is such that we can not accept it in justice to our Constitution and in protection of our future, then the time to make changes or reservations is before the adoption and not after it. [Applause.]

When the United States was negotiating the Louisiana purchase from France, it is said that one of Napoleon's secretaries declared to Napoleon that he believed some of the provisions of the agreement were obscure, whereupon the Emperor told his secretary to examine the agreement very carefully, and if he found any language that was not obscure to make it so. It would seem that the framers of this document must have been governed pretty largely by the policy of Napoleon, to give birth to an instrument that would immediately evoke such a multitude of different interpretations.

I am utterly unable to understand those gentlemen who advocate the acceptance of this document without reservations. They seem to be acting under the hallucination that the gentlemen who sat at the peace table were supermen working under some sort of infallible direction. My own thought is that we have just emerged from this great world struggle in which 7,400,000 men have been killed, 7,145,000 men permanently maimed for life, and \$190,000,000,000 of treasure destroyed for the purpose of forever disapproving the fallacy of the superman. It would indeed be a grave mistake at this time to see this great Republic enter into a program that would ultimately shipwreck her on the same autocratic reefs that have brought such disaster to the peoples of Central Europe. [Applause.]

When the Senate had before it the ratification of the agreement of the two Hague tribunals, in both cases that body made the following reservation:

Nothing contained in this convention shall be so construed as to require the United States of America to depart from its traditional policy of not intruding upon or interfering with or entangling itself in the political questions of policy or international administration of any foreign State. Nor shall anything contained in the said convention be construed to imply a relinquishment by the United States of America of its traditional attitude toward purely American questions.

At the time this reservation was made the people of this country believed it to be a wise act on the part of the Senate; but now there are those who come forward under the direction of the Chief Executive and contend that the document now before us—the most far-reaching and revolutionary document ever considered by the American people—should be accepted line for line and word for word without the dotting of an "i" or the crossing of a "t." I am one of those who have read with considerable care every speech that has been made at the other end of the Capitol on the subject of the league of nations, and have discovered this fact, as have many others with whom I have conversed, namely, that those who are in favor of the league without change assume, without facing the general world conditions, that the league of nations will keep us out of war, and they proceed to argue wholly from the emotional point of view, dwelling in pathetic terms on the number of lives that have been lost and the property that has been destroyed, and pleading for the adoption of the league in order that such calamities may not again curse the world.

On the other hand, those who are opposing the league in its present form are basing their opposition on clear, cold, logical facts, resulting from an analysis of the provisions of the document and the consideration of the same in the light of history and human nature. The people are refusing to be

swayed by emotional pleas, and are yielding to the evidence revealed by the clear, cold, undeniable facts in the premise. [Applause on the Republican side.]

In this, as well as in its every conclusion, democracy has again proven her right to a high place in Government circles. I have the utmost confidence that when the American people are given the facts and have sufficient time to get their bearings they will decide right.

Mr. Speaker, I am among those who desire peace; I am for any international league or agreement in harmony with our Constitution that will keep us out of war; I want peace, but I fear this league will embroil us in constant war and bankrupt our Nation. I will follow any man anywhere that will lead the world into the haven of universal peace, but the very provisions of this league are such on the face of them as to force us into constant warfare. Believing these things sincerely and having sworn to support the Constitution of the United States, I must oppose by whatever, direct or indirect, methods at my command the provisions in this league of nations that are not in harmony with our Constitution and the traditions of the American people. In taking this stand I am, in my best judgment, casting my lot with those who are endeavoring to perpetuate the liberties for which Washington and his compatriots fought and died, the unity and integrity of the Nation for which the immortal Lincoln and his loyal soldiery laid down their lives, and the perpetuity of this beloved Republic for which the best and bravest of our young manhood have been so recently sacrificed.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. RUCKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended two minutes more.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

Mr. RUCKER. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended two minutes in order that I may ask him a question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. RUCKER. The gentleman has, in his closing remarks, announced himself a very ardent advocate of peace and is very much in favor of a league of nations. Can the gentleman give the House some suggestions which would tend more surely to peace than those contained in the document now before the Senate?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. I will say to the gentleman that I think the splendid reservations that have been already suggested on the other side of the Capitol Building, if adopted, will correct the errors that are in the covenant.

Mr. RUCKER. If the treaty is amended, then, as proposed, I take it that the gentleman is for it?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. If the treaty is properly amended; yes, I am for it.

Mr. RUCKER. Will the gentleman please tell what is a proper amendment? Everybody says "if properly amended."

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. I have just referred the gentleman to the reservations already proposed in the Senate. And permit me further to say to the gentleman that I am rather astonished, in discussing this subject on the floor of this House, to find such a different expression on the question of the league of nations and the part of the Chief Executive in the same from what I hear frequently in the Democratic cloakrooms. [Applause on the Republican side.]

I may say further to the gentleman that many people in my district would be satisfied with "the 14 points," which were so completely lost in Europe.

Mr. REAVIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. Yes, with pleasure.

Mr. REAVIS. Under the date line of Omaha in this afternoon's papers, in a speech made by the President to-day this statement is made, speaking of the reservations to the league of nations:

If reservations were put in, Mr. Wilson told them, all that the Senate had written in would have to go back for the consent of Germany.

Does not the gentleman know that at the meeting at the White House between the President and the Committee on Foreign Relations the President admitted that inasmuch as Germany is not a party to the league of nations she would have nothing to do with the reservations?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Nebraska. That is true. I distinctly recall that when the Foreign Relations Committee was in conference with the President at the White House, Senator FALL called the President's attention to the fact that amendments or reservations to the league covenant would not at all affect the treaty with Germany, inasmuch as Germany is not at present a party to the league of nations, and the President agreed fully with Sena-

tor FALL at that time. And I might say to my colleague and the Members of the House, in view of the foregoing facts, I am astonished to have read in the Washington Evening Star that the President to-day declared in his Omaha speech, "If reservations are inserted, the treaty must go back to Germany." The President has evidently forgotten his statement exactly to the opposite to Senator FALL and other members of the committee.

Since gentlemen have raised this question of the President's statements, I wish to quote further from the President as recorded in the noon edition of the Washington Times to-day, in which he says, "I have the greatest respect for the United States Senate, but I have come out to fight for a cause. That cause is greater than the Senate; it is greater than the Government." It is very evident that the President, according to his own language, would even sacrifice this Government in order to have his own particular brand of a league adopted. This statement is in complete harmony with the President's threat in his Boston speech, which I have already quoted. Putting it all in all, it would seem that the President, who has already usurped more power than any king, prince, or potentate in the history of the world, would be further willing to imperil the very foundations and the future of this Republic, and then sally forth in quest of "other worlds to conquer." [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Does the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. KINKAID] desire recognition this afternoon?

Mr. KINKAID. I do not.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 2700. An act granting the consent of Congress to the D. E. Hewitt Lumber Co. to construct and maintain a bridge across Tug River, connecting Martin County, Ky., and Mingo County, W. Va.; and

S. 2395. An act amending section 25 of the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, as amended by the act approved September 7, 1916.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

Mr. BELL, by unanimous consent, was granted leave of absence for five days, on account of official business in connection with hearings of the Joint Postal Commission.

INVESTIGATION OF SUGAR PRICES, ETC.

Mr. TINKHAM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may replace on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent without prejudice House resolution 150.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts asks unanimous consent that House resolution 150, to which objection was made on last unanimous-consent day, and which therefore went off the calendar, be replaced on that calendar without prejudice. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, what is that?

Mr. TINKHAM. In relation to sugar legislation.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman wants it placed in the same position it was in prior to its being stricken off the calendar?

Mr. TINKHAM. Yes, without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, September 9, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting supplemental estimate of appropriation required for additional employees in the national bank redemption agency of the office of the Treasurer for the last nine months of the fiscal year 1920 (H. Doc. No. 244); to the Committee on Appropriations.

2. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting request for increase in appropriation requested for the construction in the north court of the Treasury Building of a three-story structure to provide additional modern vaults and to furnish necessary additional room for the cash room and accounting division of the department (H. Doc. No. 245); to the Committee on Appropriations.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 1943) granting an increase of pension to Louis F. Ursenbach; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7274) granting a pension to Walter Sewell; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7730) granting a pension to William Constable; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 9108) amending section 10 of an act approved June 3, 1916, entitled "An act making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," as amended by the act of August 29, 1916, entitled "An act making appropriations for the support of the Army for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1917, and for other purposes," to provide for commissioning as first lieutenants temporary medical officers who entered the active service on or before April 6, 1917; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MCKENZIE: A bill (H. R. 9109) providing for the refund to enlisted men in the Army, Navy, and Marine Corps of all money deducted from their pay while in service to pay allotments to dependents, and providing for additional compensation to all honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines who served in the present war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. STEENSON: A bill (H. R. 9110) to amend an act entitled "An act to regulate and improve the civil service of the United States," approved January 16, 1883; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. PELL: A bill (H. R. 9111) granting service medals to veterans of the Great War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 9112) authorizing the Secretary of War to loan Army rifles to posts of the American Legion; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. STRONG of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 9113) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Leonardville, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9114) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the high school of Marysville, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9115) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the Kansas Wesleyan University, Salina, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9116) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Concordia, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9117) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Belleville, Kans., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9118) donating a captured German cannon or field gun and carriage to the county high school, Chapman, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 9119) authorizing the adjustment of the boundaries of the Deschutes National Forest in the State of Oregon, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Resolution (H. Res. 285) directing the Secretary of Commerce to make report on the Peek committee; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. FESS: Resolution (H. Res. 286) providing for the immediate consideration of bills on the Private Calendar; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. SNELL: Resolution (H. Res. 288) providing for the consideration of House bill 8778; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. BRAND: Memorial from the General Assembly of the State of Georgia, regarding employment of and homes for discharged soldiers; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 9120) granting a pension to Mathilde Richter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BURDICK: A bill (H. R. 9121) to remove the charge of desertion against Thomas P. Carroll; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 9122) granting an increase of pension to Thomas W. Moody; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9123) granting an increase of pension to John L. Hix; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9124) granting a pension to Emma A. Esarey; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GREENE of Vermont: A bill (H. R. 9125) granting an increase of pension to Harlow Sanders; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HAYS: A bill (H. R. 9126) granting an increase of pension to Finis H. Stringer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9127) granting a pension to William Surrell; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MCFADDEN: A bill (H. R. 9128) for the relief of Thomas Ridgway; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: A bill (H. R. 9129) for the relief of Frances E. Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHELAN: A bill (H. R. 9130) for the relief of John F. Malley; to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9131) awarding a medal of honor to Hercules Korgis; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. POU: A bill (H. R. 9132) for the relief of the heirs of Frank W. Knight; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROSE: A bill (H. R. 9133) granting an increase of pension to Bertha Blanch Weimer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SHERWOOD: A bill (H. R. 9134) granting an increase of pension to John L. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SINNOTT: A bill (H. R. 9135) for the relief of Moses F. Birdwell; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. TOWNER: A bill (H. R. 9136) granting an increase of pension to William H. Calfee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. CAREW: Petition of the Central Labor Union of Brooklyn and Queens, of Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the immediate recall of all American troops in Russia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EMERSON: Petition of the Cleveland Chamber of Commerce, in favor of legislation to regulate aircraft traffic; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HAYS: Petition of 38 citizens of Scott County, Mo., against the passage of the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. LONERGAN: Petition of the board of mayor and aldermen of the city of Derby, Conn., favoring self-determination for Ireland; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Petition of citizens of Amesbury, Mass., praying for the passage of Senate bill 3063 for the preservation of the *Niagara*, Commodore Perry's flagship; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Salem Lodge of Elks, No. 799, reaffirming and repeating its firm allegiance and adherence to the Constitution of the United States and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Capt. Lester S. Wass Post, No. 3, American Legion, indorsing the so-called Johnson bill for the restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of the American Legion of New York City, opposing House bill 487, known as the soldiers' settlement bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. SNELL: Petition of employees of post office of Potsdam, N. Y., favoring flat increase of \$150 for all postal employees for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. YATES: Petition of Edmund T. Perkins, Chicago, containing protest against House bill 7656 to do with salvaging of 6,000 houses built by the United States Housing Corporation; to the Committee on the Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of Tanners' Products Co., Chicago, containing protest against the Sims bill, embodying the Plumb plan; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of W. E. Emery, Danville, Ill., containing protest against the Seigel bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Woodbury Brook Co., Vermillion County Pharmaceutical Association, Dowling-Schultz Hardware Co., Strouse Bazaar, Meis Brothers, Heil-McClimans Co., Marrs-Tanner Electric Co., Union Store, Cable Piano Co., Royal Cloak Co., Golden Rule Store, Danville Chamber of Commerce, Frank A. Johnson, Ries-Strauss Co., and Plaster Drug Co., all of Danville, Ill., protesting against the Seigel bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Maywood Commercial Association, Maywood, Ill., urging passage of Senate joint resolution 84; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Shaw, Welsh & Co., Galesburg, Ill., protesting against House joint resolution 121 and Senate joint resolution 57; to the Committee on Labor.

Also, petition of Roy E. Bard, Highland Park, Ill., urging the passage of the Chamberlain-Kahn act, the national service act; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Mrs. H. K. Y. Warner, Geneva, Ill., containing protest against House bill 5941; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, September 9, 1919.

(Legislative day of Monday, September 8, 1919.)

The Senate met at 12 o'clock noon, on the expiration of the recess.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

H. R. 333. An act providing for the disinterment and removal of the remains of the infant child, Norman Lee Molzahn, from the temporary burial site in the District of Columbia to a permanent burial place; and

H. R. 7767. An act authorizing the appointment of two permanent admirals in the Navy.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice President:

S. 2395. An act amending section 25 of the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act, as amended by the act approved September 7, 1916; and

S. 2700. An act granting the consent of Congress to the D. E. Hewitt Lumber Co. to construct and maintain a bridge across Tug River, connecting Martin County, Ky., and Mingo County, W. Va.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented a petition of sundry enlisted men of the Hospital Corps of the United States Navy attached to the Naval Hospital at Fort Lyon, Colo., praying for their release from the Navy in order that they may complete their education, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Mr. CAPPER presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Lehigh, Kans., and a memorial of sundry citizens of Inman, Kans., remonstrating against universal military training, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Local Union No. 16489, Cement Workers' Union, of Chanute, Kans., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. McLEAN presented a petition of the Connecticut Retail Liquor Dealers' Association and the Local Retail Liquor Dealers' Association of Connecticut, praying that permission be granted to transfer distilled spirits to bonded warehouses in Connecticut, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Common Council of Derby, Conn., praying for the recognition by the United States of the independence of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry Lithuanian citizens of Waterbury and Thompsonville, in the State of Connecticut, praying for the recognition by the United States of the independence of Lithuania, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. SHERMAN presented memorials of sundry citizens of Springfield, Chicago, Elgin, Quincy, Albion, Aurora, Pontiac, Eddyville, Harrisburg, Gibson, Eldorado, Waterloo, Sterling, Murphysboro, Macomb, Glen Carbon, Galesburg, Marion, and Bloomington, all in the State of Illinois, remonstrating against

the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Chicago, Ill., praying for a referendum of the league of nations covenant, and for free speech and the liberation of all war prisoners, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a memorial of the Association of Commerce of Chicago, Ill., remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for Federal control of the meat-packing industry, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of the Board of Government of the Freight Bureau of Quincy, Ill., remonstrating against the adoption of the so-called "Plumb plan" for the operation and control of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Chicago, Fairbury, and Troy, all in the State of Illinois, praying for the repeal of the tax on ice cream, sodas, and soft drinks, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented a petition of sundry Lithuanian citizens of Nokomis, Ill., praying for the recognition by the United States of the independence of Lithuania and for the withdrawal of Polish troops from Lithuanian territory, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of sundry employees of the Kimball Glass Co., of Chicago, Ill., praying for the enactment of legislation to protect, by restriction of importation or by tariff, laboratory and scientific glass, surgical instruments, etc., which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 2973) granting a pension to James A. Clements; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CAPPER (by request):

A bill (S. 2974) to grant a Victory bond bonus to the members of the military and naval forces of the United States who brought about the victory; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SHERMAN:

A bill (S. 2975) to amend an act approved February 28, 1899, entitled "An act relative to the payment of claims for material and labor furnished for District of Columbia buildings; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HITCHCOCK (for Mr. WILLIAMS):

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 106) for the maintenance of peace in Armenia; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

PROTECTION, PRESERVATION, AND PROPAGATION OF SALMON.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I ask as in open executive session that the injunction of secrecy may be removed from the treaty between the United States and Great Britain with reference to the salmon fisheries of the Northwest, which came in a few days ago.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the injunction of secrecy is removed from the treaty.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

H. R. 333. An act providing for the disinterment and removal of the remains of the infant child, Norman Lee Molzahn, from the temporary burial site in the District of Columbia to a permanent burial place was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

H. R. 7767. An act authorizing the appointment of two permanent admirals in the Navy was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

DISTRICT POLICE AND LABOR UNIONS.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, I dislike to occupy the valuable time of the Senate by undue reference to a subject to which I have already called its attention and concerning which the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] yesterday introduced a joint resolution, accompanied by a courageous and commendable expression of sentiment, which I trust found the approval of every man who heard him.

I must, however, occupy a brief period with the substance of two items in the Washington Post of this morning, one being the report of a committee of the Central Labor Union upon the police situation in the District and the other a telegram from Boston regarding the action of its police union yesterday.

The committee of the Central Labor Union yesterday submitted a report upon the police controversy signed by a number of its officials and occupying about a column of space. I shall