Congressional Record.

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE SIXTY-SIXTH CONGRESS FIRST SESSION.

SENATE.

MONDAY, *October 6, 1919.*

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

Almighty God, we come to Thee day by day lifting up our hearts for Thy guidance and blessing. We pray that as we come this morning we may have the touch of the divine spirit upon our hearts. We unite our hearts in asking Thy blessing upon the President of the United States. We seek Thy guidance and blessing upon those who minister to him that he may speedily be restored to health and strength. We pray Thee to keep in Thy tenderest care the life and health and strength of all those whom Thou hast called into places of authority and power in this testing time of our national life. May they all, preserved by Thy grace and power and led by Thy spirit, so cooperate in the great movement of the world to-day as that Thy name may be glorified and the people of this country blessed. For Christ's sake. Amen.

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

ESTIMATES OF APPROPRIATIONS (S. DOC. NO. 119).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a letter from the United States Employees' Compensation Commission, submitting supplemental estimates of appropriations in the sum of $1,283,000 required by the commission for the compensation fund and contingent expenses of the commission for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

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 bill (S. 253) for the payment of claims for loss of private property on account of the loss of firearms and ammunition taken by the United States troops during the labor strikes in the State of Colorado in 1914.

The message also announced that the House disagrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8624) to amend 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, insists on its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate, requests a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. HAUGEN, Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan, and Mr. RUBEY managers at the further conference on the part of the House.

The message further announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 396. An act to authorize the payment of certain amounts for damages sustained by prairie fire on the Rosebud Indian Reservation in South Dakota;

H. R. 400. An act authorizing the Sioux Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims;

H. R. 685. An act for the relief of Frank S. Ingalls;

H. R. 974. An act for the relief of W. T. Dingler;

H. R. 1761. An act for the relief of the Farmers National Bank of Wilkinson, Ind.;

H. R. 1812. An act making an appropriation to compensate James M. Moore for damages sustained while in the service of the Government of the United States;

H. R. 1853. An act to reimburse E. T. Thing and S. A. Thing for losses and damages sustained by them by the negligent dipping of their cattle by the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture;

H. R. 5348. An act for the relief of Mrs. Thomas McGovern;

H. R. 5665. An act for the relief of Carlow Avellina; and

H. R. 6413. An act granting the sum of $549.12 to Clara Kane, dependent parent, by reason of the death of William A. Yenser, late civil employee, killed as a result of an accident at the Philadelphia Navy Yard.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The message also announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the enrolled 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, and it was thereupon signed by the Vice President.

PEACE TREATY AND LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I ask, if there is no objection, that the Secretary may read a telegram received by me this morning.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

LOS ANGELES, CALIF., *October 5, 1919.*

Hon. GILBERT HITCHCOCK,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The following telegram is sent you by the Los Angeles branch of the League to Enforce Peace as a brief summary of important actions that have been taken by individuals and organizations in southern California on the subject of the league of nations and its ratification by the Senate of the United States during and following the visit and address here of Senator HIRAM JOHNSON, and is intended as a recital of the principal facts showing that the sentiment of the people of the State of California is overwhelmingly in favor of the league of nations and directly opposed to the attitude taken on the subject by Senator JOHNSON.

The morning after Senator JOHNSON's speech in Los Angeles the following letter, as an answer thereto, was addressed to him by more than 150 men and women widely representative of all southern California:

"Your recent statements that California stands with you in your opposition to the covenant of the league of nations is incorrect. Hundreds of polls taken by newspapers, clubs, and societies indicate that at least 75 per cent of the votes are for immediate ratification without amendment, which will be the first great step toward allaying the unrest of the world. Present chaotic world conditions will not, in our judgment, improve until the Allies reach a common understanding in matters of such grave import. We believe a representative ought to reflect the sentiments of the majority."

The above telegram was signed by 21 judges and members of the bar; 43 business men; 9 ministers; 5 educators and college presidents; 10 Federal, State, and county officials; 3 labor leaders; 5 bankers; 4 professional men; and 61 club-women leaders.

The board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, representing a membership of over 3,600, unanimously passed the following resolution:

"*Resolved,* That it is to the best interests of the country that the United States Senate speedily ratify the treaty and league of nations as it now stands, without amendment."

The following signed statement was published by prominent judges and attorneys:

"We have given careful study to the covenant of the league of nations and have given due attention to the arguments which have been advanced in support and in opposition to the covenant; further, we see clearly that unless the Senate ratifies the peace treaty, with the league of nations, that our country must stand alone against the world and we must enter upon a stupendous program for naval and military armament, which

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

means a crushing burden of taxation upon every man and woman in America, and that our thought and energy must go for munition manufacturing rather than for reconstruction and development of our resources for peaceful pursuits. We urge every thinking man and woman to consider this matter wholly apart from partisan bias, racial hatred, and national jealousy, and to lend his or her influence to secure the ratification of the peace treaty with the league of nations.

"(Signed) N. P. Conrey, presiding justice, department 1, second district court of appeals; W. J. Hunsaker, ex-president of the bar association; Benjamin F. Bledsoe, judge, United States district court; James A. Anderson, ex-president of the bar association; Oscar A. Trippet, judge, United States district court; W. H. Thomas, judge, department 2, second district court of appeals; Frank G. Finlayson, presiding justice, department 2, second district court of appeals; Leslie R. Hewitt, judge, superior court; Henry W. O'Melveny, ex-president of the bar association; John Perry Wood, judge, superior court; John D. Fredericks, former district attorney; W. A. Sloane, justice, department 2, second district court of appeals; Silas Evans, president Occidental College; Roy Malcolm, professor of political science, University of Southern California; Louis W. Meyers, judge, superior court; Dana R. Weller, judge, superior court; Fred H. Taft, judge, superior court; Russ Avery, judge, superior court; Dr. Ernst Carroll Moorehead, Southern Branch, University of California; George F. Bovard, president University of Southern California."

The Central Labor Council of Los Angeles unanimously adopted the following resolution:

"Whereas the American Federation of Labor at its last convention at Atlantic City declared the labor movement in favor of the covenant of the league of nations by practically a unanimous vote—29,000 to 400; and

"Whereas Senator HIRAM W. JOHNSON, while governor of this State, proved himself to be a friend of organized labor on many occasions, and is still highly regarded in consequence; and

"Whereas Senator JOHNSON is now one of the most active opponents of the covenant, so earnestly desired by the organized wage earners of the United States: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the Central Labor Council of Los Angeles, the parent body of 40,000 trade unionists of this city,* That we deplore the position taken by Senator JOHNSON, and ask him to cease his opposition to the covenant of the league of nations."

At a meeting of Southern California Club Women, 300 club presidents being in attendance and 16,000 club members being represented, the following resolution was unanimously adopted:

"*Resolved,* That the Presidents' Council of the Los Angeles District Federation of Women's Clubs, assembled September 27, 1919, approved the ratification of the peace treaty and the covenant of the league of nations, and that telegrams be sent to Senators JOHNSON and PHELAN, notifying them of such action and requesting their support of the same in the United States Senate."

On the morning of Senator JOHNSON's arrival in Los Angeles Mayor Meredith P. Snyder was requested by the Johnson committee to make an address of welcome to the Senator. His response was a 500-word signed statement in support of the league of nations, of which the following is the opening paragraph:

"Whether a man be a high representative of the people of California at Washington or a lowly citizen here at home, he is doing something for which he should be condemned if he attempts to prevent the ratification of the covenant of the league of nations, without offering a substitute for it which will be an improvement."

In addition the mayors of a number of southern California cities, including places of importance, such as Santa Monica, San Bernardino, Pomona, Santa Ana, Passadena, and Ventura, sent signed statements to this organization enthusiastically indorsing the league of nations and requesting its immediate ratification.

The lay and ministerial conferences of the Methodist Episcopal Church of California, representing a total joint membership of approximately 85,000, in two meetings adopted strong resolutions indorsing the league of nations. One of these conferences, representing 50,000 church members, passed at Santa Barbara, Calif., on October 3 the following resolution in the form of a telegram addressed to Senator JOHNSON:

"The Laymen's Association of the Southern California Conference of the Methodist Episcopal Church, in annual session at Santa Barbara, most heartily indorse the league of nations covenant and urge its speedy ratification. We respectfully call upon you to withdraw your opposition."

President Blaisdell and 52 members of the Pomona College faculty presented a petition personally to Senator JOHNSON, urging that he support the peace treaty and league of nations as presented to the Senate by the President of the United States.

The following telegram was sent to Senator JOHNSON, signed by 32 officials and business men of Riverside County, all Republicans:

"We, the undersigned Republicans of Riverside City and County, do not approve of the stand taken by you on the league of nations. We are strongly for the league of nations."

This telegram was signed by the sheriff, city attorney, judge, chief of police, and 18 business men and church women.

The Church Federation of Los Angeles, representing a constituency of approximately 75,000 church members, adopted the following resolution:

"We believe the treaty of peace and the covenant for the league of nations should be ratified without reservation or amendment at the earliest possible date."

Twenty-two of the members of Senator JOHNSON's Los Angeles reception committee, both men and women, all but two Republicans, publicly withdrew their names from the committee on the ground that they were not in agreement with the Senator on the subject of the league of nations. Included among these were the speaker of the California Legislature, a State senator and assemblyman, superior court judge, two county supervisors, and others prominent in the commercial and club life of this city. Among the letters of withdrawal from the committee the following, by Capt. Walter Brinkop, Three hundred and sixty-fourth Infantry, United States Army, in France, and now president of the American Legion. Here is an example:

"I not only repudiate the use of my name, but I bitterly resent it. There is no pro-Germanism in my blood and therefore I am not with JOHNSON's fight against the league, but am unequivocally for it. Americanism is the big question of the hour, and the league of nations is the big hope of all of us who are true, loyal Americans."

One other member of the Johnson reception committee, who was JOHNSON's former campaign manager in the important city of Pomona, in withdrawing his name from the committee, wrote as follows:

"My name was used without my authority. I consider the policy of the Johnson committee in naming a large list of vice presidents, without securing their consent as unfair and unjust, because it implies an indorsement of Senator JOHNSON's position. I am heartily in favor of the league of nations, and after reading Senator JOHNSON's speeches I can say that I so heartily disapprove of his methods and his attacks upon England and France that I do not want to support him in any manner whatsoever."

A petition circulated for only a few hours among the returned soldiers expressing unqualified approval of the league of nations covenant and calling upon the Senate to ratify without amendment was signed by a total of 212 ex-soldiers, many of whom had just returned from service in France, and including Col. Charles F. Hutchinson, of the One hundred and sixtieth (Los Angeles) Infantry, United States Army; and Capt. Walter Brinkop, of the Three hundred and sixty-fourth Infantry, United States Army, machine-gun commander, and president of the American Legion in Los Angeles.

Many editorial expressions from Republican newspapers in various sections of the State favoring "immediate ratification" of the league covenant, challenging Senator JOHNSON's claim that support of the treaty is "un-American," and voicing the opinion that "the people unmistakably want the peace treaty and the league of nations covenant ratified without hampering amendments" have also been transmitted to our headquarters.

One of the strongest of such expressions, antagonistic to the cause of Senator JOHNSON, came from Chester H. Rowell, proprietor of the Fresno Republican, an intimate friend and former political supporter of Senator JOHNSON. The two Republican daily newspapers of this city, the Los Angeles Times and Los Angeles Express, are unqualified supporters of the league of nations, demanding its immediate ratification and repudiating Senator JOHNSON's attitude.

At a public meeting to-day, Sunday afternoon, every seat in auditorium filled and about 2,000 turned away. JOHNSON's

speech was answered by John D. Fredericks, former Republican district attorney and leading attorney of Los Angeles; A. J. Wallace, former Republican lieutenant governor with JOHNSON; and J. Stitt Wilson, distinguished orator and former mayor of Berkeley, Calif., who for more than three hours compared statements of Senator JOHNSON in his Los Angeles address with the language of the treaty and covenant. At the conclusion of the meeting a rising vote was taken on the question of the league of nations, with result that entire audience of nearly 4,000 stood up as favoring the league of nations, with only 20 remaining seated.

LEAGUE TO ENFORCE PEACE, COUNTY ORGANIZATION,
By WM. BOWEN, *President*,
ROY MALCOM, *Secretary*.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the telegram which has just been read into the RECORD from the League to Enforce Peace lays stress upon the proposition that some of the former political friends of Senator JOHNSON, of California, disagree with him as to the league of nations, I suppose drawing the inference that he would thereby suffer politically. It may be possible, Mr. President, that Senator JOHNSON will be able to recoup his losses of Republicans in California by gains from the Democrats in Massachusetts. I desire to read a portion of the platform which was adopted by the Massachusetts Democrats, in convention assembled on last Saturday. They favor the ratification of the treaty, "provided the covenant is so amended"—not that reservations shall be made in it but that it shall be so amended—"as to give to no other nation more votes than the United States; to protect the sovereignty of the American people; to protect the right of self-determination, and to refrain from adding to the burden of peoples wanting to be free and independent."

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President——

Mr. NELSON. Will the Senator from Florida permit me to ask the Senator from Idaho a question?

Mr. BORAH. I yield to the Senator from Minnesota.

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator from Idaho will allow me, I desire to interrupt him. Why does the Senator not also ask to have inserted in the RECORD the Republican platform which was adopted in Massachusetts in juxtaposition to the Democratic platform? It might possibly throw some further light on the subject.

Mr. BORAH. No; I do not think it would throw any light upon the particular subject; but if the Senator from Minnesota can see any light in it, I shall be very glad to have it inserted. So, Mr. President, I ask also to insert the Republican platform, although I have not it upon my desk at this moment. I desire to have inserted in the RECORD both platforms as soon as full copies can be secured.

While I am on my feet I desire to say that, notwithstanding the assurances that this question would not enter the domain of politics, there seems to be some danger of its getting into the political arena, for every political organization and every political meeting which has gathered together since this matter came before the people has declared upon this question, one way or the other. I now yield to the Senator from Florida.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I was going to make an observation along the lines of the statement made by the Senator from Minnesota that I thought the Republicans would probably offset the Democrats in Massachusetts.

Mr. BORAH. In what respect does the Senator think so?

Mr. TRAMMELL. In regard to their indorsement of the league of nations with no modifications or amendments which would result in reopening negotiations. That seems to have been the indorsement of the Republicans in Massachusetts.

Mr. BORAH. I am perfectly willing to have the Republican platform inserted in the RECORD; and, so far as my construction of it is concerned, I understand it to be an indorsement of reservations, unmistakable and efficient to accomplish certain things which they define. While that is not my program, it is far from being the program, as I understand, of those who are in favor of the treaty upon the other side of the Chamber. So I do not see any particular consolation to them in that platform. However, I shall be glad to insert it in the RECORD.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the Senator from Idaho has somewhat mistaken my purpose in presenting the telegram from California showing a tremendous repudiation of Senator JOHNSON's views upon the league of nations. My purpose was not to show that Senator JOHNSON had lost personal following there; my purpose was to show that the Republicans of that State, the business men, the laboring men, the churches, the women, large portions of the reception committee, and many of his former campaign managers repudiated his attitude upon the league of nations. I am not saying that those elements of the community in California may not still be in favor of the Senator from California as a Republican candidate for President of the United States; I am introducing it to show that Republican sentiment and public sentiment generally in California is so overwhelmingly strong in favor of a league of nations that they repudiate even the attitude of a favorite son upon that subject, which shows a strength greater than any that I can conceive of in any State in the Union.

Mr. BORAH. How does the Senator construe the Democratic platform in Massachusetts with reference to the amendment of Senator JOHNSON? Does he construe that to be in harmony with his position?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am not construing platforms. If I were to construe platforms, I would construe the platform which was adopted by the Republican convention in Massachusetts, to which reference has already been made and which, with the Senator's permission, I should like to read at length——

Mr. BORAH. I will permit the Senator to read it; but the difference between the Senator from Nebraska and the Senator from Idaho is that I am perfectly willing to construe both platforms; it does not make any difference to me which platform the Senator reads; but will not the Senator before he takes his seat state what he understands to be the position of the great Democratic Party in the State of Massachusetts with reference to the particular proposition which Senator JOHNSON represents?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, the Democratic Party of the State of Massachusetts has on so few occasions been of any service to the national Democratic Party that I am not so much interested in their attitude. However, there is one notable exception, which has given us the presence of the able Democratic Senator from Massachusetts, Mr. WALSH, but such events are so rare and depend so largely on personal strength that we who represent debatable States and Democratic States are not worrying about the resolutions that may be adopted by the Democrats of Republican Massachusetts. We see, however, a peculiar significance when the dominant Republican Party of the State from which the Republican leader hails speaks on the treaty. The chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee is the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], and in a platform adopted in his presence the Massachusetts convention denounces and condemns amendments to the treaty reported by the committee of which he is chairman and supported by him in the Senate. We see in the attitude of those Republicans from Massachusetts, as we see in the attitude of the Republicans of California repudiating the attitude of their favorite son, a tremendous evidence that the Republican as well as the Democratic sentiment of the people of the United States is overwhelmingly in favor of the league of nations.

Mr. BORAH. It seems to me that the Senator's reference to the Democrats in Massachusetts is hardly justified by the facts; the Democrats of Massachusetts have furnished quite as much strength to this Chamber in the present situation as have the Democrats in Nebraska. The Democrats of Nebraska have furnished one Senator and the Republicans have furnished one, and that is what the Democrats of Massachusetts have done.

Mr. HITCHCOCK, Mr. McCORMICK, and Mr. EDGE addressed the Chair.

Mr. BORAH. Just a moment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is not a chorus.

Mr. BORAH. It is true, Mr. President, that the Democrats of Nebraska have furnished a candidate for President more often than have the Democrats of Massachusetts, but they are not any nearer the White House than the Democrats of Massachusetts.

Mr. THOMAS, Mr. McCORMICK, and Mr. EDGE addressed the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Four Senators are on their feet. To whom does the Senator from Idaho yield?

Mr. BORAH. I yield first to the Senator from Colorado.

Mr. THOMAS. I merely wish to ask the Senator from Idaho if he does not think that this discussion powerfully supports the President of the United States in so far as he has urgently requested the people of the United States not to make this a partisan question?

Mr. BORAH. I do not know that it is a partisan question, but it is a political question, and that is a matter in which I have always been interested. It is not so material to me which side either party gets on. I expect them to take positions, though, and they have taken positions, and they will continue to take positions. Now, I yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, I wanted to ask if our seniors in experience would not enlighten the novices in the Senate as to the significance of the Alabama elections? In Massachusetts politicians assembled in conventions spoke; but in Alabama the people spoke.

Mr. EDGE. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. BORAH. Yes; I shall be very glad to have more light.

Mr. EDGE. It occurred to me that the Senator from Nebraska was somewhat critical as to Democracy in Massachusetts and did not seem to be very much impressed with the action of the Democratic convention in that great State. I thought it perhaps appropriate to draw his attention to the action of the Democratic Party in the State of New Jersey in the State convention only a week ago. The Democratic Party in New Jersey, perhaps unfortunately, has been of some consequence to the Democratic development throughout the country, and a week or 10 days ago, when the Democratic convention was held in the city of Trenton, they passed unanimously a resolution as part of their platform that they would not indorse the league of nations—mind you, the President's own State—unless it took proper care of the people of Ireland.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, this is out of order from the standpoint that we have enough discussion of the league of nations in the afternoon; but the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK] recently referred to the election in Alabama. There were a good many issues involved in that election, but undoubtedly the issue over the ratification of the league of nations was one of the issues. The Republican candidate was occupying a position in emphatic repudiation of the league and the ratification of the treaty with the league in it, while the Democratic candidate was sustaining the position of the President of the United States. I do not know what the exact official returns are, but my information is that the Democratic candidate carried the district by a normal majority.

I have seen some statements in the paper recently with reference to this district that are very misleading. I saw in one of the papers yesterday the statement that the usual majority was 4,000. As a matter of fact, since I have been in Congress that district has been twice represented by a Republican. Mr. Burnett, who represented it for 20 years, carried it largely on account of his great personal popularity; but he rarely got a majority of over 1,000, and one time his majority was only 326. I think, though, in the last elections during the war, due to war conditions, Mr. Burnett got the largest majority that his district ever had, and that was a majority of something over 3,000. I think, though, that if you will take the trouble to estimate the results, you will see that the present candidate was elected by a majority that equaled the average majority in the district.

Now, Mr. President, I do not think that decides the question as to how we should vote on the league of nations, or as to how public opinion is divided on the subject. The seventh Alabama district is a good deal like the eastern Tennessee district and the western Virginia district. It is the district in the State of Alabama where the largest number of Republicans live. It is largely a white district. There are very few negroes in it. It is what we call a mountain district; and although the league of nations was an issue, the vote was along old-time party lines, and largely determined along those lines, and our candidate won out by a majority that I think was about an average majority. So I do not claim that there was anything very remarkable in the vote in favor of the league of nations, and I am sure there was nothing in that vote or that election that sustained the Republican contention that the league of nations ought to be eliminated from the treaty.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I quite agree with the Senator from Alabama that there is nothing in the popular vote which should determine how Senators should vote here; but it is a fact, nevertheless, that the Republican candidate was pronouncedly and uncompromisingly against the league of nations and made his campaign upon that issue.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. And got beaten.

Mr. BORAH. And got beaten by 45 votes, according to the last telegram.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the Senator will find he is mistaken about that.

Mr. BORAH. I received a telegram just before I came into the Chamber from Mr. Pollack, with whom I have been in touch since the campaign opened, in which he said that, according to the count at the present time, the Democratic candidate was 45 votes ahead. That is my authority.

ADDRESS OF HERBERT C. HOOVER.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD the report which I send to the desk of an address by Mr. Hoover on the league of nations, which was delivered in Palo Alto, Calif., on October 2.

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

PALO ALTO, CALIF., *October 2.*

Herbert C. Hoover explained his views on the peace treaty to the students of Stanford University and his own townspeople. He stated he had been urged to do so by ex-President Taft and others.

Mr. Hoover began by saying he was not impatient of honest debate and did not criticize the Senate for not accepting the treaty out of hand. He touched on the difficult situation in Paris and said none could have been more disappointed than the American delegation that great wrongs, the result of secret treaties, were not eradicated by the conference.

NO OBLIGATION TO FIGHT.

Coming specifically to the league of nations, he said in part:

"We hear the cry that the league obligates that our sons be sent to fight in foreign lands. Yet the very intent and structure of the league is to prevent war. There is no obligation for the United States to engage in military operations or to allow any interference with our internal affairs without the full consent of our representatives in the league. If there is any danger that we should be charged with an obligation to go to war, either direct or implied, without the full consent and approval of Congress, I believe the President will be the first to agree to any interpretation that this can not be.

THE FRENCH VIEW.

"The French Government so far takes this view: That it has requested from us a separate military guaranty for themselves. The league is founded expressly in the attempt to secure the specific settlement of these questions without military force. To me every line of it is the complete negation of militarism. Its opposition in Paris arose entirely from the representatives of the old militaristic régimes and from the reactionaries of the world in general. They saw in it truly the undermining of militarism. What they foresaw has already happened in a great military nation, the British, where the population, broken under a load of taxation, is responding quickly to the new possibility of international safety without the burden of gigantic naval armament. It would have been impossible to give liberty to the score of new nations of militarily weak yet liberty-loving people without the league to safeguard them from invasion.

"I paid a recent visit to many of the capitals of the new States, and the first anxious question of their officials was, 'Will America ratify the league?' Their invariable statement was that without it their only course was the hopeless effort to arm themselves against stronger neighbors; to do it in the midst of misery; to endeavor to set up groups and military alliances, all the old treadmill of oppression of arms and ultimate war.

WANT TREATY TO FAIL.

"There are many elements in Europe who wish to see the treaty break down and the league of nations disappear. For instance, during the last five months our allies have been growing weaker from a military point of view, due to the necessity of demobilizing their armies, while at the same time the reactionary group in Germany has been growing in strength through the hope of yet securing a division of the Allies.

"At the time I left Europe, a month ago, a German militarism had already reestablished itself as a well disciplined, well officered army of at least 400,000 men, largely congregated on the Polish frontier, and even defying the Government at Berlin. If the treaty is ratified the German Army will be reduced to 200,000 men. The failure of the treaty means the invasion of the Polish State.

"This is only one of the powder magazines in Europe which can not be destroyed until this treaty is ratified, and during every day of delay more explosives are poured into them.

"If the balance of power is to supplant the league of nations we will have torn asunder the only hope that Europe will not break into further wars of races, classes, and combinations that will take civilization back to the Middle Ages.

CHAOS WITHOUT TREATY.

"I am confident that if we attempt now to revise the treaty we shall tread a road through European chaos. Even if we managed to keep our soldiers out of it, we will not escape fearful economic losses. If the league is to break down we must at once prepare to fight.

"Few people seem to realize the desperation to which Europe has been reduced. During the coming winter some of them will look with longing eyes on this rich, fat Nation, possessing great surpluses of every human necessity, while they endure inevitable hunger and cold. Others of them will be plunged into war with their neighbors, and we have already experienced the impossibility of maintaining neutrality with self-respect and safety.

"We can not fiddle while Rome burns. The Allies may themselves ratify this treaty without us, and thus assemble a council

of nations of their own in an endeavor to solve the problems of Europe. It would be a council of Europe, and in the midst of these terrible times, considering the debts they owe us, the material they must have from us or starve, I would rather that we be represented therein lest it become a league of Europe against the Western Hemisphere. A peace without us means more Army and Navy for us, with the old treadmill of taxes and dangers for us.

"Neither the gospel of hate nor the gospel of unpreparedness is the road to peace. The true road lies in every effort to remove the causes of war, not in tearing down such structure of peace as we have, nor in blindness to present dangers. Those who think we can isolate ourselves seem to ignore the fact that modern communication has shortened our distance from our neighbors from a month to an hour.

ECONOMIC LOSSES.

"We are an overseas people and we are dependent upon Europe for a market for the surplus products of our farmers and laborers. Without order in Europe we will at best have business depression, unemployment, and all their train of troubles. With renewed disorganization in Europe, social diseases, and anarchy thrive, and we are infected by every social wind that blows from Europe.

"Our expansion overseas has entangled us for good or ill, and I stand for an honest attempt to join with Europe's better spirits to prevent these entanglements from involving us in war. We are not dealing with perfection, we are dealing with the lesser of evils. These are reasons of interest.

"There are also reasons of idealism and true national interest lies along the path of practical ideals. It was with the hope of ending war that we went into it. To fix peace in international law—that idea dominated our representatives in the peace conference. We have expended the lives of our sons and an enormous portion of our wealth hoping to see these ends made secure. For us to refuse to enter into a joint attempt with the well-thinking sections of a large part of the world, to establish a continuing moral conscience against war, is the utmost folly in our own interests.

SHALL WE DESERT NOW?

"We fought the attempt to impose autocracy on the world. We won. We imposed democracy all over Europe. We set up a score of new democracies, and there are in many of them peoples of our own blood—in the Baltic, Polish and Slav races. Are we to refuse our counsels to these peoples now struggling to realize our own ideals?

"I am one of those who hold that this war would never have happened if the nations of Europe had accepted the invitation of Sir Edward Grey to a conference of civilians in July, 1914. We have now seen the most terrible five years of history, because the reactionaries of Europe refused to come into a room to discuss the welfare of humanity. From this mighty political, social, and economic upheaval there has resulted a host of outstanding problems which can breed war at any minute. The liberal world is not asking for soldiers, it is asking for our economic and moral weight, our idealism, and our distinterested sense of justice. Are we not to take the responsibility that rests on the souls of those men in Europe who refused this invitation in 1914?"

ADDRESSES OF PRESIDENT WILSON.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I also ask to have inserted in the RECORD the remaining addresses of the President of the United States upon his recent trip in the West.

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

THE PRESIDENT AT SAN DIEGO, CALIF., SEPTEMBER 19, 1919.

"Mr. Mayor, ladies, and gentlemen, it is very agreeable to have been indirectly introduced by my friend Mr. Gage, for whom I have so affectionate a regard. I know he will not mind my saying that I first met him when we were both 'lame ducks.' I had just come out of the hospital after an operation and he had one arm out of commission from neuritis, and we met sitting, rather helplessly and perhaps hopelessly, on one of the broad piazzas of one of the hotels at Palm Beach. Being fellow sufferers and comrades in misery, we were drawn toward each other and drawn into confidences which I greatly enjoyed, and which I now recall with peculiar pleasure in seeing Mr. Gage without his hand bound up and in the sort of health I would wish to see him in. What he has said has reminded me of one of the thoughts which has been prominent in my mind of late. He has spoken of our dealings with the Philippine Islands. One of the perplexities under which we have suffered is that, although we were leading the Philippine Islands toward independence, we were in doubt of what would happen to them when they obtained their independence. Before this conference at Paris, the only thing that could be suggested was that we should get a common guaranty from all the nations of the world that the Philippines should be regarded as neutral, just as Belgium was once regarded as neutral, and that they should guarantee her inviolability, because it was certainly to be expected that she would not be powerful enough to take care of herself against those who might wish to commit aggression against her. That serves as a very useful illustration of one of the purposes for which the league of nations has been established, for do you not observe that the moment we are ready to give independence to the Philippines her independence is already guaranteed, because all the great nations of the world are under engagement of the most solemn sort to respect and preserve her territorial integrity and her existing political independence as against external aggression? Those words 'external aggression' are sometimes left out of the exposition of article 10. There was not a member of that peace conference with whom I conferred who did not hold the same opinion that I hold as to the sacred right of self-determination and did not hold the principle which all Americans hold, that it was not the right of any nation to dictate to another nation what sort of government it should have or under what sort of sovereignty it should live.

"For us the problem of the future of the Philippines is solved by the league of nations. It is the first time that the world has come to this mind about matters of that sort, and what brought it to that mind? The breakdown of the neutrality of Belgium. You know you can not establish civil society if anybody is going to be a neutral with regard to the maintenance of the law. We are all bound in conscience, and all public officers are bound in oath, not to remain neutral with regard to the maintenance of the law and the vindication of the right, and one of the things that occurred in this conference, as a sort of practical joke on myself, was this: One of the principles that I went to Paris most insisting on was the freedom of the seas. Now, the freedom of the seas means the definition of the right of neutrals to use the seas when other nations are at war, but under the league of nations there are no neutrals, and, therefore, what I have called the practical joke on myself was that by the very thing that I was advocating it became unnecessary to define the freedom of the seas. All nations are engaged to maintain the right, and in that sense no nation can be neutral when the right is invaded, and, all being comrades and partners in a common cause, we all have an equal right to use the seas. To my mind it is a much better solution than had occurred to me, or than had occurred to anyone else with regard to that single definition of right.

"We have no choice, my fellow citizens, in this matter except between these alternatives: We must go forward with this concert of nations or we must go back to the old arrangement, because the guaranties of peace will not be sufficient without the United States, and those who oppose this covenant are driven to the necessity of advocating the old order of balances of power. If you do not have this universal concert, you have what we have always avoided, necessary alignment of this or that nation with one other nation or with some other group of nations. What is disturbing me most about the present debate—not because I doubt its issue, but because I regret its length—is that it is heartening the representatives of Germany to believe that at last they are going to do in this way what they were not able to do by arms, separate us in interest and purpose from our associates in the war. I am not suggesting, I have no right to suggest, that the men who are opposing this covenant have any thought of assisting Germany in their minds, but my point is that by doing what they are doing they are assisting Germany, whether they want to do so or not. And it is not without significance, my fellow countrymen, that coincidentally with this debate there has been a revival of the pro-German propaganda all over the United States, for this is Germany's calculation that, inasmuch as she is obliged to stand apart and be for the time suspected and have other nations come slowly to accommodation with her, if we hold off other nations will be similarly alienated from us, as they will be, and that there will be, whether we design it or not, a community of interest between the two isolated nations. It is an inevitable psychological result. We must join this arrangement to complete the psychology of this war.

"The psychology of this war is this, that any nation that attempts to do what Germany did will certainly have the world combined against it. Germany not only did not know she would have the world combined against her, but she never dreamed she would. Germany confidently expected that Great Britain would not go into the war; she never dreamed that America would go into the war, and in order not absolutely to disbearten

her people she had continuously to lie to them and tell them that the submarine warfare was so effective that American troops could not be sent to Europe. Friends of mine who, before we went into the war, conversed with Germans on the other side and told them that they had come over since the submarine warfare began were not believed. The Germans said, 'Why, you can not cross the sea.' The body of the German people actually thought that the sea was closed, and that we could send 2,000,000 men over there without losing any of them, except on a single transport, was incredible to them. If they had ever dreamed that that would happen they never would have ventured upon so foolish an attack upon the liberties of mankind.

"What is impressed upon my mind by my stay on the other side of the water more than any one thing is that, while old rivalries and old jealousies and many of the intricate threads of history woven in unhappy patterns have made the other nations of the world suspect one another, nobody doubts or suspects America. That is the amazing and delightful discovery that I made on the other side of the water. If there was any place in our discussions where they wanted troops sent, they always begged that American troops might be sent, because they said none of the other associated powers would suspect them of any ulterior designs, and that the people of the country itself would know that they had not gone there to keep anything that they took, that they had not gone there to interfere with their internal affairs; that they had gone not as exploiters but as friends. That is the reputation of American soldiers throughout Europe, and it is their reputation because it is true. That is the beautiful background of it. That is the temper in which they go; that is the principle upon which they act and upon which the Government back of them acts, and the great people whom that Government represents. There is something more than the choosing between peace and armed isolation, for that is one aspect of the choice. We are choosing between a doubtful peace and an assured peace, guided and led by the United States of America.

"I was very much interested to scan the names on a very beautifully engrossed communication that was put in my hands to-day by Mr. Gage, a communication from the representatives of the League to Enforce Peace. I found upon it the names of many of the principal and most representatives citizens and professional men of San Diego, and it happened, I believe, unless I am misinformed, that practically all the signers were Republicans. There is one thing against which I wish to enter a protest. I have had, I do not know how many, men come to me and say, 'Mr. President, I am a Republican, but I am for the league of nations.' Why but? For as a Democrat you will permit me to remind you who are Republicans that you have always boasted that your party was the party of constructive programs. Here is the most constructive, the greatest constructive, program ever proposed. Why should you say but? If I were in your place and had in my heart the pride which you very properly entertain because of the accomplishments of your party, I would say, 'I am a Republican, and for that reason I am in favor of the league of nations.' But I am not going to say that I am a Democrat, and therefore in favor of the league of nations, because I am not in favor of it because I am a Democrat. I am in favor of it because I am an American and a believer in humanity, and I believe in my heart that if the people of this country, as I am going about now, were to suspect that I had political designs they would give me evident indication that they wanted me to go back to Washington right away. They would not give me the splendid and delightful welcomes they are giving me. Men and women would not come up to me as they are doing now and take my hand in theirs and say, 'Mr. President, God bless you!' I wonder if you realize, as I have tried to realize, what that gracious prayer means. I have had women who had lost their dearest in the war come up to me with tears upon their cheeks any say, 'God bless you!' Why did they bless me? I advised the Congress to go into the war and to send their sons to their death. As Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy, I sent their sons to their death, and they died, and their mothers come and say 'God bless you!' There can be only one explanation. They are proud of the cause in which their sons died; and, my friends, since we all have to die, the way those fellows died is the best way after all. There was nothing in it for them, no possible personal gain, nothing except the noble performance of a disinterested duty, and that is the highest distinction that any man can achieve.

"I remember years ago reading an essay that left a permanent impression on my mind. It was entitled 'Christmas, Its Unfinished Business.' It was a discourse upon what was then a very common occurrence—the meeting of assemblies to promote peace. You know, we used to be always having conventions to promote peace, and most of the men who sat on the platform were men who were doing everything they could to bring on war by unjustly exploiting other countries and taking advantages that they should not take, that were sure to exasperate the feeling of people elsewhere. But they did not realize that they were really bringing on wars; they, in their minds, were trying to bring on peace, and the writer of the essay called attention to this. His thesis was, 'There will be peace when peace is as handsome as war.' He hurried to explain that what he meant was this: That leaving aside the men who may have unjustly and iniquitously plotted war—like the general staff in Germany—the men in the ranks gave everything that they had, their lives included, for their country, and that while you would always hang the boy's musket or the boy's sword up over the mantelpiece, you never would hang up his ledger or his yardstick or his spade; not that civil employments meant to support yourself are dishonorable, but that they are centered upon yourself, whereas the sword and the gun mean that you had forgotten yourself and remembered only the call of your country. Therefore, there was a certain sacredness about that implement that could not attach to any implement of civil life. 'Now,' said my essayist, 'when men are devoted to the purposes of peace with the same self-forgetfulness and the same thought for the interest of their country and the cause that they are devoted to that they display under arms in war, then there will be no more war. When the motives of peace are as disinterested and as handsome as the motives of war for the common soldier, then we will all be soldiers in an army of peace and there will be no more wars.' Now, that comes about when there is a common conception of peace, and the heart of this covenant of peace is to bring nations together into consultation so that they will see which of their objects are common, so that they will discuss how they can accommodate their interests, so that their chief objective will be conciliation and not alienation; and when they understand one another, they will cooperate with one another in promoting the general interest and the common peace. It is the parliament of nations at last, where everyone is under covenant himself to do right, to respect and preserve the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the others, and where everyone engages never to go to war without first trying to settle the matter by the slow-cooling, disinterested processes of discussion. It is what we have been striving for for generation after generation, and now some men hesitate to accept it when the golden thing is placed in their hand. It would be incredible to me if I did not understand some of them, but it is not permitted to one occupying my present office to make personal remarks. After all, personal remarks are neither here nor there. What does any one of us matter in so great a thing as this? What difference does it make whether one man rises and another falls, or we all go down or go up together? We have got to serve humanity. We have got to redeem the honor of the United States. We have got to see this thing through to its great end of justice and peace."

THE PRESIDENT AT HOTEL ALEXANDRIA, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., SEPTEMBER 20, 1919.

"Mr. Toastmaster and ladies and gentlemen, may I not first thank you, Mr. Toastmaster, for your very generous introduction. It spoke in the same delightful tone of welcome that I have heard in the voices on the street to-day, and, although I do not accept for myself the praise that you have so generously bestowed upon me, I nevertheless do recognize in it that you have set just the right note for the discussion which I wanted for a few moments to attempt.

"There is only one thing, my fellow citizens, that has daunted me on this trip. My good father used to teach me that you can not reason out of a man what reason did not put in him, and, suspecting—may I not say knowing—that much of the argument directed against the league of nations is not based upon reason, I must say I have sometimes been puzzled how to combat it, because it is true, as your toastmaster has said, that there is a great constructive plan presented, and no man in the presence of the present critical situation of mankind has the right to oppose any constructive plan except by a better constructive plan. I will say now that I am ready to take ship again and carry back to Paris any constructive proposals which appear a suitable and better substitute for those which have been made.

"There is a peculiarity about this constructive plan which ought, I think, to facilitate our acceptance of it. It is laid out in every part upon American principles. Everybody knows that the principles of peace proposed by America were adopted, were adopted as the basis of the armistice and have been acted upon as the basis of the peace, and there is a circumstance about those American principles which gives me absolute confidence in them. They were not principles which I originated. They

would have none of the strength in them that they have if they had been of individual origination. I remember how anxiously I watched the movements of opinion in this country during the months immediately preceding our entrance into the war. Again and again I put this question to the men who sat around the board at which the Cabinet meets: They represented different parts of the country, they were in touch with the opinion in different parts of the United States, and I would frequently say to them, 'How do you think the people feel with regard to our relation to this war?' And I remember, one day, one of them said, 'Mr. President, I think that they are ready to do anything you suggest.' I said, 'That is not what I am waiting for. That is not enough. If they do not go in of their own impulse, no impulse that I can supply will suffice, and I must wait until I know that I am their spokesman. I must wait until I know that I am interpreting their purpose. Then I will know that I have got an irresistible power behind me.' And that is exactly what happened.

"That is what is now appreciated as it was not at first appreciated on the other side of the sea. They wondered and wondered why we did not come in. They had come to the cynical conclusion that we did not come in because we were making money out of the war and did not want to spoil the profitable game; and then at last they saw what we were waiting for, in order that the whole plot of the German purpose should develop, in order that we might see how the intrigue of that plot had penetrated our own life, how the poison was spreading, and how it was nothing less than a design against the freedom of the world. They knew that when America once saw that she would throw her power in with those who were going to redeem the world. And at every point of the discussion I was attempting to be the mouthpiece of what I understood right-thinking and forward-thinking and just-thinking men without regard to party or section in the United States to be purposing and conceiving, and it was the consciousness in Europe that that was the case that made it possible to construct the peace upon American principles. The American principles were not only accepted. They were acted upon, and when I came back to this country with that plan I think you will bear me out that the Nation was prepared to accept it. I have no doubt, and I have not met anybody who had any well-reasoned doubt, that if immediate action could have been secured upon the treaty at that time only a negligible percentage of our people would have objected to its acceptance, without a single change in either the wording or the punctuation. But then something intervened, and, my fellow citizens, I am not only not going to try to analyze what that was, I am not going to allow my own judgment to be formed as regards what it was. I do not understand it, but there is a certain part of it that I do understand. It is to the immediate interest of Germany to separate us from our associates in the war, and I know that the opposition to the treaty is most acceptable in those quarters of the country where the pro-German sentiment was strongest. I know that all over the country German propaganda has lifted its hideous head again, and I hear the hiss of it on every side.

"When gentlemen speak of isolation, they forget we would have a companion. There would be another isolated nation, and that is Germany. They forget that we would be in the judgment of the world in the same class and at the same disadvantage as Germany. I mean sentimental disadvantage. We would be regarded as having withdrawn our cooperation from that concerted purpose of mankind which was recently conceived and exercised for the liberation of mankind, and Germany would be the only nation in the world to profit by it. I have no doubt there are scores of business men present. Do you think we would profit materially by isolating ourselves and centering upon ourselves the hostility and suspicion and resistance of all the liberal minds in the world? Do you think that if, after having won the absolute confidence of the world and excited the hope of the world, we would lead if we should turn away from them and say, 'No; we do not care to be associated with you any longer; we are going to play a lone hand; we are going to play it for our single advantage'? Do you think after that there is a very good psychology for business, there is a very good psychology for credit? Do you think that throws foreign markets open to you? Do you remember what happened just before we went into the war? There was a conference in Paris, the object of which was to unite the peoples fighting against Germany in an economic combination which would be exclusively for their own benefit. It is possible now for those powers to organize and combine in respect of the purchase of raw materials, and if the foreign market for our raw materials is united, we will have to sell at the price that they are willing to pay or not sell at all. Unless you go into the great economic partnership with the world, you have the rest of the world economically combined against you. So that if you bring the thing down to this lowest of all bases, the bases of material self-interest, you lose in the game, and, for my part, I am free to say that you ought to lose.

"We are told that we are strong and they are weak; that we still have economic or financial independence and they have not. Why, my fellow citizens, what does that mean? That means that they went into the redemption of the freedom of the world sooner than we did and gave everything that they had to redeem it. And now we, because we did not go in so soon or lose so much, want to make profit of the redeemers! The thing is hideous. The thing is unworthy of every tradition of America. I speak of it not because I think that sort of thing takes the least hold upon the consciousness or the purpose of America but because it is a pleasure to condemn so ugly a thing.

"When we look at the objections which these gentlemen make, I have found in going about the country that the result has been that in the greater part of the United States the people do not know what is in the treaty. To my great surprise, I have had to stand up and expound the treaty—tell the people what is in it—and I have had man after man say, 'Why, we never dreamed that those things were in the treaty. We never heard anything about that.' No; you never heard anything about the greater part of the enterprise; you only heard about some of the alleged aspects of the method in which the enterprise was to be carried out. That is all you have heard about. I remember saying—and I believe it was the thought of America—that this was a people's war and the treaty must be a people's peace. That is exactly what this peace treaty proposes. For the first time in the history of civilized society, a great international convention, made up of the leading statesmen of the world, has proposed a settlement which is for the benefit of the weak and not for the benefit of the strong. It is for the benefit of peoples who could not have liberated themselves, whose weakness was profitable to the ambitious and imperialistic nations, whose weakness had been traded in by every cabinet in Europe; and yet these very cabinets represented at the table in Paris were unanimous in the conviction that the people's day had come and that it was not their right to dispose of the fortunes of people without the consent of those people themselves.

"At the front of this great settlement they put the only thing that will preserve it. You can not set weak peoples up in independence and then leave them to be preyed upon. You can not give a false gift. You can not give to people rights which they never enjoyed before and say, 'Now, keep them if you can.' That is an Indian gift. That is a gift which can not be kept. If you have a really humane purpose and a real knowledge of the conditions of peace in the world, you will have to say, 'This is the settlement and we guarantee its continuance.' There is only one honorable course when you have won a cause—to see that it stays won and nobody interferes with or disturbs the results. That is the purpose of the much-discussed article 10 in the covenant of the league of nations. It is the Monroe doctrine applied to the world. Ever since Mr. Monroe uttered his famous doctrine we have said to the world, 'We will respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and the political independence of every State in the Western Hemisphere,' and those are practically the words of article 10. Under article 10 all the members of the league engage to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the other member States, and if that guaranty is not forthcoming the whole structure of peace will crumble, because you can not point out a great war that has not begun by a violation of that principle; that has not begun by the intention to impair the territorial integrity or to interfere with the political independence of some body of people of some nation. It was the heart of the Pan-German plan. It is the heart of every imperialistic plan, because imperialism is the design to control the destinies of people who did not choose you to control them. It is the principle of domination. It is at the opposite extreme from the principle of self-determination and self-government, and in that same covenant of the league of nations is the provision that only self-governing States shall be admitted to the membership of the league. No influence shall be injected there which is not sympathetic with the fundamental principle, namely, that ancient and noble principle that underlies our institutions, that all just government depends upon the consent of the governed.

"You have no choice, my fellow citizens, because the peoples of the world, even those that slept, are awake. There is not a country in the world where the great mass of mankind is not now aware of its rights and determined to have them at any cost, and the present universal unrest in the world, which renders return to normal conditions impossible so long as it continues, will not stop until men are assured by some arrangement

they can believe in that their rights will be protected and that they can go about the normal production of the necessaries of life and begin to enjoy the ordinary pleasures and privileges of life without the constant shadow of some cloud of terror over them, some threat of injustice, some tyranny of control. Men are not going to stand it. If you want to quiet the world, you have got to reassure the world, and the only way in which you can reassure it is to let it know that all the great fighting powers of the world are going to maintain that quiet, that the fighting power is no longer to be directed toward aggression, but is to be directed toward protection. And every great fighting nation in the world will be in the league—because Germany for the time being is not a great fighting power. That great nation of over 60,000,000 people has consented in the treaty to reduce its standing armed force to 100,000 men and to give up all the war material over and above what is necessary to maintain an army of 100,000 men; so that for the time being we may exclude Germany from the list of the fighting nations of the world. The whole power of the world is now offered to mankind for the maintenance of peace, and for the maintenance of peace by the very processes we have all professed to believe in, by substituting arbitration and discussion for war, by substituting the judgment of mankind for the force of arms. I say without qualification that every nation that is not afraid of the judgment of mankind will go into this arrangement. There is nothing for any nation to lose whose purposes are right and whose cause is just. The only nations that need fear to go into it are those that have designs which are illegitimate, those which have designs that are inconsistent with justice and are the opposite of peace.

"The whole freedom of the world not only, but the whole peace of mind of the world, depends upon the choice of America, because without America in this arrangement the world will not be reassured. I can testify to that. I can testify that no impression was borne in deeper upon me on the other side of the water than that no great free peoples suspected the United States of ulterior designs, and that every nation, the weakest among them, felt that its fortunes would be safe if intrusted to the guidance of America; that America would not impose upon it. At the peace table one of the reasons why American advice constantly prevailed, as it did, was that our experts, our financial experts, our economic experts, and all the rest of us—for you must remember that the work of the conference was not done exclusively by the men whose names you all read about every day; it was done in the most intensive labor of experts of every sort who sat down together and got down to the hardpan of every subject that they had to deal with—were known to be disinterested, and in nine cases out of ten, after a long series of debates and interchanges of views and counterproposals, it was usually the American proposal that was adopted. That was because the American experts came at last into this position of advantage, they had convinced everybody that they were not trying to work anything, that they were not thinking of something that they did not disclose, that they wanted all the cards on the table, and that they wanted to deal with nothing but facts. They were not dealing with national ambitions, they were not trying to disappoint anybody, and they were not trying to stack the cards for anybody. It was that conviction, and that only, which led to the success of American counsel in Paris.

"Is not that a worthy heritage for people who set up a great free Nation on this continent in order to lead men in the ways of justice and of liberty? My heart was filled with a profound pride when I realized how America was regarded, and my only fear was that we who were over there would not have wisdom enough to play the part. Delegations from literally all parts of the world came to seek interviews with me as the spokesman of America, and there was always a plea that America should lead; that America should suggest. I remember saying to one of the delegations, which seemed to me more childlike in its confidence than the rest, 'I beg that you gentlemen will not expect the impossible. America will do everything that she can, but she can not do some of the things that you are expecting of her. My chief fear is to disappoint, because you are expecting what can not be realized.' My fear was not that America would not prove true to herself, but that the things expected of her were so ideal that in this practical world, full of obstacles, it would be impossible to realize the expectation. There was in the background the infinite gratification at the reputation and confidence that this country had won.

"The world is in that situation industrially, economically, politically. The world will be absolutely in despair if America deserts it. But the thing is inconceivable. America is not going to desert it. The people of America are not going to desert it. The job is to get that into the consciousness of men who do not understand it. The job is to restore some of our fellow citizens to that large sort of sanity which makes a man bigger than himself. We have had a great many successful men in America, my fellow citizens, but we have seldom erected a statue to a man who was merely successful in a business way. Almost all the statues in America, almost all the memorials, are erected to men who forgot themselves and worked for other people. They may not have been rich, they may not have been successful in the worldly sense, they may have been deemed in their generation dreamers and idealists, but when they were dead America remembered that they loved mankind, America remembered that they embodied in those dreamy ideals of theirs the visions that America had had, America remembered that they had a great surplus of character that they spent not upon themselves but upon the enterprises of humanity. A man who has not got that surplus capital of character that he spends upon the great enterprises of communities and of nations will sink into a deserved oblivion, and the only danger is that in his concentration upon his own ambitions, in his centering of everything that he spends upon himself, he will lead others astray and work a disservice to great communities which he ought to have served. It is now an enterprise of infection ahead of us—shall I call it? We have got to infect those men with the spirit of the Nation itself. We have got to make them aware that we will not be led; that we will not be controlled; that we will not be restrained by those who are not like ourselves; and that America now is in the presence of the realization of the destiny for which she has been waiting.

"You know, you have been told, that Washington advised us against entangling alliances, and gentlemen have used that as an argument against the league of nations. What Washington had in mind was exactly what these gentlemen want to lead us back to. The day we have left behind us was a day of alliances. It was a day of balances of power. It was a day of 'every nation take care of itself or make a partnership with some other nation or group of nations to hold the peace of the world steady or to dominate the weaker portions of the world.' Those were the days of alliances. This project of the league of nations is a great process of disentanglement. I was reading only this morning what a friend of mine reminded me of, a speech that President McKinley made the day before he was assassinated, and in several passages of that speech you see the dawn of this expectation in his humane mind. His whole thought was against isolation. His whole thought was that we had by process of circumstance, as well as of interest, become partners with the rest of the world. His thought was that the world had grown little by quickened methods of intercommunication. His whole thought was that the better we knew each other and the closer we drew together, the more certain it would be that the processes of arbitration would be adopted; that men would not fight but would talk things over; that they would realize their community of interest; and shot all through that speech you see the morning light of just such a day as this. It would look as if the man had been given a vision just before he died—one of the sweetest and most humane souls that have been prominent in our affairs, a man who thought with his head and with his heart. This new day was dawning upon his heart, and his intelligence was beginning to draw the lines of the new picture which has been completed and sketched in a constructive document that we shall adopt and that, having adopted it, we shall find to reflect a new glory upon the things that we did. Then what significance will attach to the boy's sword or the boy's musket over the mantelpiece—not merely that he beat Germany but that he redeemed the world."

THE PRESIDENT AT AUDITORIUM, LOS ANGELES, CALIF., SEPTEMBER 20, 1919.

"Mr. Mayor, Mrs. Cowles, my fellow countrymen. I esteem it a great privilege to stand before this audience, and I esteem it one of the most interesting occasions that I have had to expound a theme so great that I am always afraid that I am inadequate to its exposition. I esteem it a privilege to be in the presence that I find myself in, on the stage with this committee of gentlemen representing the nations with whom we have been associated in the war, with these men who saved the Union and with these men who saved the world.

"I feel that there is a certain sense in which I am rendering my account to the soldiers and sailors whose Commander in Chief I have been, for I sent them across the sea believing that their errand was not only to defeat Germany but also to redeem the world from the danger to which Germany had exposed it, to make the world a place in which arbitration, discussion, the processes of peace, the processes of justice should supplant the brutal processes of war. I came back from the other side proud that I was bringing with me a document which contained a great constructive plan to accomplish that very thing. It is a matter

of unaffected amazement on my part, my fellow citizens, that there should be men in high station who oppose its adoption. It is a matter of amazement that they should devote their scrutiny to certain details and forget the majesty of the plan, that they should actually have made is necessary that I should go throughout the country telling the people of the United States what is in the treaty of peace. For they have not told you. They have given you no conception of its scope. They have not expounded its objects. They have not shown you how it is a people's and not a statesmen's peace. They have not shown you how at its heart lies the liberation of nations. They have not shown you that in it is the redemption of our promise that we were fighting for the right of the weak and not for the power of the strong. These promises are redeemed in that great document, these hopes are realized, and the only buttress for that great structure is the league of nations. If that should fail, there is no guaranty that any part of the settlement will stand. If that should fail, nations will once more sink back into that slough of despond in which they formerly struggled, suspecting one another, rivaling one another in preparation for war, intriguing against one another, plotting against the weak in order to supplement the power of the strong.

"And they did more than that, because mankind is now aware that the rights of the greater portion of mankind have not been safeguarded and regarded. Do not for a moment suppose that the universal unrest in the world at the present time, my fellow citizens, is due to any whim, to any newborn passion, to any newly discovered ambition. It is due to the fact, the sad, the tragic fact, that great bodies of men have throughout the ages been denied the mere rights of humanity. The peoples of the world are tired of a time with governments that exploit their people, and they are determined to have, by one process or another, that concerted order of conciliation and debate and conference which is set up in the great document that we know as the covenant of the league of nations. The heart of that document is not in the mere details that you have heard about. The heart of that document is that every great fighting nation in the world—for Germany at present is not a great fighting nation—solemnly engages that it will never resort to war without first having done one or other of two things, either submitted the matter in dispute to arbitration, in which case it agrees to abide by the verdict, or, if it does not choose to submit it to arbitration, submit it to the discussion and examination of the council of the league of nations, before whom it promises to lay all the documents, to whom it promises to disclose all the pertinent facts, by whom it agrees all the documents and facts shall be published and laid before the opinion of the world. It agrees that six months shall be allowed for the examination of those documents and facts by the council of the league and that, even if it is dissatisfied with the opinion finally uttered, it will still not resort to war until three months after the opinion has been rendered. All agree that there shall be nine months of deliberate discussion and frank weighing of the merits of the case before the whole jury of mankind before they will go to war.

"If any one of them disregards that promise and refuses to submit the question in dispute either to arbitration or to discussion, or goes to war within less than the nine months, then there is an automatic penalty that is applied, more effective, I take leave to say, than war itself, namely, the application of an absolute boycott. The nation that disregards that promise, we all agree, shall be isolated; shall be denied the right to ship out goods or to ship them in, to exchange telegraphic messages or messages by mail, to have any dealings of any kind with the citizens of the other members of the league. First, the pressure of opinion and then the compelling pressure of economic necessity—those are the great bulwarks of peace. Do you say they are not sufficient? I put this proposition to you: You want insurance against war. Wouldn't you rather have 10 per cent insurance than none? If you could get 20 per cent insurance, wouldn't you be delighted? If you got 50 per cent insurance, wouldn't you think it Utopian? Why, my fellow citizens, if you examine the provisions of this league of nations, I think you will agree with me that you have got 99 per cent insurance. That is what we promised the mothers and wives and sweethearts of these men that they should have—insurance against the terrible danger of losing those who were dear to them, slain upon the battle field because of the unhallowed plots of autocratic governments. Autocratic governments are excluded henceforth from respectable society. It is provided in the covenant of the league of nations that only self-governing peoples shall be admitted to its membership, and the reason that Germany is for the time being excluded is that we want to wait and see whether she really has changed permanently her form of constitution and her habit of government. If she has changed her mind in reality, if her great people have taken charge of their own affairs and will prove it to us, they are entitled to come into respectable society and join the league of nations. Until then they are on probation, and to hear some of them talk now you would think the probation had to be rather long, because they do not seem to have repented of their essential purpose.

"Now, offset against this, my fellow citizens, some of the things that are being said about the covenant of the league and about the treaty. I want to begin with one of the central objections which are made to the treaty, for I have come here disposed to business. I do not want to indulge in generalities. I do not want to dwell more than it is proper to dwell upon the great ideal purposes that lie behind this peace and this covenant. I want to contrast some things that have been said with the real facts. There is nothing that is formidable in this world in public affairs except facts. Talk does not matter. As I was saying the other night, if you suspect any acquaintance of yours of being a fool, encourage him to hire a hall. Your fellow citizens will then know whether your judgment of him was right or wrong, and it will not be you that convinced them, it will be he who does the convincing. The best way to dissipate nonsense is to expose it to the open air. It is a volatile thing, whereas fact and truth are concrete things and you can not dissipate them that way. Perhaps I may tell a rather trivial story. When I was governor of New Jersey I got rather reluctant support for a certain measure of reform that I was very much interested in from a particular member of the senate of the State who, I think, if he had been left to his own devices, would probably have not voted for the measure, but to whom an influential committee of his fellow townsmen came and, so to say, personally conducted his vote. After they had successfully conducted it in the way that they wished, they solemnly brought him into my office to be congratulated. It was a great strain upon my gravity, but I pulled as straight a face as I could and thanked him and congratulated him. Then, tipping a very heavy wink indeed he said, 'Governor, they never get me if I see them coming first.' Now, I have adopted that as my motto with regard to facts. I never let them get me if I see them coming first. The danger for some of the gentlemen we are thinking about to-night, but not mentioning, is that the facts are coming and they do not see them. My prediction is that the facts are going to get them and make a very comfortable meal off of them.

"Let us take up some of these things, to grow serious again. In the first place, there is that very complex question of the cession of the rights which Germany formerly enjoyed in Shantung Province, in China, and which the treaty transfers to Japan. The only way in which to clear this matter up is to know what lies back of it. Let me recall some circumstances which probably most of you have forgotten. I have to go back to the year 1898, for it was in March of that year that these cessions which formerly belonged to Germany were transferred to her by the Government of China. What had happened was that two German missionaries in China had been murdered. The central Government at Peking had done everything that was in its power to do to quiet the local disturbances, to allay the local prejudice against foreigners which led to the murders, but had been unable to do so, and the German Government held them responsible, nevertheless, for the murder of the missionaries. It was not the missionaries that the German Government was interested in. That was a pretext. Ah, my fellow citizens, how often we have made Christianity an excuse for wrong! How often in the name of protecting what was sacred we have done what was tragically wrong! That was what Germany did. She insisted that, because this thing had happened for which the Peking Government could not really with justice be held responsible, a very large and important part of one of the richest Provinces of China should be ceded to her for sovereign control, for a period of 99 years, that she should have the right to penetrate the interior of that Province with a railway, and that she should have the right to exploit any ores that lay within 30 miles either side of that railway. She forced the Peking Government to say that they did it in gratitude to the German Government for certain services which she was supposed to have rendered but never did render. That was the beginning. I do not know whether any of the gentlemen who are criticizing the present Shantung settlement were in public affairs at that time or not, but I will tell you what happened, so far as this Government was concerned.

"One of the most enlightened and humane Presidents we have ever had was at the head of the Government—William McKinley, a man who loved his fellow men and believed in justice—and associated with him was one of our ablest Secretaries of State—Mr. John Hay. The state of international law was such then that they did not feel at liberty to make

even a protest against these concessions to Germany. Neither did they make any protest when, immediately following that, similar concessions were made to Russia, to Great Britain, and to France. It was almost immediately after that that China granted to Russia the right of the possession and control of Port Arthur and a portion of the region of Talien-Wan. Then England, not wishing to be outdone, although she had similar rights elsewhere in China, insisted upon a similar concession and got Weihaiwei. Then France insisted that she must have a port, and got it for 99 years. Not against one of those did the Government of the United States make any protest whatever. They only insisted that the door should not be shut in any of these regions against the trade of the United States. You have heard of Mr. Hay's policy of the open door. That was his policy of the open door—not the open door to the rights of China, but the open door to the goods of America. I want you to understand, my fellow countrymen, I am not criticizing this, because, until we adopt the covenant of the league of nations, it is an unfriendly act for any government to interfere in the affairs of any other unless its own interests are immediately concerned. The only thing Mr. McKinley and Mr. Hay were at liberty to do was to call attention to the fact that the trade of the United States might be unfavorably affected and insist that in no circumstances it should be. They got from all of these powers the promise that it should not be—a promise which was more or less kept. Following that came the war between Russia and Japan, and at the close of that war Japan got Port Arthur and the rights which Russia enjoyed in China, just as she is now getting Shantung and the rights her recently defeated enemy had in China—an exactly similar operation. That peace that gave her Port Arthur was concluded, as you know, on the territory of the United States—at Portsmouth, N. H. Nobody dreamed of protesting against that. Japan had beaten Russia. Port Arthur did not at that time belong to China; it belonged for the period of the lease to Russia, and Japan was ceded what Japan had taken by the well-recognized processes of war.

"Very well, at the opening of this war, Japan went and took Kiaochow and supplanted Germany in Shantung Province. The whole process is repeated, but repeated with a new sanction. In the meantime, after this present war began, England and France, not at the same time, but successively, feeling that it was essential that they should have the assistance of Japan on the Pacific, agreed that if Japan would go into this war and take whatever Germany had in the Pacific she should retain everything north of the Equator which had belonged to Germany. That treaty now stands. That treaty absolutely binds Great Britain and France. Great Britain and France can not in honor, having offered Japan this inducement to enter the war and to continue her operations, consent to an elimination of the Shantung provision from the present treaty. Very well, let us put these gentlemen who are objecting to the Shantung settlement to the test. Are they ready to fight Great Britain and France and Japan, who will have to stand together, in order to get this Province back for China? I know they are not, and their interest in China is not the interest of assisting China, but of defeating the treaty. They know beforehand that a modification of the treaty in that respect can not be obtained, and they are insisting upon what they know is impossible; but if they ratify the treaty and accept the covenant of the league of nations they do put themselves in a position to assist China. They put themselves in that position for the very first time in the history of international engagements. They change the whole faith of international affairs, because after you have read the much-debated article 10 of the covenant I advise you to read article 11. Article 11 says that it shall be the friendly right of any member of the league to call attention at any time to anything, anywhere, that threatens to disturb the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends. That in itself constitutes a revolution in international relationships. Anything that affects the peace of any part of the world is the business of every nation. It does not have simply to insist that its trade shall not be interfered with; it has the right to insist that the rights of mankind shall not be interfered with. Not only that, but back of this provision with regard to Shantung lies, as everybody knows or ought to know, a very honorable promise which was made by the Government of Japan in my presence in Paris, namely, that just as soon as possible after the ratification of this treaty they will return to China all sovereign rights in the Province of Shantung. Great Britain has not promised to return Weihaiwei; France has not promised to return her part. Japan has promised to relinquish all the sovereign rights which were acquired by Germany for the remaining 78 of the 99 years of the lease, and to retain only what other Governments have in many other parts of China, namely, the right to build and operate the railway under a corporation and to exploit the mines in the immediate neighborhood of that railway. In other words, she retains only the rights of economic concessionaires. Personally, I am frank to say that I think all of these nations have invaded some of the essential rights of China by going too far in the concessions which they have demanded, but that is an old story now, and we are beginning a new story. In the new story we all have the right to talk about what they have been doing and to convince them, by the pressure of the public opinion of the world, that a different course of action would be just and right. I am for helping China and not turning away from the only way in which I can help her. Those are the facts about Shantung. Doesn't the thing look a little different?

"Another thing that is giving some of our fellow countrymen pangs of some sort—pangs of jealousy, perhaps—is that, as they put it, Great Britain has six votes in the league and we have only one. Well, our one vote, it happens, counts just as heavily as if every one of our States were represented and we had 48, because it happens, though these gentlemen have overlooked it, that the assembly is not an independent voting body. Great Britain has only one representative and one vote in the council of the league of nations, which originates all action, and its six votes are in the assembly, which is a debating and not an executive body. In every matter in which the assembly can vote along with the council it it necessary that all the nations represented on the council should concur in the affirmative vote to make it valid, so that in every vote, no matter how many concur in it in the assembly, in order for it to become valid, it is necessary that the United States should vote aye.

"Inasmuch as the assembly is a debating body, that is the place where this exposure that I have talked about to the open air is to occur. It would not be wise for anybody to go into the assembly with purposes that will not bear exposure, because that is the great cooling process of the world; that is the great place where gases are to be burned off. I ask you, in debating the affairs of mankind, would it have been fair to give Panama a vote, as she will have, Cuba a vote, both of them very much under the influence of the United States, and not give a vote to the Dominion of Canada, to that great energetic Republic in South Africa, to that place from which so many liberal ideas and liberal actions have come, that stout little Commonwealth of Australia? When I was in Paris the men I could not tell apart, except by their hats, were the Americans and the Australians. They both had the swing of fellows who say, 'The gang is all here, what do we care?' Could we deny a vote to that other little self-governing nation, for it practically is such in everything but its foreign affairs, New Zealand, or to those toiling—I was about to say uncounted—millions in India? Would you want to deprive these great communities of a voice in the debate? My fellow citizens, it is a proposition which has never been stated, because to state it answers it. But they can not outvote us. If we, as I said a minute ago, had 48 votes in the assembly, they would not count any more than our 1, because they would have to be combined, and it is easier to combine 1 than to combine 48. The vote of the United States is potential to prevent anything that the United States does not care to approve. All this nonsense about six votes and one vote can be dismissed and you can sleep with perfect quiet. In order that I may not be said to have misled you, I must say that there is one matter upon which the assembly can vote, and which it can decide by a two-thirds majority without the concurrence of all the States represented in the council, and that is the admission of new members to the league.

"Then, there is that passion that some gentlemen have conceived, that we should never live with anybody else. You can call it the policy of isolation or the policy of taking care of yourself, or you can give any name you choose to what is thoroughly impossible and selfish. I say it is impossible, my fellow citizens. When men tell you that we are, by going into the league of nations, reversing the policy of the United States, they have not thought the thing out. The statement is not true. The facts of the world have changed. It is impossible for the United States to be isolated. It is impossible for the United States to play a lone hand, because it has gone partners with all the rest of the world with regard to every great interest that it is connected with. What are you going to do? Give up your foreign markets? Give up your influence in the affairs of other nations and arm yourselves to the teeth and double your taxes and be ready to spring instead of ready to cooperate? We are tied into the rest of the world by kinship, by sympathy, by interest in every great enterprise of human affairs. The United States has become the economic center of the

world, the financial center. Our economic engagements run everywhere, into every part of the globe. Our assistance is essential to the establishment of normal conditions throughout the world. Our advice is constantly sought. Our standards of labor are being extended to all parts of the world just so fast as they can be extended. America is the breeding center for all the ideas that are now going to fecundate the great future. You can no more separate yourselves from the rest of the world than you can take all the tender roots of a great tree out of the earth and expect the tree to live. All the tendrils of our life, economic and social and every other, are interlaced in a way that is inextricable with the similar tendrils of the rest of mankind. The only question which these gentlemen can ask us to decide is this: Shall we exercise our influence in the world, which can henceforth be a profound and controlling influence, at a great advantage or at an insuperable disadvantage? That is the only question that you can ask. As I put it the other night, you have got this choice: You have got to be either provincials, little Americans, or big Americans, statesmen. You have got to be either ostriches with your heads in the sands or eagles. I doubt if the comparison, with the head in the sands, is a good one, because I think even an ostrich can think in the sand. What he does not know is that people are looking at the rest of him. Our choice is in the bird kingdom, and I have in my mind's eye a future in which it will seem that the eagle has been misused. You know that it was a double-headed eagle that represented the power of Austria-Hungary, you have heard of the eagles of Germany, but the only proper symbol of the eagle is the symbol for which we use it—as the bird of liberty and justice and peace.

"I want to put it as a business proposition, if I am obliged to come down as low as that, for I do not like in debating the great traditions of a free people to bring the debate down to the basis of dollars and cents; but if you want to bring it down to that, if anybody wants to bring it down to that, reason it out on that line. Is it easier to trade with a man who suspects and dislikes you or with one who trusts you? Is it easier to deal with a man with a grouch or with a man who opens his mind and his opportunities to you and treats you like a partner and a friend? There is nothing which can more certainly put a drop of acid into every relationship we have in the world than if we now desert our former associates in this war. That is exactly what we should be doing if we rejected this treaty, and that is exactly what, speaking unwisely and too soon, the German leaders have apprised us that they want us to do. No part of the world has been so pleased by our present hesitation as the leaders of Germany, because their hope from the first has been that sooner or later we would fall out with our associates. Their hope was to divide us before the fighting stopped, and now their hope is to divide us after the fighting. You read how a former German privy councillor, I believe he was, said in an interview the other day that these debates in the Senate looked to him like the dawn of a new day. A new day for the world? No; a new day for the hopes of Germany, because he saw what anybody can see who lifts his eyes and looks in the future—two isolated nations; one isolated nation on probation, and then two, the other a nation infinitely trusted, infinitely believed in, that had given magnificent purpose of its mettle and of its trustworthiness, now drawing selfishly and suspiciously apart and saying, 'You may deceive us, you may draw us into broils, you may get us into trouble; we will take care of ourselves, we will trade with you and we will trade on you.' The thing is inconceivable. America is no quitter, and least of all is she a quitter in a great moral enterprise where her conscience is involved. The only immortal thing about America is her conscience. America is not going to be immortal because she has immense wealth. Other great nations had immense wealth and went down in decay and disgrace, because they had nothing else. America is great because of the ideas she has conceived. America is great because of the purposes she has set herself to achieve. America is great because she has seen visions that other nations have not seen, and the one enterprise that does engage the steadfast loyalty and support of the United States is an enterprise for the liberty of mankind.

"How can we make the purpose evident? I was saying in one place to-night that my dear father had once taught me that there was no use trying to reason out of a man what reason did not put in him, and yet here to-night I am trying to apply the remedy of reason. We must look about and find some other remedy, because in matters of this sort remedies are always homeopathic—like must cure like. Men must be made to see the great impulses of the Nation in such a fashion that they will not dare to resist them. I do not mean by any threat of political disaster. Why, my fellow citizens, may I indulge in a confidence? I have had men politically disposed say to me, as a Democrat, 'This is all to the good. These leaders of the Republican Party in Washington are going to ruin the party.' They seem to think that I will be pleased. I do not want to see the great Republican Party misrepresented and misled. I do not want to see any advantage reaped by the party I am a member of because another great party has been misrepresented, because I believe in the loyalty and Americanism and high ideals of my fellow citizens who are Republicans just as much as I believe in those things in Democrats. It seems almost absurd to say that; of course I do. When we get to the borders of the United States we are neither Republicans nor Democrats. It is our privilege to scrap inside the family just as much as we please, but it is our duty as a Nation in those great matters of international concern which distinguish us to subordinate all such differences and to be a united family and all speak with one voice what we all know to be the high conceptions of American manhood and womanhood.

"There is a tender side to this great subject. Have these gentlemen no hearts? Do they forget the sons that are dead in France? Do they forget the great sacrifice that this Nation has made? My friends, we did not go to France to fight for anything special for America. We did not send men 3,000 miles away to defend our own territory. We did not take up the gage that Germany had thrown down to us because America was being specially injured. America was not being specially injured. We sent those men over there because free people everywhere were in danger and we had always been, and will always be, the champion of right and of liberty. That is the glory of these men that sit here. The hardest thing that I had to do, and the hardest thing that a lot of you had to do, was to continue to wear civilian clothes during the war, not to don a uniform, not to risk something besides reputation—risk life and everything. We knew that an altar had been erected upon which that sacrifice could be made more gloriously than upon any other altar that had ever been lifted among mankind, and we desired to offer ourselves as a sacrifice for humanity. And that is what we shall do, my fellow citizens. All the mists will pass away. A number of halls are being hired. All the gases are being burned off; and when you come down, as the gases have passed away, to the solid metal of which this Nation is made, it will shine as lustrously and bright as it has ever shone throughout the history of the Nation we love and the Nation we will always consecrate ourselves to redeem."

THE PRESIDENT FROM REAR PLATFORM, SACRAMENTO, CALIF., SEPTEMBER 22, 1919.

"My fellow countrymen, it is impossible in these circumstances for me to attempt a speech, but I can not let the occasion go by without telling you how strong it makes my heart that you should have given me so extraordinary and delightful a welcome as this. It is the more delightful to me because I believe that it is not only a desire to welcome me, but a desire to show your interest and your support of the great cause I have come out to advocate. The happy circumstance of this journey is that I have not come out to advocate anything personal to myself; that I have not come out to seek the fortunes of any man or group of men, but to seek the safety and the guaranted peace of mankind. We undertook a great war for a definite purpose. That definite purpose is carried out in a great treaty. I have brought the treaty back, and we must not much longer hesitate to ratify it, because that treaty is the guaranty of peace; it is the guaranty of permanent peace, for all the great fighting nations of the world are combined in it to maintain a just settlement. Without this treaty, without the covenant of the league of nations which it contains, we would simply sink back into that slough of despond in which mankind was before this war began, with the threat of war and of terror constantly over them. We can not go back. We will not go back.

"It is more than a guaranty of peace. It is a guaranty of justice. For example, it affords the only hope that China can get of the restoration to herself not only of the sovereignty of Shantung, but of the sovereignty which other nations as well have taken away from her. It affords the only expectation, in similar cases elsewhere, that by the pressure, the terrible, irresistible pressure of public opinion throughout the world, ancient wrongs will be righted and men will get the chance to live that they never had before. It is the first combination of the power of the world to see that justice shall reign everywhere. We can not turn away from such an arrangement, and I am sure, my fellow citizens, not only from this great outpouring here, but from the great outpourings I have seen everywhere in this country, that the heart of America is right and her purpose is irresistible."

THE PRESIDENT FROM REAR OF PLATFORM AT OGDEN, UTAH, SEPTEMBER 23, 1919.

"I can not make a real speech in the circumstances, but it would be ungracious of me if I did not say how delightful I have felt the welcome of Ogden to be and how refreshing it is to me to come into contact with you, my fellow citizens, in this part of the world which I wish I knew much better. You will understand that the theme that I have most at heart needs a lot of sea room to turn in, and I would despair of making any adequate remarks about so great a matter as the treaty of peace or the league of nations; but I do find this, my fellow countrymen, that the thing is very near the heart of the people. There are some men in public life who do not seem to be in touch with the heart of the people, but those who are know how that heart throbs deep and strong for this great enterprise of humanity, for it is nothing less than that. We must set our purposes in a very definite way to assist the judgment of public men. I do not mean in any way to coerce the judgment of public men, but to enlighten and assist that judgment, for I am convinced, after crossing the continent, that there is no sort of doubt that 80 per cent of the people of the United States are for the league of nations, and that the chief opposition outside legislative halls comes from the very disquieting element that we had to deal with before and during the war. All the elements that tended toward disloyalty are against the league, and for a very good reason. If this league is not adopted we will serve Germany's purpose, because we will be dissociated from the nations, and I am afraid permanently dissociated from the nations, with whom we cooperated in defeating Germany. Nothing is so gratifying, we now learn by cable, to public opinion in Germany as the possibility of their doing now what they could not do by arms, separating us in feeling when they could not separate us in fact. I for my part am in to see this thing through, because these men who fought the battles on the fields of France are not now going to be betrayed by the rest of us; we are going to see that the thing they fought for is accomplished, and it does not make any difference how long the fight or how difficult the fight, it is going to be won, and triumphantly won."

THE PRESIDENT AT RENO, NEV., SEPTEMBER 22, 1919.

"Gov. Boyle, Mr. Chairman, my fellow countrymen, the governor and your chairman have both alluded to the fact that it does not often happen that the President comes to Nevada. Speaking for this President, I can say that it was not because he did not want to come to Nevada more than once, because from the first, when I have studied the movements of the history of this great country, nothing has fascinated me so much or seemed so characteristic of that history as the movement to the frontier, the constant spirit of adventure, the constant action forward. A wit in the East recently said, explaining the fact that we were able to train a great army so rapidly, that it was so much easier to train an American army than any other because you had to train them to go only one way. That has been true of America and of the movement of population. It has always been one way. They have never been returning tides. They have always been advancing tides, and at the front of the advancing tide have always been the most adventurous spirits, the most originative spirits, the men who were ready to go anywhere and to take up any fortune to advance the things that they believed in and desired. Therefore, it is with a sense of exhilaration that I find myself in this community, which your governor has described as still a frontier community. You are a characteristic part of this great country which we all love.

"And it is the more delightful to look at your individual aspect, because the subject that I have come to speak about is a forward-looking subject. Some of the critics of the league of nations have their eyes over their shoulders; they are looking backward. I think that is the reason they are stumbling all the time; they are always striking their feet against obstacles which everybody sees and avoids and which do not lie in the real path of the progress of civilization. Their power to divert, or to pervert, the view of this whole thing has made it necessary for me repeatedly on this journey to take the liberty that I am going to take with you to-night, of telling you just what kind of a treaty this is. Very few of them have been at pains to do that. Very few of them have given their audiences or the country at large any conception of what this great document contains or of what its origin and purpose are. Therefore, I want, if you will be patient with me, to set the stage for the treaty, to let you see just what it was that was meant to be accomplished and just what it was that was accomplished.

"Perhaps I can illustrate best by recalling some history. Something over a hundred years ago the last so-called peace conference sat in Vienna—back in the far year 1815, if I remember correctly. It was made up, as the recent conference in Paris was, of the leading statesmen of Europe. America was not then drawn into that general family and was not represented at that conference, and practically every Government represented at Vienna at that time, except the Government of Great Britain, was a Government like the recent Government of Germany, where a small coterie of autocrats were able to determine the fortunes of their people without consulting them, were able to use their people as puppets and pawns in the game of ambition which was being played all over the stage of Europe. But just before that conference there had been many signs that there was a breaking up of that old order, there had been some very ominous signs, indeed. It was not then so long ago that, though there were but 3,000,000 people subject to the Crown of Great Britain in America, they had thrown off allegiance to that Crown successfully and defied the power of the British Empire on the ground that nobody at a distance had a right to govern them and that nobody had a right to govern them whom they did not choose to be their government; founding their government upon the principle that all just government rests upon the consent of the governed. And there had followed, as you remember, that whirlwind of passion that we know as the French Revolution, when all the foundations of French Government not only, but of French society, had been shaken and disturbed—a great rebellion of a great suffering population against an intolerable authority that had laid all the taxes on the poor and none of them on the rich, that had used the people as servants, that had made the boys and men of France play upon the battle field as if they were chessmen upon a board. France revolted and then the spirit spread, and the conference of Vienna was intended to check the revolutionary spirit of the time. Those men met in order to concert methods by which they could make monarchs and monarchies safe, not only in Europe but throughout the world.

"The British representatives at that conference were alarmed because they heard it whispered that European governments, European monarchies, particularly those of the center of Europe, those of Austria and Germany—for Austria was then stronger than Germany—were purposing to extend their power to the Western Hemisphere, to the Americas, and the prime minister of Great Britain suggested to Mr. Rush, the minister of the United States at the Court of Great Britain, that he put it in the ear of Mr. Monroe, who was then President, that this thing was afoot and it might be profitable to say something about it. Thereupon, Mr. Monroe uttered his famous Monroe doctrine, saying that any European power that sought either to colonize this Western Hemisphere or to interfere with its political institutions, or to extend monarchical institutions to it, would be regarded as having done an unfriendly act to the United States, and since then no power has dared interfere with the self-determination of the Americas. That is the famous Monroe doctrine. We love it, because it was the first effective dam built up against the tide of autocratic power. The men who constituted the Congress of Vienna, while they thought they were building of adamant, were building of cardboard. What they threw up looked like battlements but presently were blown down by the very breath of insurgent people, for all over Europe during the middle of the last century there spread, spread irresistibly, the spirit of revolution. Government after government was changed in its character; people said, 'It is not only in America that men want to govern themselves, it is not only in France that men mean to throw off this intolerable yoke. All men are of the same temper and of the same make and same rights.' So the tide of revolution could not be stopped by the conclusions of the Congress of Vienna; until it came about, my fellow citizens, that there was only one stronghold left for that sort of power, and that was at Berlin. In the year 1914 that power sought to make reconquest of Europe and the world. It was nothing less than the reassertion of that old, ugly thing which the hearts of men everywhere always revolt against, the claim of a few men to determine the fortunes of all men, the ambition of little groups of rulers to dominate the world, the plots and intrigues of military staffs and men who did not confide in their fellow citizens what it was that was their ultimate purpose. So the fire burned in Europe, until it spread and spread like a great forest conflagration, and every free nation was at last aroused; saw the danger, saw the fearful sparks blowing over, carried by the winds of passion and likely to lodge in their own dear countries and destroy their own fair homes; and at last the chief champion and spokesman of liberty, beloved America, got into the war, and said, 'We see the dark plot now. We promised at our birth to be the champions of humanity and we have never made a promise yet that we will

not redeem.' I know how the tides of war were going when our men began to get over there in force, and I think it is nothing less than true to say that America saved the world.

"Then a new congress of peace met to complete the work that the congress of Vienna tried to stop and resist. At the very front of this treaty of peace, my fellow citizens, is the covenant of the league of nations, and at the heart of that lies this principle, that no nation shall be a member of that league which is not a self-governing and free nation; that no autocratic power may have any part in the partnership; that no power like Germany—such as Germany was—shall ever take part in its counsels. Germany has changed her constitution, as you know—has made it a democratic constitution, at any rate in form—and she is excluded for the time being from the league of nations only in order that she may go through a period of probation to show that she means what she professes; to demonstrate that she actually does intend permanently to alter the character of her constitution and put into the hands of her people what was once concentrated as authority in Wilhelmstrasse in Berlin. If she can prove her change of heart and the permanency of her change of institutions, then she can come into respectable society; but if she can not, she is excluded forever. At last the cycle is completed, and the free peoples who were resisted at Vienna have come into their own. There was not a single statesman at Paris who did not know that he was the servant, and not the master, of his people. There was not one of them who did not know that the whole spirit of the times had changed and that they were there to see that people were liberated, not dominated; that people were put in charge of their own territories and their own affairs. The chief business of the congress was to carry out that great purpose, and at last, in the covenant of the league of nations, the Monroe doctrine became the doctrine of the world. Not only may no European power impair the territorial integrity or interfere with the political independence of any State in the Americas but no power anywhere may impair the territorial integrity or invade the political independence of another power. The principle that Mr. Canning suggested to Mr. Monroe has now been vindicated by its adoption by the representatives of mankind.

"When I hear gentlemen ask the question, 'Is the Monroe doctrine sufficiently safeguarded in the covenant of the league of nations?' I can only say that it is, if I understand the English language. It says in plain English that nothing in that covenant shall be interpreted as affecting the validity of the Monroe doctrine. Could anything be plainer than that? And when you add to that that the principle of the Monroe doctrine is applied to the whole world, then surely I am at liberty to say that the heart of the document is the Monroe doctrine itself. We have at last vindicated the policy of America, because all through that treaty, and you will presently see all through the Austrian treaty, all through the Bulgarian treaty, all through the Turkish treaty, all through the separate treaty we must make with Hungary, because she is separated from Austria, runs the same principle, not only that no government can impose its sovereignty on unwilling people, but that governments which have imposed their sovereignty upon unwilling people must withdraw it. All the regions that were unwillingly subject to Germany, subject to Austria-Hungary, and subject to Turkey are now released from that sovereignty, and the principle is everywhere adopted that territories belong to the people that live on them, and that they can set up any sort of government they please, and that nobody dare interfere with their self-determination and autonomy. I conceive this to be the greatest charter—nay, it is the first charter—ever adopted of human liberty. It sets the world free everywhere from autocracy, from imposed authority, from authority not chosen and accepted by the people who obey it.

"By the same token it removes the grounds of ambition. My fellow citizens, we never undertake anything that we do not see through. This treaty was not written, essentially speaking, at Paris. It was written at Chateau-Thierry and in Belleau Wood and in the Argonne. Our men did not fight over there for the purpose of coming back and letting the same thing happen again. They did not come back with any fear in their heart that their public men would go back on them and not see the thing through. They went over there expecting that the business would be finished, and it shall be finished. Nothing of that sort shall happen again, because America is going to see it through, and what she is going to see through is this, what is contained in article 10 of the covenant of the league. Article 10 is the heart of the enterprise. Article 10 is the test of the honor and courage and endurance of the world. Article 10 says that every member of the league, and that means every great fighting power in the world, Germany for the time being not being a great fighting power, solemnly engages to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the other members of the league. If you do that, you have absolutely stopped ambitious and aggressive war. There is one thing you have not stopped, and that I for my part do not desire to stop, and I think I am authorized to speak for a great many of my colleagues, if not all of my colleagues at Paris, that they do not wish to stop it. It does not stop the right of revolution. It does not stop the choice of self-determination. No nation promises to protect any government against the wishes and actions of its own people or of any portion of its own people. Why, how could America join in a promise like that? She threw off the yoke of a government. Shall we prevent any other people from throwing off the yoke that they are unwilling to bear? She never will, and no other government ever will, under this covenant. But as against external aggression, as against ambition, as against the desire to dominate from without, we all stand together in a common pledge, and that pledge is essential to the peace of the world.

"I said that our people were trained to go only one way, that our soldiers were trained to go only one way, and that America will never turn about upon the path of emancipation upon which she has set out. Not once, but several times, German orders were picked up, or discovered during the fighting, the purport of which was to certain commanders, 'Do not let the Americans capture such and such a post, because if they ever get there you can never get them out.' They had got other troops out, temporarily at any rate, but they could not get the Americans out. The Americans were under the impression that they had come there to stay, and I am under that impression about American political purposes. I am under the impression that we have come to the place where we have got in order to stay, and that some gentlemen are going to find that no matter how anxious they are to know that the door is open and that they can get out any time they want to they will be allowed to get out by themselves. We are going to stay in. We are going to see this thing finished, because, my fellow citizens, that is the only possibility of peace; and the world not only desires peace but it must have it. Are our affairs entirely in order? Isn't the rest of the world aflame? Have you any conception of the restlessness, of the insubordinate restlessness, of the great population of Europe and of great portions of Asia? Do you suppose that these people are going to resume any sort of normal life unless their rulers can give them adequate and ample guaranty of the future? And do you realize—I wonder if America does realize—that the rest of the world deems America indispensable to the guaranty? For a reason of which we ought to be very proud. They see that America has no designs on any other country in the world. They keep in mind—they keep in mind more than you realize—what happened at the end of the Spanish-American War. There were many cynical smiles on the other side of the water when we said that we were going to liberate Cuba and then let her have charge of her own affairs. They said, 'Ah, that is a very common subterfuge. Just watch. America is not going to let that rich island, with its great sugar plantations and its undeveloped agricultural wealth, get out of its grip again.' And all Europe stood at amaze when, without delay or hesitation, we redeemed our promise and gave Cuba the liberty we had won for her. They know that we have not imperialistic purposes. They know that we do not desire to profit at the expense of other peoples. And they know our power, they know our wealth, they know our indomitable spirit; and when we put our names to the bond then Europe will begin to be quiet, then men will begin to seek the peaceful solutions of days of normal industry and normal life, then men will take hope again, then men will cease to think of the revolutionary things they can do and begin to think of the constructive things they can do, will realize that disorder profits nobody and that order can at last be had upon terms of liberty and peace and justice. Then the reaction will come on our own people, because, do you think, my fellow citizens, does any body of Americans think, that none of this restlessness, this unhappy feeling, has reached America? Do you find everybody about you content with our present industrial order? Do you hear no intimations of radical change? Do you learn of no organizations the object of which is nothing less than to overturn the Government itself? We are a self-possessed Nation. We know the value of order. We mean to maintain it. We will not permit any minority of any sort to dominate it. But it is rather important for America, as well as for the rest of the world, that this infection should not be everywhere in the air, and that men everywhere should begin to look life and its facts in the face and come to calm counsels and purposes that will bring order and happiness and

prosperity again. If you could see the stopped, the arrested factories over there, the untilled fields, the restless crowds in the cities with nothing to do, some of them, you would realize that they are waiting for something. They are waiting for peace, and not only for peace but for the assurance that peace will last, and they can not get that assurance if America withholds her might and her power and all the freshness of her strength from the assurance. There is a deep sense in which what your chairman said just now is profoundly true. We are the hope of humanity, and I for one have not the slightest doubt that we shall fulfill that hope.

"Yet, in order to reassure you about some of the things about which you have been diligently misinformed, I want to speak of one or two details. I have set the stage now, and I have not half described the treaty. It not only fulfills the hopes of mankind by giving territories to the people that belong to them and assuring them that nobody shall take it from them, but it goes into many details. It rearranges, for example, the great waterways of Europe, so that no one nation can control them, so that the currents of European life through the currents of its commerce may run free and unhampered and undominated. It embodies a great charter for labor by setting up a permanent international organization in connection with the league of nations which shall periodically bring the best counsels of the world to bear upon the problem of raising the levels and conditions of labor for men, women, and children. It goes further than that. We did not give Germany back her colonies, but we did not give them to anybody else. We put them in trust in the league of nations, said that we would assign their government to certain powers by assigning the powers as trustees, responsible to the league, making annual report to the league and holding the power under mandates which prescribe the methods by which they should administer those territories for the benefit of the people living in them, whether they were developed or undeveloped people. We have put the same safeguards, and as adequate safeguards, around the poor, naked fellows in the jungles of Africa that we have around those peoples almost ready to assume the rights of self-government in some parts of the Turkish Empire, as, for example, in Armenia. It is a great charter of liberty and of safety, but let me come to one or two details.

"It sticks in the craw of a great many persons that in the constitution of the league of nations, as it is said, Great Britain has been given six votes and the United States only one. That would be very interesting if true, but it does not happen to be true; that is to say, it is not true in this sense, that the one American vote counts as much as the British six. In the first place, they have not got six votes in the council of the league, which is the only body that originates action, but in the assembly of the league, which is the debating and not the voting body. Every time the assembly participates in any active resolution of the league that resolution must be concurred in by all the nations represented on the council, which makes the affirmative vote of the United States in every instance necessary. The six votes of the British Empire can not do anything to which the United States does not consent. Now—I am mistaken—there is one thing they can do. By a two-thirds vote they can admit new members to the league, but I do not think that is a formidable privilege since almost everybody is going to be in the league to begin with, and since the only large power that is not in the league enjoys, if I may use that word, a universal prejudice against it, which makes its early admission, at least, unlikely. But aside from admission of any members, which requires a two-thirds vote—in which the six British votes will not count a very large figure—every affirmative vote that leads to action requires the assent of the United States, and, as I have frequently said, I think it is very much more important to be one and count six than to be six and count six. So much for this bugaboo, for it is nothing else but a bugaboo. Bugaboos have been very much in fashion in the debates of those who have been opposing this league. The whole energy of that body is in the council of the league, for whose every action in the way of formulating policy or directing energetic measures a unanimous vote is necessary. That may sometimes, I am afraid, impede the action of the league; but, at any rate, it makes the sovereignty and the sovereign choice of every nation that is a member of that league absolutely safe. And pray do not deceive yourselves. The United States is not the only Government that is jealous of its sovereignty. Every other Government, big or little or middle sized, that had to be dealt with in Paris, was just as jealous of its sovereignty as the United States. The only difference between some of them and us is that we could take care of our sovereignty and they could not take care of theirs, but it has been a matter of principle with the United States to maintain that in respect of rights there was and should be no difference between a weak State and a strong State. Our contention has always been, in international affairs, that we should deal with them upon the principle of the absolute equality of independent sovereignty, and that is the basis of the organization of the league. Human society has not moved fast enough yet or far enough yet, my fellow citizens, for any part of that principle of sovereignty to be relinquished, by any one of the chief participants at any rate.

"Then there is another matter, that lies outside the league of nations, that I find my fellow citizens, in this part of the continent particularly, are deeply interested in. That is the matter of the cession of certain German rights in Shantung Province in China to Japan. I think that it is worth while to make that matter pretty clear, and I will have to ask you to be patient while I make a brief historical review in order to make it clear. In the first place, remember that it does not take anything from China, it takes it from Germany, and I do not find that there is any very great jealousy about taking things from Germany. In 1898 China granted to Germany for a period of 99 years certain very important rights around Kiaochow Bay, in the rich and ancient Province of Shantung, together with the right to penetrate the interior with a railway and exploit such ores as might be found in that Province for 30 miles on either side of the railway. We are thinking so much about that concession to Germany that we have forgotten that practically all of the great European powers had exacted similar concessions of China previously; they already had their foothold of control in China; they already had their control of railways; they already had their exclusive concessions over mines. Germany was doing an outrageous thing, I take the liberty of saying, as the others had done outrageous things, but it was not the first; at least, it had been done before. China lay rich and undeveloped and the rest of the world was covetous and it had made bargains with China, generally to China's disadvantage, which enabled the world to go in and exploit her riches. I am not now going to discuss the merits of that question, because it has no merits. The whole thing was bad, but it was not unprecedented. Germany obliged China to give her what China had given others previously. Immediately thereafter China was obliged, because she had done this thing, to make fresh concessions to Great Britain of a similar sort, to make fresh concessions to France, to make concessions of a similar kind to Russia. It was then that she gave Russia Port Arthur and Talien-Wan.

"Now, remember what followed. The Government of the United States did not make any kind of protest against any of those cessions. We had at that time one of the most public-spirited and humane men in the Executive Chair at Washington that have ever graced that chair—I mean William McKinley—and his Secretary of State was a man whom we have all always delighted to praise, Mr. John Hay. But they made no protest against the cession to Germany, or to Russia, or to Great Britain, or to France. The only thing they insisted on was that none of those powers should close the door of commerce to the goods of the United States in those territories which they were taking from China. They took no interest, I mean so far as what they did was concerned, in the liberties and rights of China. They were interested only in the rights of the merchants of the United States. I want to hasten to add that I do not say this even to imply criticism on those gentlemen, because as international law stood then it would have been an unfriendly act for them to protest in any one of these cases. Until this treaty was written in Paris it was not even proposed that it should be the privilege of anybody to protest in any such case if his own rights were not directly affected. Then, some time after that, followed the war between Russia and Japan. You remember where that war was brought to a close—by delegates of the two powers sitting at Portsmouth, N. H., at the invitation of Mr. Roosevelt, who was then President. In that treaty, Port Arthur—China's Port Arthur, ceded to Russia—was ceded to Japan, and the Government of the United States, though the discussions were occurring on its own territory, made no suggestion even to the contrary. Now, the treaty in Paris does the same thing with regard to the German rights in China. It cedes them to the victorious power, I mean to the power that took them by force of arms, the power which was in the Pacific victorious in this war, namely, to Japan, and there is no precedent which would warrant our making a protest. Not only that, but, in the meantime, since this war began, Great Britain and France entered into solemn covenants of treaty with Japan that if she would come into the war and continue her operations against Germany in the Pacific they would lend their whole influence and power to the cession to Japan of everything that Germany had in the Pacific, whether on the mainland or in the islands, north of the Equator, so that

if we were to reject this provision in the treaty Great Britain and France would not in honor be at liberty to reject it, and we would have to devise means to do what, let me say with all solemnity only war could do, force them to break their promise to Japan.

"Well, you say, 'Then, is it just all an ugly, hopeless business?' It is not, if we adopt the league of nations. The Government of the United States was not bound by these treaties. The Government of the United States was at liberty to get anything out of the bad business that it could get by persuasion and argument, and it was upon the instance of the Government of the United States that Japan promised to return to China what none of these other powers has yet promised to return—all rights of sovereignty that China had granted Germany over any portion of the Province of Shantung—the greatest concession in that matter that has ever been made by any power that has interested itself in the exploits of China—and to retain only what corporations out of many countries have long enjoyed in China, the right to run the railroad and extend its line to certain points and to continue to work the mines that have already been opened. Not only that, but I said a minute ago that Mr. Hay and Mr. McKinley were not at liberty to protest. Turn to the league of nations and see what will be the situation then. Japan is a member of the league of nations, all these other powers that have exploited China are members, and they solemnly promise to respect and preserve the territorial integrity and existing political independence of China. Not only that, but in the next article the international law of the world is revolutionized. It is there provided that it is the friendly right of any member of the league at any time 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. If we had had the covenant at that time, Mr. McKinley could, and I venture to say would, have said to Germany, 'This is directly none of our business, for we are seeking no competitive enterprise of that sort in China, but this is an invasion of the territorial integrity of China. We have promised, and you have promised, to preserve and respect that integrity, and if you do not keep that promise it will destroy the good understanding which exists between the peaceful nations of the world. It will be an invasion, a violation of the essential principle of peace and of justice.' Do you suppose for one moment that if the matter had been put in that aspect, with the attention of the world called to it by the great power of the United States, Germany would have persisted in that enterprise?

"How had she begun it? She had made the excuse of the death of two German missionaries at the hands of irresponsible mobs in certain Provinces of China an excuse for taking this valuable part of China's territory. Ah, my fellow citizens, it makes anybody who regards himself as a Christian blush to think what Christian nations have done in the name of protecting Christianity! But it can not be done any more under the league of nations. It can not be done without being cited to the bar of mankind, and if Germany had been cited to the bar of mankind before she began her recent tragical enterprise she never would have undertaken it. You can not expose such matters to the cool discussion of the world without disclosing all their ugliness, their illegitimacy, their brutality. This treaty sets up, puts in operation, so to say, puts into commission the moral force of the world. Our choice with regard to Shantung, therefore, is to keep out of the treaty, for we can not change it in that respect, or go in and be an effective friend of China. I for one am ready to do anything or to cooperate in anything in my power to be a friend, and a helpful friend, to that great, thoughtful, ancient, interesting, helpless people—in capacity, in imagination, in industry, in numbers one of the greatest peoples in the world and entitled to the wealth that lies underneath their feet and all about them in that land which they have not as yet known how to bring to its development.

"There are other things that have troubled the opponents of the league. One thing is they want to be sure they can get out. That does not interest me very much. If I go into a thing, my first thought is not how I can get out. My first thought is not how I can scuttle, but how I can help, how I can be effective in the game, how I can make the influence of America tell for the guidance and salvation of the world—not how I can keep out of trouble. I want to get into any kind of trouble that will help liberate mankind. I do not want always to be thinking about my skin or my pocketbook or my friendships. Is it just as comfortable to die quietly in your bed, never having done anything worth anything, as to die as some of those fellows that we shall always love when we remember them died upon the field of freedom? Is there any choice? Do you think anybody outside the family is going to be interested in any souvenir of you after you are dead? They are going to be interested in souvenirs of the boys in khaki, whether they are of their family or not. They are going to touch with reverence any sword or musket or rapid-fire gun or cannon that was fired for liberty upon the fields of France. I am not thinking of sitting by the door and keeping my hand on the knob, but if you want to do that you can get out any time you want to. There is absolutely nothing in the covenant to prevent you. I was present at its formulation, and I know what I am talking about, besides being able to understand the English language. It not only meant this, but said it, that any nation can, upon two years' notice, withdraw at any time, provided that at the time it withdraws it has fulfilled its international obligations and its obligations under the covenant, but it does not make anybody judge as to whether it has fulfilled those obligations, except the nation that withdraws.

"The only thing that can ever keep you in the league is being ashamed to get out. You can get out whenever you want to after two years' notice, and the only risk you run is having the rest of the world think you ought not to have got out. I, for my part, am not very sensitive about that, because I have a memory. I have read the history of the United States. We are in the habit of keeping our international obligations, and I do not believe that there will ever come a time when any just question can be raised as to whether we have fulfilled them or not. Therefore, I am not afraid to go before the jury of mankind at any time on the record of the United States with regard to the fulfillment of its international obligations; and when these gentlemen who are criticizing it once feel, if they ever should feel, the impulse of courage instead of the impulse of cowardice, they will realize how much better it feels. Your blood is at least warm and comfortable, and the red corpuscles are in command, when you have got some spunk in you; but when you have not, when you are afraid somebody is going to put over something on you, you are furtive and go about looking out for things, and your blood is cold and you shiver when you turn a dark corner. That is not a picture of the United States. When I think of these great frontier communities, I fancy I can hear the confident tread, tread, tread of the great hosts that crossed this continent. They were not afraid of what they were going to find in the next canyon. They were not looking over their shoulders to see if the trail was clear behind them. They were making a trail in front of them and they had not the least notion of going back.

"What I have come to suggest to you, my fellow citizens, is that you do what I am sure all the rest of our fellow countrymen are doing—clear the deck of these criticisms, that really have nothing in them, and look at the thing in its large aspect, in its majesty. Particularly, look at it as a fulfillment of the destiny of the United States, for it is nothing less. At last, after this long century and more of blood and terror, the world has come to the vision that that little body of 3,000,000 people, strung along the Atlantic coast of this continent, had in that far year 1776. Men in Europe laughed at them, at this little handful of dreamers, this little body of men who talked dogmatically about liberty, and since then that fire which they started on that little coast has consumed every autocratic government in the world, every civilized autocratic government, and now at last the flame has leaped to Berlin, and there is the funeral pyre of the German Empire."

—

THE PRESIDENT AT TABERNACLE, SALT LAKE CITY, UTAH, SEPTEMBER 23, 1919.

"Gov. Bamberger, President Grant, my fellow countrymen, it is indeed inspiring to stand before this great audience, and yet I feel that I have come to present a theme which deserves the greatest of all audiences. I must admit to a very considerable degree of unaffected diffidence in presenting this theme, because the theme is so much bigger than any man's capacity to present it adequately. It is a theme which must engage the enthusiastic support of every lover of humanity and every man who professes Christian conviction, because we are now as a nation to make what I can not help characterizing as the most critical decision we have ever made in the history of America. We sent our boys across the sea to defeat the purposes of Germany, but we engaged that after we had defeated the purposes of Germany we would complete what they had begun and effect such arrangements of international concert as would make it impossible for any such attempt ever to be made again. The question therefore is, Shall we see it through or shall we now at this most critical juncture of the whole transaction turn away from our associates in the war and decline to complete and fulfill our sacred promise to mankind?

"I have now crossed the continent, my fellow countrymen, and am on my way East again, and I feel qualified to render testimony as to the attitude of this great Nation toward the covenant of the league. I say without the slightest hesitation that an overwhelmnig majority of our fellow countrymen purpose that this covenant shall be adopted. One by one the objections to it have melted away. One by one it has become evident that the objections urged against it were without sufficient foundation. One by one it has become impossible to support them as objections, and at last we come to the point of critical choice as to the very heart of the whole matter.

"You know it troubled some of our public men because they were afraid it was not perfectly clear that we could withdraw from this arrangement whenever we wanted to. There is no justification for doubt in any part of the language of the covenant on that point. The United States is at liberty to withdraw at any time upon two years' notice, the only restriction being that when it withdraws it shall have fulfilled its international obligations and its obligations under the covenant of the league, but it is left to its own conscience and to no other tribunal whatever to determine whether those obligations have been fulfilled or not. I, for one, am not afraid of the judgment of mankind with regard to matters of this sort. The United States never has failed to fulfill its international obligations. It never will fail, and I am ready to go to the great jury of humanity upon that matter at any time that within our judgment we should withdraw from this arrangement. But I am not one of those who, when they go into a great enterprise, think first of how they are going to get out of it. I think first of how I am going to stay in it and how, with the power and influence I can command, I am going to promote the objects of the great concert and association which is being formed. And that is the temper of America.

"I was quoting the other night the jest of an American wit who, commenting upon the extraordinary rapidity with which we had trained an army, said that it was easier to train an army in America than anywhere else; it took less time, because you had to train them to go only one way. They showed the effects of the training. They went only one way, and the issues that we are now debating were really decided at Chateau-Thierry and Belleau Wood and in the Argonne. We are now put to the test by these men who fought, as they were put to the test by those of us who ordered them to the field of battle. And the people of the United States have the same training as their army; they do not look back, they go only one way.

"The doubt as to whether some superior authority to our own Congress could intervene in matters of domestic policy is also removed. The language of the covenant expressly excludes the authorities of the league from taking any action or expressing any judgment with regard to domestic policies like immigration, like naturalization, like the tariff, like all of those things which have lain at the center so often of our political action and of our choice of policy.

"Nobody doubts any longer that the covenant gives explicit, unqualified recognition to the Monroe doctrine. Indeed, it does more than that. It adopts the principle of the Monroe doctrine as the principle of the world. The principle of the Monroe doctrine is that no nation has the right to interfere with the affairs or to impose its own will in any way upon another nation in the Western Hemisphere, and President Monroe said to the Governments of Europe, 'Any attempt of that sort on the part of any Government of Europe will be regarded as an act unfriendly to the United States.' The covenant of the league indorses that. The covenant of the league says that nothing in that document shall be construed as affecting the validity of the Monroe doctrine, which means that if any power seeks to impose its will upon any American State in North America, Central America, or South America, the world now acknowledges the right of the Government of the United States to take the initiative and check that action.

"The forces of objection being driven out of one position after another are now centering upon the heart of the league itself. I have come here to-night, my fellow countrymen, to discuss that critical matter that you constantly see in the newspapers, which we call 'reservations.' I want you to have a very clear idea of what is meant by reservations. Reservations are to all intents and purposes equivalent to amendments. I can say, I believe with confidence, that it is the judgment of the people of the United States that neither the treaty nor the covenant should be amended. Very well, then; look at the character of the reservations. What does a reservation mean? It means a stipulation that this particular Government insists upon interpreting its duty under that covenant in a special way, insists upon interpreting it in a way in which other Governments, it may be, do not interpret it. This thing, when we ratify it, is a contract. You can not alter so much as the words of a contract without the consent of the other parties. Any reservation will have to be carried to all the other signatories, Germany included, and we shall have to get the consent of Germany, among the rest, to read this covenant in some special way in which we prefer to read it in the interest of the safety of America. That, to my mind, is one of the most unacceptable things that could happen. To my mind, to reopen the question of the meaning of this clearly written treaty is to reopen negotiations with Germany, and I do not believe that any part of the world is in the temper to do that. In order to put this matter in such a shape as will lend itself to concrete illustration, let me read you what I understand is a proposed form of reservation:

"The United States assumes no obligation under the provisions of article 10 to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country or to interfere in controversies between other nations, whether members of the league or not, or to employ the military and naval forces of the United States under any article of the treaty for any purpose, unless in any particular case the Congress, which under the Constitution has the sole power to declare war or authorize the employment of the military and naval forces of the United States, shall by act or joint resolution so declare.

"That is a rejection of the covenant. That is an absolute refusal to carry any part of the same responsibility that the other members of the league carry. Does the United States want to be in on that special footing? Does the United States want to say to the nations with whom it stood in this great struggle, 'We have seen you through on the battle field, but now we are done. We are not going to stand by you'? Article 10 is an engagement on the part of all the great fighting nations of the world, because all the great fighting nations are going to be members of the league, that they will respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and the existing political independence of the other members of the league. That is cutting at the heart of all wars. Every war of any consequence that you can cite originated in an attempt to seize the territory or interfere with the political independence of some other nation. We went into this war with the sacred promise that we regarded all nations as having the same rights, whether they were weak or strong, and unless we engage to sustain the weak we have guaranteed that the strong will prevail, we have guaranteed that imperialistic enterprise may revive, we have guaranteed that there is no barrier to the ambition of nations that have the power to dominate, we have abdicated the whole position of right and substituted the principle of might. This is the heart of the covenant, and what are these gentlemen afraid of? Nothing can be done under that article of the treaty without the consent of the United States. I challenge them to draw any other deduction from the provisions of the covenant itself. In every case where the league takes action the unanimous vote of the council of the league is necessary; the United States is a permanent member of the council of the league, and its affirmative vote is in every case necessary for every affirmative, or for that matter every negative, action.

"Let us go into particulars. These gentlemen say, 'We do not want the United States drawn into every little European squabble.' Of course, we do not, and under the league of nations it is entirely within our choice whether we will be or not. The normal processes of the action of the league are certainly to be this: When trouble arises in the Balkans, when somebody sets up a fire somewhere in central Europe among those little nations, which are for the time being looking upon one another with a good deal of jealousy and suspicion, because the passions of the world have not cooled—whenever that happens, the council of the league will confer as to the best methods of putting out the fire. If you want to put out a fire in Utah, you do not send to Oklahoma for the fire engine. If you want to put out a fire in the Balkans, if you want to stamp out the smouldering flame in some part of central Europe, you do not send to the United States for troops. The council of the league selects the powers which are most ready, most available, most suitable, and selects them only at their own consent, so that the United States would in no such circumstances conceivably be drawn in unless the flame spread to the world. And would they then be left out, even if they were not members of the league? You have seen the fire spread to the world once, and did not you go in? If you saw it spread again, if you saw human liberty again imperiled, would you wait to be a member of the league to go in?

My fellow citizens, the whole thing goes directly to the conscience of the Nation. If the fight is big enough to draw the United States in, I predict that they will be drawn in anyhow, and if it is not big enough to bring them in inevitably, they can go in or stay out according to their own decision. Why are these gentlemen afraid? There is no force to oblige the United States to do anything except moral force. Is any man, any proud American, afraid that the United States will resist the duress

of duty? I am intensely conscious of the great conscience of this Nation. I see the inevitableness, as well as the dignity and the greatness, of such declarations as President Grant has made aligning all the great organized moral forces of the world on the same side. It is inconceivable they should be on different sides.

"There is no necessity for the last part of this reservation. Every public man, every statesman, in the world knows, and I say that advisedly, that in order that the United States should go to war it is necessary for the Congress to act. They do not have to be told that, but that is not what this resolution says. This resolution says the United States assumes no obligation under the provisions of article 10 to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country—washes its hands of the whole business; says 'We do not want even to create the presumption that we will do the right thing. We do not want to be committed even to a great principle, but we want to say that every time a case arises the Congress will independently take it up as if there were no covenant and determine whether there is any moral obligation; and after determining that, determining whether it will act upon that moral obligation or not, it will act.' In other words, that is an absolute withdrawal from the obligations of article 10. That is why I say that it would be a rejection of the covenant and thereby a rejection of the treaty, for the treaty can not be executed without the covenant.

"I appeal, and I appeal with confidence, my fellow countrymen, to the men whose judgment I am told has approved of reservations of this sort. I appeal to them to look into the matter again. I know some of the gentlemen who are quoted as approving a reservation of that sort; I know them to be high-minded and patriotic Americans, and I know them to be men whose character and judgment I entirely respect, and whose motives I respect as much as I respect the motives of any man, but they have not looked into the matter. Are they willing to ask the rest of the world to go into this covenant and to let the United States assume none of its obligations? Let us have all the advantages of it and none of the responsibilities? Are they willing that proud America should ask for special exemptions, should show a special timidity, should ask to go into an arrangement depending upon a judgment when its own judgment is a different judgment? I confidently believe, my fellow citizens, that they will do no such thing. This is not an interpretation of the covenant. I have been trying to interpret it to you. This is a rejection of the covenant, and if this is adopted, the whole treaty falls to the ground, for, my fellow citizens, we must realize that a great and final choice is between this people. Either we are going to guarantee civilization or we are going to abandon it. I use the word with perhaps the admission that it may carry a slight exaggeration, but nevertheless advisedly, when I say abandon civilization, for what is the present condition of civilization? Everywhere, even in the United States, there is an attitude of antagonism toward the ordered processes of government. We feel the evil influence on this side of the Atlantic, and on the other side of the Atlantic every public man knows that it is knocking at the door of his government.

"While this unrest is assuming this menacing form of rebellion against authority, of determination to cut roads of force through the regular processes of government, the world is waiting on America, for—I say it with entire respect for the representatives of other governments, but I say it with knowledge—the Government of the United States is the only government in the world that the rest of the world trusts. It knows that the Government of the United States speaks for the people of the United States, that it is not anybody's master, but the servant of a great people. It knows that that people can always oblige its governors to be its servants. It knows that nobody has ever dared defy the public judgment of the people of the United States, and it knows that that public judgment is on the side of right and justice and of peace. It has seen the United States do what no other nation ever did. When we fought the war with Spain there was many a cynical smile on the other side of the water when we said that we were going to win freedom for Cuba and then present it to her. They said, 'Ah, yes; under the control of the United States. They will never let go of that rich island which they can exploit so much to their own advantage.' When we kept that promise and proved our absolute disinterestedness, and, notwithstanding the fact that we had beaten Spain until she had to accept anything that we dictated, paid her $20,000,000 for something that we could have taken, namely, the Philippine Islands, all the world stood at amaze and said, 'Is it true, after all, that this people believes and means what it says? Is it true, after all, that this is a great altruistic force in the world?'

"And now look what has happened, my fellow citizens. Poland, Bohemia, the released parts of Roumania, Jugo-Slavia—there are kinsmen, I dare say, of these people in this audience—these could, none of them, have won their own independence any more than Cuba could have won hers, and they were under an authority just as reckless in the exercise of its force, just as regardless of the people and of humanity, as the Spanish Government ever was in Cuba and the Philippines; and by the force of the world these people have been liberated. Now the world is waiting to hear whether the United States will join in doing for them what it sanely did for Cuba, guaranteeing their freedom and saying to them, 'What we have given to you no man shall take away.' It is our final heroic test of character, and I for one have not the slightest doubt as to what the result of the test is going to be, because I know that at heart this people loves freedom and right and justice more than it loves money and material prosperity or any of the things that anybody can get but nobody can keep unless they have elevation of spirit enough to see the horizons of the destiny of man.

"Instead of wishing to ask to stand aside, get the benefits of the league, but share none of its burdens or responsibilities, I for my part want to go in and accept what is offered to us, the leadership of the world. A leadership of what sort, my fellow citizens? Not a leadership that leads men along the lines by which great nations can profit out of weak nations, not an exploiting power, but a liberating power, a power to show the world that when America was born it was indeed a finger pointed towards those lands into which men could deploy some of these days and live in happy freedom, look each other in the eyes as equals, see that no man was put upon, that no people were forced to accept authority which was not of their own choice, and that out of the general generous impulse of the human genius and the human spirit we were lifted along the levels of civilization to days when there should be wars no more, but men should govern themselves in peace and amity and quiet. That is the leadership we said we wanted, and now the world offers it to us. It is inconceivable that we should reject it. It is inconceivable that men should put any conditions upon accepting it, particularly—for I speak this with a certain hurt pride, my fellow citizens, as an American—particularly when we are so safeguarded that the world under the covenant can not do a thing that we do not consent to being done. Other nations, other governments, were just as jealous of their sovereignty as we have been, and this guarantees the sovereignty of all the equal members of this great union of nations. There is only one nation for the time being excluded. That is Germany, and Germany is excluded only in order that she may go through a period of probation, only in order that she may prove to the world that she has made a real and permanent change in her constitution, and that hereafter, not Wilhelmstrasse but the votes of the German people will determine the policy of the German Government.

"If I may say so without even by implication involving great public men whom I entirely respect, I want to say that the only popular forces back of serious reservations, the only popular forces back of the impulse to reject any part of this treaty, proceed from exactly the same sources that the pro-German propaganda proceeded from. I ask the honorable and enlightened men who I believe thoughtlessly favor reservations such as I have read to reflect upon that and examine into the truth of it, and to reflect upon this proposition: We, by holding off from this league, serve the purposes of Germany, for what Germany has sought throughout the war was, first, to prevent our going in, and then to separate us in interest and purpose from the other Governments with which we were associated. Now, shall we by the vote of the United States Senate do for Germany what she could not do with her arms? We shall be doing it, whether we intend it or not. I exculpate the men I am thinking of entirely from the purpose of doing it; it would be unworthy of me to suggest such a purpose; but I do suggest, I do state with confidence, that that is the only end that would be gained, because Germany is isolated from the other nations, and she desires nothing so much as that we should be isolated, because she knows that then the same kind of suspicion, the same kind of hostility, the same kind of unfriendliness—that subtle poison that brings every trouble that comes between nations—will center on the United States as well as upon Germany. Her isolation will be broken; she will have a comrade, whether that nation wants to be her comrade or not, and what the lads did on the fields of France will be undone. We will allow Germany to do in 1919 what she failed to do in 1918!

"It would be unworthy of me, my fellow citizens, in the responsible position into which you have put me, if I were to overstate any of these things. I have searched my conscience with regard to them. I believe I am telling you the sober truth, and I am telling you what I get, not by intuition, but through those many voices that inevitably reach the Government and do not always reach you from over sea. We know

what the leading men of Germany are thinking and saying, and they are praying that the United States may stand off from the league. I call upon you, therefore, my fellow citizens, to look at this thing in a new aspect, to look upon it not with calculations of interest, not with fear of responsibility, but with a consciousness of the great moral issue which the United States must now decide and which, having decided, it can not reverse. If we keep out of this league now, we can never enter it except alongside of Germany. We can either go in now or come in later with our recent enemies, and to adopt a reservation such as I have read, which explicitly renounces responsibility under the central engagement of the covenant, is to do nothing less than that.

"I hope that in order to strengthen this impression on your minds you will take pains to read the treaty of peace. You need not read all of it; a lot of it is technical and you can skip that; but I want you to get a picture of what is in this great document. It is most too narrow a view of it to think of it as a treaty of peace with Germany. It is that, but it is very much more than a treaty of peace with Germany; it is a treaty in which an attempt is made to set up the rights of peoples everywhere, for exactly the lines of this treaty are going to be projected—have been projected—into the treaty with Austria, into the treaty with Bulgaria, into the treaty with Hungary, into the treaty with Turkey. Everywhere the same principle is adopted, that the men who wrote the treaties at Versailles were not at liberty to give anybody's property to anybody else. It is the first great international agreement in the history of civilization that was not based on the opposite principle. Every other great international arrangement has been a division of spoils, and this is an absolute renunciation of spoils, even with regard to the helpless parts of the world, even with regard to those poor benighted people in Africa, over whom Germany had exercised a selfish authority which exploited them and did not help them. Even they are not handed over to anybody else. The principle of annexation, the principle of extending sovereignty to territories that are not occupied by your own people, is rejected in this treaty. All of those regions are put under the trust of the league of nations, to be administered for the benefit of their inhabitants—the greatest humane arrangement that has ever been attempted—and the rules are laid down in the covenant itself which forbid any form of selfish exploitation of these helpless people by the agents of the league who will exercise authority over them during the period of their development.

"Then see how free course is given to our sympathies. I believe that there is no region of the world toward which the sympathies of the United States have gone out so abundantly as to the poor people of Armenia, those people infinitely terrified and infinitely persecuted. We have poured out money, we have sent agents of all sorts to relieve their distress, and at every turn we have known that every dollar we spent upon them might be rendered useless by the cruel power which had authority over them, that under pretense of not being able to control its own forces in those parts of the empire, the Turkish Government might say that it was unable to restrain the horrible massacres which have made that country a graveyard. Armenia is one of the regions that are to be under trust of the league of nations. Armenia is to be redeemed. The Turk is to be forbidden to exercise his authority there, and Christian people are not only to be allowed to aid Armenia but they are to be allowed to protect Armenia. At last this great people, struggling through night after night of terror, knowing not what day would see their land stained with blood, are now given a promise of safety, a promise of justice, a possibility that they may come out into a time when they can enjoy their own rights as free people, as they never dreamed they would be able to exercise them before. All of the great humane impulses of the human heart are expressed in this treaty, and we would be recreant to every humane obligation if we did not lend our whole force and, if necessary, make our utmost sacrifice to maintain its provisions. We are approaching the time in the discussions of the Senate when it will be determined what we are going to say about it, and I am here making this public appeal to you and, through you, to gentlemen who have favored such utterances as I have read to you to-night, to take a second thought upon the matter, to realize that what they are after is already accomplished. The United States can not be drawn into anything it does not wish to be drawn into, but the United States ought not to be itself in the position of saying, 'You need not expect of us that we assume the same moral obligations that you assume. You need not expect of us that we will respect and preserve the territorial integrity and political independence of other nations.'

"Let me remove another misapprehension about that clause, my fellow citizens. Almost every time it is quoted the words 'external aggression' are left out of it. There was not a member of that conference with whom I conferred who wanted to put the least restraint upon the right of self-determination by any portion of the human family, who wished to put the slightest obstacle in the way of throwing off the yoke of any Government if that yoke should become intolerable. This does not guarantee any country, any Government, against an attempt on the part of its own subjects to throw off its authority. The United States could not keep its countenance and make a promise like that, because it began by doing that very thing. The glory of the United States is that when we were a little body of 3,000,000 people strung along the Atlantic coast we threw off the power of a great empire because it was not a power chosen by or consented to by ourselves. We hold that principle. We never will guarantee any Government against the exercise of that right, and no suggestion was made in the conference that we should. We merely ourselves promised to respect the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the other members of the league and to assist in preserving them against external aggression.

"And if we do not do that the taproot of war is still sunk deep into the fertile soil of human passion. I am for cutting the taproot of war. I am for making an insurance against war, and I am prudent enough to take 10 per cent insurance if I can not get any more. I would be very pleased to get 25 per cent. I would be delighted to get 50 per cent, and here, in conscience, I believe we are getting 99 per cent. No man, no body of men, can give you absolute 100 per cent insurance against war any more than they can give you 100 per cent insurance against losing your temper. You can not insure men against human passion, but notice what this covenant does. It provides nine months as a minimum for the cooling off of human passion. It is pretty hard to be crazy mad for nine months. If you stay crazy mad, or crazy anything else, for nine months, it will be wise to segregate you from your fellow citizens. The heart of this covenant, to which very few opponents ever draw attention, is this, that every great fighting nation in the world engages never to go to war without first having done one or the other of two things, without having either submitted the point in controversy to arbitration, in which case it promises absolutely to abide by the verdict or submit it to the council of the league of nations, not for decision but for discussion; it agrees to lay all the documents and all the pertinent facts before the council and agrees that the council shall publish the documents and the facts to mankind, that it will give six months to the council for the consideration of the matter and that, even if it does not accept the result, it will not go to war for three months after the opinion is rendered. You have nine months in which to accomplish all the gentle work of mediation, all the same work of discussion, all the quieting work of a full comprehension of what the result of bringing the matter to the issue of war would be upon the nations immediately concerned and upon the nations of the world. And in article 11, which follows article 10, it is made the right of any member of the league to call attention to anything, anywhere, which is likely to affect the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends. So that, after the storm begins to gather, you can call the attention of the world to it, and the cleansing, purifying, cooling processes of public opinion will at once begin to operate.

"When a very important part of Shantung Province was ceded by China to Germany in March, 1898, the Government of the United States uttered not a single protest. One of the most enlightened and humane men that have ever sat in the executive chair was President of the United States, William McKinley. One of the ablest Secretaries of State in the long list of distinguished men who have occupied that office was associated with him as Secretary of State, the Hon. John Hay. They made not a single intimation of protest. Why? Because under international law as it was, and as it is until this covenant is adopted, it would have been a hostile act for them to do any such thing unless they could show that the material or political interest of the United States was directly affected. The only ground which they insisted upon was that Germany should not close Shantung Province to the trade of the United States. They could not lift a little finger to help China. They could only try to help the trade of the United States. Immediately after that cession China made similar cessions to England, to Russia, to France, and again no protest, only an insistence that the door should be kept open to our goods—not to our moral ideas, not to our sympathy with China, not to our sense of right violated, but to our merchandise. You do not hear anything about the

cessions in that year to Great Britain or to France, because, unhappily, they were not unprecedented, as the cession to Germany was not unprecedented. Poor China had done the like, not once but many times before. What happened afterwards? In the treaty between Japan and Russia, after the Japanese-Russian war, a treaty signed on our own territory—in Portsmouth, N. H.—Port Arthur, the Chinese territory ceded to Russia, was transferred to Japan. Here were our own people sitting about, here was our own Government that had invited these gentlemen to sit at Portsmouth—did they object to Port Arthur being, not handed back to China, but handed to Japan?

"I am not going to stop, my fellow citizens, to discuss the Shantung provision in all its aspects, but what I want to call your attention to is that just so soon as this covenant is ratified every nation in the world will have the right to speak out for China. And I want to say very frankly, and I ought to add that the representatives of those great nations themselves admit, that Great Britain and France and the other powers which have insisted upon similar concessions in China will be put in a position where they will have to reconsider them. This is the only way to serve and redeem China, unless, indeed, you want to start a war for the purpose. At the beginning of the war and during the war Great Britain and France engaged by solemn treaty with Japan that if she would come into the war and continue in the war, she could have, provided she in the meantime took it by force of arms, what Germany had in China. Those are treaties already in force. They are not waiting for ratification. France and England can not withdraw from those obligations, and it will serve China not one iota if we should dissent from the Shantung arrangement; but by being parties to that arrangement we can insist upon the promise of Japan—the promise which the other Governments have not matched—that she will return to China immediately all sovereign rights within the Province of Shantung. We have got that for her now, and under the operations of article 11 and of article 10 it will be impossible for any nation to make any further inroads either upon the territorial integrity or upon the political independence of China. I for one want to say that my heart goes out to that great people, that learned people, that accomplished people, that honest people, hundreds of millions strong but never adequately organized for the exercise of force, therefore always at the mercy of anyone who has effective armies or navies, always subject to be commanded, and never in a position unassisted by the world to insist upon its own rights.

"It is a test—an acid test: Are you willing to go into the great adventure of liberating hundreds of millions of human beings from the threat of foreign power? If you are timid, I can assure you you can do it without shedding a drop of human blood. If you are squeamish about fighting, I will tell you you will not have to fight. The only force that outlasts all others and is finally triumphant is the moral judgment of mankind. Why is it that when a man tells a lie about you you do not wince, but when he tells the truth about you, if it is not creditable, then you wince? The only thing you are afraid of is the truth. The only thing you dare not face is the truth. The only thing that will get you sooner or later, no matter how you sneak or dodge, is the truth; and the only thing that will conquer nations is the truth. No nation is going to look the calm judgment of mankind in the face for nine months and then go to war. You can illustrate the great by the little. I dare say you have taken time to cool off sometimes. I know I have. It is very useful for a person, particularly with a Scotch disposition like mine, to withdraw from human society when he is mad all through and just think about the situation and reflect upon the consequences of making a conspicuous ass of himself. It is for that reason that I have always said that if you have an acquaintance whom you suspect of being a fool, encourage him to hire a hall. There is nothing that tests a man's good sense like exposure to the air. We are applying this great healing, sanitary influence to the affairs of nations and of men, and we can apply it only by the processes of peace which are offered to us after a conference, which I can testify was taken part in in the knowledge and in the spirit that never obtained before in any such conference; that we were not at liberty to work out the policy and ambition of any nation, but that our single duty and our single opportunity was to put the peoples of the world in possession of their own affairs.

"So, as much of the case, my fellow citizens, as I can lay before you on a single occasion—as much of this varied and diversified theme—is laid before you, and I ask your assistance to redeem the reputation of the United States. I ask you to make felt everywhere that it is useful to make it felt, not by way of threat, not by way of menace of any sort, but by way of compelling judgment, that the thing for us to do is to redeem the promises of America made in solemn presence of mankind when we entered this war, for I see a happy vision before the world, my fellow countrymen. Every previous international conference was based upon the authority of governments. This, for the first time, was based upon the authority of peoples. It is, therefore, the triumphant establishment of the principle of democracy throughout the world, but only the establishment of the principle of political democracy. What the world now insists upon—order and peace in order to consider and in order to achieve—is the establishment of industrial democracy, is the establishment of such relationships between those who direct labor and those who perform labor as shall make a real community of interest, as shall make a real community of purpose, as shall lift the whole level of industrial achievement above bargain and sale, into a great method of cooperation by which men, purposing the same thing and justly organizing the same thing, may bring about a state of happiness and of prosperity such as the world has never known before. We want to be friends of each other as well as friends of mankind. We want America to be united in spirit as well as the world. We want America to be a body of brethren, and if America is a body of brethren, then you may be sure that its leadership will bring the same sort of comradeship and intimacy of spirit and purity of purpose to the counsels and achievements of mankind."

THE PRESIDENT AT CHEYENNE, WYO., SEPTEMBER 24, 1919.

"Gov. Carey, my fellow countrymen, it is with genuine satisfaction that I find myself in this great State, which I have only too seldom visited, and I appreciate this close contact with a body of its citizens in order that I may make clear some of the matters which have emerged in the discussion in the midst of which we now find ourselves. Gov. Carey is quite right in saying that no document ever drew upon it more widespread discussion than the great treaty of peace with which your representatives returned from Paris. It is not to be wondered at, my fellow citizens, because that treaty is a unique document. It is the most remarkable document, I venture to say, in human history, because in it is recorded a complete reversal of the processes of government which had gone on throughout practically the whole history of mankind. The example that we set in 1776, which some statesmen in Europe affected to disregard and others presumed to ridicule, nevertheless set fires going in the hearts of men which no influence was able to quench, and one after another the Governments of the world have yielded to the influences of democracy. No man has been able to stay the tide, and there came a day when there was only one bulwark standing against it. That was in Berlin and Vienna—standing in the only territory which had not been conquered by the liberal forces of the opinion of the world, continued to stand fast where there was planted a pair of Governments that could use their people as they pleased, as pawns and instruments in a game of ambition, send them to the battle field without condescending to explain to them why they were sent, send them to the battle field to work out a dominion over free peoples on the part of a Government that had never been liberalized and made free.

"The world did not realize in 1914 that it had come to the final grapple of principle. It was only by slow degrees that we realized that we had any part in the war. We started the forces in 1776, as I have said, that made this war inevitable, but we were a long time realizing that, after all, that was what was at issue. We had been accustomed to regarding Europe as a field of intriguing, of rival ambitions, and of attempts to establish empire, and at first we merely got the impression that this was one of the usual European wars, to which, unhappily, mankind had become only too accustomed. You know how unwilling we were to go into it. I can speak for myself. I made every effort to keep this country out of the war, until it came to my conscience, as it came to yours, that after all it was our war as well as Europe's war, that the ambition of these central empires was directed against nothing less than the liberty of the world, and that if we were indeed what we had always professed to be, champions of the liberty of the world, it was not within our choice to keep out of the great enterprise. We went in just in time. I can testify, my fellow countrymen, that the hope of Europe had sunk very low when the American troops began to throng overseas. I can testify that they had begun to fear that the terror would be realized and that the German power would be established. At first they were incredulous that our men could come in force enough to assist them. At first they thought that it was only a moral encouragement they would get from seeing that gallant emblem of the Stars and Stripes upon their fields. Presently they realized that the tide was real, that here came men by the thousands, by the hundreds of thousands, by the millions; that there was no end to the force which would now be asserted to rescue the free peoples of the world from the

terror of autocracy; and America had the infinite privilege of fulfilling her destiny and saving the world. I do not hesitate to say, as a sober interpretation of history, that American soldiers saved the liberties of the world.

"I want to remind you of all this, my fellow citizens, because it is pertinent to the discussion that is now going on. We saved the liberties of the world, and we must stand by the liberties of the world. We can not draw back. You remember what happened in that fateful battle in which our men first took part. You remember how the French lines had been beaten and separated and broken at Chateau-Thierry, and you remember how the gates seemed open for the advancement of the Germans upon Paris. Then a body of men, a little body of men—American soldiers and American marines—against the protests of French officers, against the command of the remote commanders, nevertheless dared to fill that breach, stopped that advance, turned the Germans back, and never allowed them to turn their faces forward again. They were advised to go back, and they asked the naïve American question, 'What did we come over here for? We did not come over here to go back; we came over here to go forward.' And they never went in any other direction. The men who went to Chateau-Thierry, the men who went into Balleau Wood, the men who did what no other troops had been able to do in the Argonne, never thought of turning back, not only, but they never thought of making any reservations on their service. They never thought of saying, 'We are going to do this much of the job and then scuttle and leave you to do the rest.' I am here, I am on this journey, to help this Nation, if I can by my counsel, to fulfill and complete the task which the men who died upon the battle fields of France began, and I am not going to turn back any more than they did. I am going to keep my face just as they kept their face—forward toward the enemy.

"My friends—I use the words advisedly—the only organized forces in this country, outside of Congressional Halls, against this treaty are the forces of hyphenated Americans. I beg you to observe that I say the only organized forces, because I would not include many individuals whom I know in any such characterization, but I do repeat that it is the pro-German forces and the other forces that showed their hyphen during the war that are now organized against this treaty. We can please nobody in America except these people by rejecting it or qualifying it in our acceptance of it. I want you to recall the circumstances of this Great War lest we forget. We must not forget to redeem absolutely and without qualification the promises of America in this great enterprise. I have crossed the continent now, my friends, and am a part of my way back. I can testify to the sentiment of the American people. It is unmistakable. The overwhelming majority of them demand the ratification of this treaty, and they demand it because, whether they have analyzed it or not, they have a consciousness of what it is that we are fighting for. We said that this was a people's war—I have explained to you that it was, though you did not need the explanation—and we said that it must be a people's peace. It is a people's peace. I challenge any man to find a contradiction to that statement in the terms of the great document with which I returned from Paris. It is so much of a people's peace that in every portion of its settlement every thought of aggrandizement, of territorial or political aggrandizement, on the part of the great powers was brushed aside, brushed aside by their own representatives. They declined to take the colonies of Germany in sovereignty, and said they would consent and demand that they be administered in trust by a concert of the nations through the instrumentality of a league of nations. They did not claim a single piece of territory. On the contrary, every territory that had been under the dominion of the Central Powers, unjustly and against its own consent, is by that treaty and the treaties which accompany it absolutely turned over in fee simple to the people who live in it. The principle is adopted without qualification upon which America was founded, that all just government proceeds from the consent of the governed. No nation that could be reached by the conclusions of this conference was obliged to accept the authority of a government by which it did not wish to be controlled. It is a peace of liberation. It is a peace in which the rights of peoples are realized, and when objection is made to the treaty, is any objection made to the substance of the treaty? There is only one thing in the substance of the treaty that has been debated seriously, and that is the arrangement by which Japan gets the rights that Germany had in Shantung Province in China. I wish I had time to go through the story of that fully. It was an unavoidable settlement, and nothing can be done for China without the league of nations.

"Perhaps you will bear with me if I take time to tell you what I am talking about. You know that China has been the common prey of the great European powers. Perhaps I should apologize to the representatives of those powers for using such a word, but I think they would admit that the word is justified. Nation after nation has demanded rights, semisovereign rights, and concessions with regard to mines and railways and every other resource that China could put at their disposition, and China has never been able to say 'No'—a great learned, patient, diligent people, numbering hundreds of millions; has had no organized force with which to resist, and has yielded again and again and again to unjust demands. One of these demands was made upon her in March, 1898, by Germany—unjustly made. I will not go into the particulars, but I could justify that word 'unjustly.' A concession was demanded of her of the control of the whole district around Kiaochow Bay, one of the open doors to the trade and resources of China. She was obliged to yield to Germany practically sovereign control over that great region by the sea, and into the interior of the Province Germany was privileged to extend a railway and to exploit all the deposits of ore that might be found for 30 miles on either side of the railway which she was to build. The Government of the United States at that time, presided over by one of the most enlightened and beloved of our Presidents—I mean William McKinley—and the Department of State, guided by that able and high-minded man, John Hay, did not make the slightest protest. Why? Not because they would not if they could have aided China, but because under international law as it then stood no nation had the right to protest against anything that other nations did that did not directly affect its own rights. Mr. McKinley and Mr. Hay did insist that if Germany took control of Kiaochow Bay, she should not close those approaches to China against the trade of the United States. How pitiful, when you go into the court of right, you can not protect China, you can only protect your own merchandise! You can not say, 'You have done a great wrong to these people.' You have got to say, 'We yield to the wrong, but we insist that you should admit our goods to be sold in those markets!' Pitiful, but nevertheless it was international law. All nations acted in that way at that time. Immediately following these concessions to Germany, Russia insisted upon concessions and got Port Arthur and other territories. England insisted, though she had had similar concessions in the past, upon an additional concession and got Weihaiwai. France came into the game and got a port and its territory lying behind it for the same period of time that Germany had got her concession, namely, 99 years.

"Then came the war between Russia and Japan, and what happened? In a treaty signed on our own sacred territory, at Porthmouth in New Hampshire, Japan was allowed to take from Russia what had belonged to China, the concession of Port Arthur and of Talienwan, the territory in that neighborhood. The treaty was written here; it was written under the auspices, so to say, of our own public opinion, but the Government of the United States was not at liberty to protest and did not protest; it acquiesced in the very thing which is being done in this treaty. What is being done in this treaty is not that Shantung is being taken from China. China did not have it. It is being taken from Germany, just as Port Arthur was not taken from China but taken from Russia and transferred to Japan. Before we got into the war, Great Britain and France had entered into solemn covenant by treaty with Japan that if she would take what Germany had in Shantung by force of arms, and also the islands lying north of the Equator which had been under German dominion in the Pacific, she could keep them when the peace came and its settlements were made. They were bound by a treaty of which we knew nothing, but which, notwithstanding our ignorance of it, bound them as much as any treaty binds. This war was fought to maintain the sacredness of treaties. Great Britain and France, therefore, can not consent to a change of the treaty in respect of the cession of Shantung, and we have no precedent in our history which permits us even to protest against it until we become members of the league of nations.

"I want this point to sink in, my fellow countrymen: The league of nations changes the international law of the world with regard to matters of this sort. You have heard a great deal about article 10 of the covenant of the league, and I will speak of it presently, but read article 11 in conjunction with article 10. Every member of the league, in article 10, agrees never to impair the territorial integrity of any other member of the league or to interfere with its existing political independence. Both of those things were done in all these concessions. There was a very serious impairment of the territorial integrity of China in every one of them, and a very serious interference with the political independence of that great but helpless kingdom. Article 10 stops that for good and all. Then, in article 11, it is provided that it shall be the friendly right of any member of the league at any time 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, so that the ban would have been lifted from Mr. McKinley and Mr. Roosevelt in the matter of these things if we had had the covenant of the league; they could have gone in and said, 'Here is your promise to preserve the territorial integrity and political independence of this great people. We have the friendly right to protest. We have the right to call your attention to the fact that this will breed wars and not peace, and that you have not the right to do this thing.' Henceforth, for the first time, we shall have the opportunity to play effective friends to the great people of China, and I for one feel my pulses quicken and my heart rejoice at such a prospect. We, a free people, have hitherto been dumb in the presence of the invasion of the freedom of other free peoples, and now restraint is taken away. I say it is taken away, for we will be members of the covenant. Restraint is taken away, and, like the men that we profess to be, we can speak out in the interest of free people everywhere.

"But that is not all. America, as I have said, was not bound by the agreements of Great Britain and France, on the one hand, and Japan on the other. We were free to insist upon a prospect of a different settlement, and at the instance of the United States Japan has already promised that she will relinquish to China immediately after the ratification of this treaty all the sovereign rights that Germany had in Shantung Province—the only promise of that kind ever made, the only relinquishment of that sort ever achieved—and that she will retain only what foreign corporations have all over China—unfortunately but as a matter of fact—the right to run the railroad and the right to work the mines under the usual conditions of Chinese sovereignty and as economic concessionaires, with no political rights or military power of any kind. It is really an emancipation of China, so far as that Province is concerned, from what is imposed upon her by other nations in other Provinces equally rich and equally important to the independence of China herself. So that inside the league of nations we now have a foothold by which we can play the friend to China.

"And the alternative? If you insist upon cutting out the Shantung arrangement, that merely severs us from the treaty. It does not give Shantung back to China. The only way you can give Shantung back to China is by arms in your hands, armed ships and armed men, sent against Japan and France and Great Britain. A fratricidal strife, in view of what we have gone through! We have just redeemed France. We can not with arms in our hands insist that France break a covenant, however ill judged, however unjust; we can not as her brothers in arms commit any such atrocious act against the fraternity of free people. So much for Shantung. Nobody can get that provision out of that treaty and do China any service whatever, and all such professions of friendship for China are empty noise, for the gentlemen who make those professions must know that what they propose will be not of the slightest service to her.

"That is the only point of serious criticism with regard to the substance of the treaty. All the rest refers to the covenant of the league of nations. With regard to that, my fellow citizens, I have this to say: Without the covenant of the league of nations that treaty can not be executed. Without the adherence of the United States to that covenant, the covenant can not be made effective. To state it another way, the maintenance of the peace of the world and the execution of the treaty depend upon the whole-hearted participation of the people of the United States. I am not stating it as a matter of power. I am not stating it with the thought that the United States has greater material wealth and greater physical power than any other nation. The point that I want you to get is a very profound point; the point is that the United States is the only nation of the world that has sufficient moral force with the rest of the world. It is the only Nation which has proved its disinterestedness. It is the only Nation which is not suspected by the other nations of the world of ulterior purposes. There is not a Province in Europe in which American troops would not at this moment be welcomed with open arms, because the population would know that they had come as friends and would go so soon as their errand was fulfilled. I have had delegations come to me, delegations from countries where disorder made the presence of troops necessary, and beg me to order American troops there. They said, 'We trust them; we want them. They are our friends.' And all the world, provided we do not betray them by rejecting this treaty, will continue to regard us as their friends and follow us as their friends and serve us as their friends. It is the noblest opportunity ever offered to a great people, and we will not turn away from it.

"We are coming now to the grapple, because one question at a time is being cleared away. We are presently going to have a show-down, a show-down on a very definite issue, and I want to bring your minds to that definite issue. A number of objections have been made to the covenant of the league of nations, but they have been disposed of in candid minds. The first was the question whether we could withdraw when we pleased. That is no longer a question in the mind of anybody who has studied the language and real meaning of the covenant. We can withdraw, upon two years' notice, when we please. I state that with absolutely no qualification. Then there was the question as to whether it interfered with self-determination; that is to say, whether there was anything in the guarantee of article 10 about territorial integrity and political independence which would interfere with the assertion of the right of great populations anywhere to change their governments, to throw off the yoke of sovereignties which they did not desire to live under. There is absolutely no such restraint. I was present and can testify that when article 10 was debated the most significant words in it were the words 'against external aggression.' We do not guarantee any government against anything that may happen within its own borders or within its own sovereignty. We merely say that we will not impair its territorial integrity or interfere with its political independence, and we will not countenance other nations outside of it making prey of it in the one way or the other. Every man who sat around that table, and at the table where the conference on the league of nations sat there were 14 free peoples represented, believed in the sacred right of self-determination, would not have dared to go back and face his own people if he had done or said anything that stood in the way of it. That is out of the way. There was some doubt as to whether the Monroe doctrine was properly recognized, though I do not see how anybody who could read the English language could have raised the doubt. The covenant says that nothing contained in it shall be construed as affecting the validity of the Monroe doctrine, so that by a sudden turn in the whole judgment of the world the Monroe doctrine was accepted by all the great powers of the world. I know what their first impressions were about it. I know the history of their change of mind, and I know the heartiness and unanimity of the conclusion. Nothing can henceforth embarrass the policy of the United States in applying the Monroe doctrine according to her own judgment. But there was apprehension that some kind of a supergovernment had been set up which could some day interfere in our domestic affairs, say that our immigration laws were too rigorous and wrong; that our laws of naturalization were too strict and severe; that our tariff policy did not suit the rest of the world. The covenant expressly excludes interference with domestic questions, expressly states that it shall not be the right of any authority of the league to interfere in matters of that sort. That matter is cleared away by everybody who can understand the clauses in question.

"There is another matter in that connection I want to speak of. The constitution of the league of nations is not often enough explained. It is made up of two bodies. One body, which is a comparatively large body, is called the assembly. The assembly is not an originative body. The assembly is, so to say, the court of the public opinion of the world. It is where you can broach questions, but not decide them. It is where you can debate anything that affects the peace of the world, but not determine upon a course of action upon anything that affects the peace of the world. The whole direction of the action of the league is vested in another body known as the council, and nothing in the form of an active measure, no policy, no recommendation with regard to the action of the governments composing the league, can proceed except upon a unanimous vote of the council. Mark you, a unanimous vote of the council. In brief, inasmuch as the United States of America is to be a permanent member of the council of the league, the league can take no step whatever without the consent of the United States of America. My fellow citizens, think of the significance of that in view of the debates you have been listening to. There is not a single active step that the league can take unless we vote aye. The whole matter is, in that negative sense, in the ability to stop any action, in our hands. I am sometimes inclined to think that that weakens the league, that it has not freedom of action enough, notwithstanding that I share with all of my fellow countrymen a very great jealousy with regard to setting up any power that could tell us to do anything, but no such power is set up. Whenever a question of any kind with regard to active policy—and there are only three or four of them—is referred to the assembly for its vote, its vote in the affirmative must include the representatives of all the nations which are represented on the council. In the assembly, as in the council, any single nation that is a member of the council has a veto upon active conclusions. That is my comment upon what you have been told about Great Britain having six votes and our having

one. I am perfectly content with the arrangement, since our one offsets the British six. I do not want to be a repeater; if my one vote goes, I do not want to repeat it five times.

"And is it not just that in this debating body, from which without the unanimous concurrence of the council no active proceeding can originate, that these votes should have been given to the self-governing powers of the British Empire? I am ready to maintain that position. Is it not just that those stout little Republics out in the Pacific, of New Zealand and Australia, should be able to stand up in the councils of the world and say something? Do you not know how Australia has led the free peoples of the world in many matters that have led to social and industrial reform? It is one of the most enlightened communities in the world and absolutely free to choose its own way of life independent of the British authority, except in matters of foreign relationship. Do you not think that it is natural that that stout little body of men whom we so long watched with admiration in their contest with the British Crown in South Africa should have the right to stand up and talk before the world? They talked once with their arms and, if I may judge by my contact with them, they can talk with their minds. They know what the interests of South Africa are, and they are independent in their control of the interests of South Africa. Two of the most impressive and influential men I met in Paris were representatives of South Africa, both of them members of the British peace delegation in Paris, and yet both of them generals who had made British generals take notice through many months of their power to fight—the men whom Great Britain had fought and beaten and felt obliged to hand over their own government to, and say, 'It is yours and not ours.' They were men who spoke counsel, who spoke frank counsel. And take our neighbor on the north—do you not think Canada is entitled to a speaking part? I have pointed out to you that her voting part is offset, but do you not think she is entitled to a speaking part? Do you not think that that fine dominion has been a very good neighbor? Do you not think she is a good deal more like the United States than she is like Great Britain? Do you not feel that probably you think alike? The only other vote given to the British Empire is given to that hitherto voiceless mass of humanity that lives in that region of romance and pity that we know as India. I am willing that India should stand up in the councils of the world and say something. I am willing that speaking parts should be assigned to these self-governing, self-respecting, energetic portions of the great body of humanity.

"I take leave to say that the deck is cleared of these bugaboos. We can get out if we want to. I am not interested in getting out. I am interested in getting on. But we can get out. The door is not locked. You can sit on the edge of your chair and scuttle any time you want to. There are so many who are interested first of all in knowing that they are not in for anything that can possibly impose anything on them. Well, we are not in for anythng that we do not want to continue to carry. We can help in the matters of self-determination, as we never helped before. The six votes of the British Empire are offset by our own, if we choose to offset them. I dare say we shall often agree with them; but if we do not, they can not do anything that we do not consent to. The Monroe doctrine is taken care of. There is no danger of interference with domestic questions.

"Well, what remains? Nothing except article 10, and that is the heart of the whole covenant. Anybody who proposes to cut out article 10 proposes to cut all the supports from under the peace and security of the world, and we must face the question in that light; we must draw the issue as sharply as that; we must see it through as distinctly as that. Let me repeat article 10. I do not know that I can do it literally, but I can come very near it. Under article 10 every member of the league engages to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of the other members of the league. That cuts at the taproot of war. The wars of the past have been leveled against the liberties of peoples and territories of those who could not defend them, and if you do not cut at that taproot, that upas tree is going to grow again; and I tell you, my fellow countrymen, that if you do not cut it up now it will be harder to cut it up next time. The next time will come; it will come while this generation is living, and the children that crowd about our car as we move from station to station will be sacrificed upon the altar of that war. It will be the last war. Humanity will never suffer another, if humanity survives. My fellow countrymen, do you realize that at the end of the war that has just closed new instruments of destruction had been invented and were about to be used that exceeded in terrible force and destructive power any that had been used before in this war? You have heard with wonder of those great cannon from which the Germans sent shells 70 miles into Paris. Just before the war closed shells had been invented that could be made to steer themselves and carry immense bodies of explosives a hundred miles into the interior of countries, no matter how great the serried ranks of their soldiers were at the border. This war will be child's play as compared with another war. You have got to cut the root of that upas tree now or betray all future generations.

"And we can not without our vote in the council, even in support of article 10, be drawn into wars that we do not wish to be drawn into. The second sentence of article 10 is that the council shall advise as to the method of fulfilling this guaranty, that the council, which must vote by unanimous vote, must advise—can not direct—what is to be done for the maintenance of the honor of its members and for the maintenance of the peace of the world. Is there anything that can frighten a man or a woman or a child, with just thought or red blood, in those provisions? And yet listen. I understand that this reservation is under consideration. I ask your very attentive ear.

"The United States assumes no obligation under the provisions of article 10 to preserve the territorial integrity or political independence of any other country or to interfere in controversies between other nations, whether members of the league or not, or to employ the military and naval forces of the United States under any article of the treaty for any purpose, unless in any particular case the Congress, which under the Constitution has the sole power to declare war or authorize the employment of the military and naval forces of the United States, shall by act or joint resolution so declare.

"In other words, my fellow citizens, what this proposes is this: That we should make no general promise, but leave the nations associated with us to guess in each instance what we were going to consider ourselves bound to do and what we were not going to consider ourselves bound to do. It is as if you said, 'We will not join the league definitely, but we will join it occasionally. We will not promise anything, but from time to time we may cooperate. We will not assume any obligations.' Observe, my fellow citizens, as I have repeatedly said to you and can not say too often, the council of the league can not oblige us to take military action without the consent of Congress. There is no possibility of that. But this reservation proposes that we should not acknowledge any moral obligation in the matter; that we should stand off and say, 'We will see, from time to time; consult us when you get into trouble, and then we will have a debate, and after two or three months we will tell you what we are going to do.' The thing is unworthy and ridiculous, and I want to say distinctly that, as I read this, it would change the entire meaning of the treaty and exempt the United States from all responsibility for the preservation of peace. It means the rejection of the treaty, my fellow countrymen, nothing less. It means that the United States would take from under the structure its very foundations and support.

"I happen to know that there are some men in favor of that reservation who do not in the least degree realize its meaning, men whom I greatly respect, men who have just as much ardor to carry out the promises of the United States as I have, and I am not indicting their purpose, but I am calling their attention to the fact that if any such reservation as that should be adopted I would be obliged as the Executive of the United States to regard it as a rejection of the treaty. I ask them, therefore, to consider this matter very carefully, for I want you to realize, and I hope they realize, what the rejection of the treaty means—two isolated and suspected people, the people of Germany and the people of the United States. Germany is not admitted to respectable company yet. She is not permitted to enter the league until such time as she shall have proved to the satisfaction of the world that her change of government and change of heart is real and permanent. Then she can be admitted. Now, her dearest desire, feeling her isolation, knowing all the consequences that would result, economic and social, is to see the United States also cut off its association with the gallant peoples with whom side by side we fought this war. I am not making this statement by conjecture. We get it directly from the mouths of authoritative persons in Germany that their dearest hope is that America will now accomplish by the rejection of the treaty what Germany was not able to accomplish by her arms. She tried to separate us from the rest of the world. She tried to antagonize the rest of the world against the United States, and she failed so long as American armies were in the field. Shall she succeed now, when only American voters are in the field? The issue is final. We can not avoid it. We have got to make it now, and, once made, there can be no turning back. We either go in with the other free peoples of the world to guarantee the peace of the world now, or we stay out and on some dark and disastrous day seek admission to the league of nations along with Germany. The rejection of this treaty, my fellow citizens,

means the necessity of negotiating a separate treaty with Germany. That separate treaty between Germany and the United States could not alter any sentence of this treaty. It could not affect the validity of any sentence of this treaty. It would simply be the Government of the United States going, hat in hand, to the assembly at Weimar and saying, 'May it please you, we have dissociated ourselves from those who were your enemies; we have come to you asking if you will consent to terms of amity and peace which will dissociate us, both of us, from the comradeship of arms and liberty.' There is no other interpretation. There is no other issue. That is the issue, and every American must face it.

"But I talk, my fellow citizens, as if I doubted what the decision would be. I happen to have been born and bred in America. There is not anything in me that is not American. I dare says that I inherit a certain stubbornness from an ancient stock from which I am remotely derived; but, then, all of you are derived, more or less remotely, from other stocks. You remember the exclamation of the Irishman who said when he was called a foreigner, 'You say we are furriners; I'd like to know who sittled this kintry but furriners!' We were all foreigners once, but we have undergone a climatic change, and the marvel of America is its solidarity, is its homogeneity, in the midst of its variety. The marvel about America is that, no matter what a man's stock and origin, you can always tell that he is an American the minute he begins to express an opinion. He may look sometimes like a foreigner, but tap him and you will find that the contents is American. Having been bred in that way myself, I do not have to conjecture what the judgments of America are going to be about a great question like this. I know beforehand, and I am only sorry for the men who do not know. If I did not know the law of custom and of honor against betting on a certainty, I would like to bet with them. But it would not be fair; I would be taking advantage of them.

"If I may close with a word, not of jest but of solemnity, I want to say, my fellow citizens, that there can be no exaggerating the importance of this peace and the importance of its immediate ratification, because the world will not and can not settle down to normal conditions, either in America or anywhere else, until it knows what the future is going to be. If it must know that the future is going to be one of disorder and of rivalry and of the old contests of power, let it know it at once, so it can make its arrangements and its calculations and lay its taxes and recruit its armies and build its ships for the next great fight; but if, on the other hand, it can be told that it will have an insurance against war, that a great body of powerful nations has entered into a solemn covenant to substitute arbitration and discussion for war, for that is the heart of the covenant, that all the great fighting peoples of the world have engaged to forego war and substitute arbitration and discussion—if it can know that the minds will be quieted, the disorders will presently cease; then men will know that we have the opportunity to do that great, that transcendent duty that lies ahead of us, sit quietly down in council chambers and work out the proper reforms of our own industrial and economic life. They have got to be worked out. If this treaty is not ratified, they will be worked out in disorder throughout the world. I am not now intimating, for I do not think, that disorder will shake the foundations of our own affairs, but it will shake the foundations of the world, and these inevitable, indispensable reforms will be worked out amongst disorder and suspicion and hatred and violence, whereas if we can have the healing influences of assured peace they will be worked out in amity and quiet and by the judgment of men rather than by the passions of men. God grant that that day may come, and come soon! Above all, may God grant that it may come under the leadership of America!"

THE PRESIDENT AT AUDITORIUM, DENVER, COLO., SEPTEMBER 25, 1919.

"Mr. Chairman, my fellow countrymen, I always feel a thrill of pride in standing before a great company of my fellow citizens to speak for this great document which we shall always know as the treaty of Versailles. I am proud to speak for it, because for the first time in the history of international consultation men have turned away from the ambitions of governments and have sought to advance the fortunes of peoples. They have turned away from all those older plans of domination and sought to lay anew the foundations for the liberty of mankind. I say without hesitation that this is a great document of liberation. It is a new charter for the liberty of men.

"As we have advanced from week to week and from month to month in the debate of this great document, I think a great many things that we talked about at first have cleared away. A great many difficulties which were at first discovered, or which some fancied that they had discovered, have been removed. The center and heart of this document is that great instrument which is placed at the beginning of it, the covenant of the league of nations. I think everybody now understands that you can not work this treaty without that covenant. Everybody certainly understands that you have no insurance for the continuance of this settlement without the covenant of the league of nations, and you will notice that, with the single exception of the provision with regard to the transfer of the German rights in Shantung in China to Japan, practically nothing in the body of the treaty has seemed to constitute any great obstacle to its adoption. All the controversy, all the talk, has centered on the league of nations, and I am glad to see the issue center; I am glad to see the issue clearly drawn, for now we have to decide, Shall we stand by the settlements of liberty, or shall we not?

"I want, just by way of introduction and clarification, to point out what is not often enough explained to audiences in this country, the actual constitution of the league of nations. It is very simply constituted. It consists of two bodies, a council and an assembly. The assembly is the numerous body. In it every self-governing State that is a member of the league is represented, and not only the self-governing independent States, but the self-governing colonies and dominions, such as Canada, New Zealand, Australia, India, and South Africa, are all represented in the assembly. It is in the assembly that the combined representation of the several parts of the British Empire are assigned six votes, and you are constantly being told that Great Britain has six votes and we have one. I want you to appreciate the full significance of that. They have six votes in the assembly, and the assembly does not vote. That bubble is exploded. There are several matters in which the vote of the assembly must cooperate with the vote of the council, but in every such case an unanimous vote of the council is necessary, and, inasmuch as the United States is a permanent member of the council, her vote is necessary to every active policy of the league. Therefore the single vote of the United States always counts six, so far as the votes of the British Empire are concerned, and if it is a mere question of pride, I would rather be one and count six than six and count six.

"That affords emphasis to the point I wish you to keep distinctly in mind with regard to reservations and all the qualifications of ratification which are being discussed. No active policy can be undertaken by the league without the assenting vote of the United States. I can not understand the anxiety of some gentlemen for fear something is going to be put over on them. I can not understand why, having read the covenant of the league and examined its constitution, they are not satisfied with the fact that every active policy of the league must be concurred in by a unanimous vote of the council, which means that the affirmative vote of the United States is in every instance necessary. That being the case, it becomes sheer nonsense, my fellow citizens, to talk about a supergovernment being set up over the United States; it becomes sheer nonsense to say that any authority is constituted which can order our armies to other parts of the world, which can interfere with our domestic questions, which can direct our international policy even in any matter in which we do not consent to be directed. We would be under our own direction just as much under the covenant of the league of nations as we are now. Of course, I do not mean to say that we do not, so to say, pool our moral issues. We do that. In acquiescing in the covenant of the league we do adopt, and we should adopt, certain fundamental moral principles of right and justice, which, I dare say, we do not need to promise to live up to, but which we are certainly proud to promise to live up to. We are not turning any corner. We always have lived up to them, and we do not intend to change our course of action or our standards of action. And it is American standards of action that are set up in the covenant of the league of nations.

"What is the covenant for? To hear most of the debate, you would think that it was an ingenious contrivance for a subtle interference with the affairs of the United States. On the contrary, it is one of the most solemn covenants ever entered into by all the great fighting powers of the world that they never will resort to war again without first having either submitted the question at issue to arbitration and undertaken to abide by the verdict of the arbitrators or submitted it to discussion by the council of the league of nations, laying all the documents, all the facts, before that council, consenting that that council should lay all those documents and all those facts before the world; they agree to allow six months for that discussion, and, even if they are not satisfied with the opinion, for it is only an opinion in that case, rendered by the council, they agree not to go to war for three months after the opinion has been rendered. There you have nine months' submission to the moral judgment of the world. In my judgment, that is an almost complete assurance against war. If any such covenant as that

had existed in 1914, Germany never would have gone to war. The one thing that Germany could not afford to do, and knew that she could not afford to do, was to submit her case to the public opinion of the world. We have now abundant proof of what would have happened, because it was the moral judgment of the world that combined the world against Germany. We were a long time, my fellow citizens, seeing that we belonged in the war, but just so soon as the real issues of it became apparent we knew that we belonged there. And we did an unprecedented thing. We threw the whole power of a great nation into a quarrel with the origination of which it had nothing to do. I think there is nothing that appeals to the imagination more in the history of men than those convoyed fleets crossing the ocean with millions of American soldiers aboard—those crusaders, those men who loved liberty enough to leave their homes and fight for it upon distant fields of battle, those men who swung out into the open as if in fulfillment of the long prophecy of American history. There is nothing finer in the records of public action than the united spirit of the American people behind this great enterprise.

"I ask your close observation to current events, my fellow countrymen. Out of doors, that is to say, that out of legislative halls, there is no organized opposition to this treaty except among the people who tried to defeat the purpose of this Government in the war. Hyphens are the knives that are being stuck into this document. The issue is clearly drawn. Inasmuch as we are masters of our own participation in the action of the league of nations, why do we need reservations? If we can not be obliged to do anything that we do not ourselves vote to do, why qualify our acceptance of a perfectly safe agreement? There can be only one object, my fellow citizens, and that is to give the United States a standing of exceptional advantage in the league, to exempt it from obligations which the other members assume, or to put a special interpretation upon the duties of the United States under the covenant which interpretation is not applied to the duties of other members of the league under the covenant. I, for my part, say that it is unworthy of the United States to ask any special privilege of that kind. I am for going into a body of equals or staying out. That is the very principle we have been fighting for and have been proud to fight for, that the rights of a weak nation were just as sacred as the rights of a great nation. That is what this treaty was drawn to establish. You must not think of this treaty alone. The lines of it are being run out into the Austrian treaty and the Hungarian treaty and the Bulgarian treaty and the Turkish treaty, and in every one of them the principle is this, to deliver peoples who have been living under sovereignties that were alien and unwelcome from the bondage under which they have lived, to turn over to them their own territory, to adopt the American principle that all just government is derived from the consent of the governed. All down through the center of Europe and into the heart of Asia has gone this process of liberation, taking alien yokes off the necks of such peoples and vindicating the American principle that you can not impose upon anybody a sovereignty that is not of its own choice. And if the results of this great liberation are not guaranteed, then they will fall down like a house of cards. What was the program of Pan-Germanism? You know the formula—from Bremen to Bagdad. Very well; that is the very stretch of country over which these people have been liberated. New States, one after another, have been set up by the action of the conference at Paris all along the route that was intended to be the route of German dominion, and if we now merely set them up and leave them in their weakness to take care of themselves, then Germans can at their leisure, by intriguing, by every subtle process of which they are master, accomplish what they could not accomplish by arms, and we will have abandoned the people whom we redeemed. The thing is inconceivable. The thing is impossible.

"We therefore have come to the straight-cut line—adoption or rejection. Qualified adoption is not adoption. It is perfectly legitimate, I admit, to say in what sense we understand certain articles. They are all perfectly obvious in meaning, so far as I can see, but if you want to make the obvious more obvious I do not see any objection to that; if by the multiplication of words you can make simple words speak their meaning more distinctly, I think that that is an interesting rhetorical exercise, but nothing more. Qualification means asking special exemptions and privileges for the United States. We can not ask that. We must either go in or stay out. Now, if we go in what do we get? I am not now confining my view to ourselves. America has shown the world that she does not stop to calculate the lower sort of advantage and disadvantage; that she goes in upon a high plane of principle, and is willing to serve mankind while she is serving herself. What we gain in this treaty is, first of all, the substitution of arbitration and discussion for war. If you got nothing else, it is worth the whole game to get that. My fellow citizens, we fought this war in order that there should not be another like it. I am under bonds, I am under bonds to my fellow citizens of every sort, and I am particularly under bonds to the mothers of this country and to the wives of this country and to the sweethearts, that I will do everything in my power to see to it that their sons and husbands and sweethearts never have to make that supreme sacrifice again. And when I passed your beautiful Capitol Square just now and saw thousands of children there to greet me, I felt a lump in my throat. These are the little people that I am arguing for. These are my clients, these lads coming on and these girls that, staying at home, would suffer more than the lads who died on the battle field, for it is the tears at home that are more bitter than the agony upon the field. I dare not turn away from the straight path I have set myself to redeem this promise that I have made.

"If you say, 'What is there? An absolute insurance against war?' I say, 'Certainly not.' Nobody can give you an insurance against human passion, but if you can get a little insurance against an infinite catastrophe, is it not better than getting none at all? Let us assume that it is only 25 per cent insurance against war. Can any humane man reject that insurance? Let us suppose that it is 50 per cent insurance against war. Why, my friends, my calm judgment is that it is 99 per cent insurance against war. That is what I went over to Europe to get, and that is what I got, and that is what I have brought back.

"Stop for a moment to think about the next war, if there should be one. I do not hesitate to say that the war we have just been through, though it was shot through with terror of every kind, is not to be compared with the war we would have to face next time. There were destructive gases, there were methods of explosive destruction unheard of even during this war, which were just ready for use when the war ended—great projectiles that guided themselves and shot into the heavens went for a hundred miles and more and then burst tons of explosives upon helpless cities, something to which the guns with which the Germans bombarded Paris from a distance were not comparable. What the Germans used were toys as compared with what would be used in the next war. Ask any soldier if he wants to go through a hell like that again. The soldiers know what the next war would be. They know what the inventions were that were just about to be used for the absolute destruction of mankind. I am for any kind of insurance against a barbaric reversal of civilization.

"And by consequence, the adoption of the treaty means disarmament. Think of the economic burden and the restraint of liberty in the development of professional and mechanical life that resulted from the maintenance of great armies, not only in Germany but in France and in Italy and, to some extent, in Great Britain. If the United States should stand off from this thing we would have to have the biggest army in the world. There would be nobody else that cared for our fortunes. We would have to look out for ourselves, and when I hear gentlemen say, 'Yes; that is what we want to do; we want to be independent and look out for ourselves.' I say, 'Well, then, consult your fellow citizens. There will have to be universal conscription. There will have to be taxes such as even yet we have not seen. There will have to be a concentration of authority in the Government capable of using this terrible instrument. You can not conduct a war or command an army by a debating society. You can not determine in community centers what the command of the Commander in Chief is going to be; you will have to have a staff like the German staff, and you will have to center in the Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy the right to take instant action for the protection of the Nation.' America will never consent to any such thing.

"Then, if we have this great treaty, we have what the world never had before—a court of public opinion of the world. I do not think that you can exaggerate the significance of that, my fellow countrymen. International law up to this time has been the most singular code of manners. You could not mention to any other Government anything that concerned it unless you could prove that your own interests were immediately involved. Unless you could prove that it was your own material interest that was involved, it was impolite to speak of it. There might be something brooding that threatened the peace of the world, and you could not speak of it unless the interests of the United States were involved. I am going to allude for a moment to a matter so interesting that I wish I could develop it. This cession in Shantung Province in China, which China gave to Germany in 1898, was an iniquitous thing at the outset; but our great President, William McKinley, and our great Secretary of State, John Hay, did not protest against it. It was an outrageous invasion of the rights of China. They not

only did not protest, but all they asked was that Germany, after she got what did not belong to her, would please not close the doors against the trade of the United States. I am not saying this by way of criticism. That is all that under international manners they had a right to ask. International law has been the principle of minding your own business, particularly when something outrageous was up; and article 11 of the league of nations makes matters of that sort everybody's business. Under article 11, any member of the league can at any time call attention to anything, anywhere, which is likely to affect the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations upon which the peace of the world depends. The littlest nation, along with the biggest—Panama, to take one of our own near neighbors—can stand up and challenge the right of any nation in the world to do a thing which threatens the peace of the world. It does not have to be a big nation to do it.

"The voice of the world is at last released. The conscience of the world is at last given a forum, and the rights of men not liberated under this treaty are given a place where they can be heard. If there are nations which wish to exercise the power of self-determination but are not liberated by this treaty, they can come into that great forum, they can point out how their demands affect the peace and quiet of the world, they can point out how their demands affect the good understanding between nations. There is a forum here for the rights of mankind which was never before dreamed of, and in that forum any representative has the right to speak his full mind. If that is not a wholesome moral clearing house, I wish somebody would suggest a better. It is just a moral clearing house that the world needs. There have been a great many things unspoken that ought to have been spoken. There have been voiceless multitudes all over the world who had nobody to speak for them in any court of conscience anywhere, and now they are given spokesmen. All forward-looking men may now see their way to the method in which they may help forward the real processes of civilization.

"There is another matter which I am sure will interest a great many within the sound of my voice. If we do not have this treaty of peace, labor will continue to be regarded, not as it ought to be regarded, a human function, but as a purchasable commodity throughout the world. There is inserted in this great treaty a Magna Charta of labor. There is set up here a means of periodic examination of the conditions of labor all over the world, particularly the labor of women and children and those who have not the physical force to handle some of the burdens that are put upon them, and it is made the duty of the nations of the world constantly to study the methods of raising the levels of human labor. You know what that means. We have not done our full duty with regard to the amelioration and betterment of the conditions of labor in America, but the conditions here are better than they are anywhere else. We now have an opportunity to exercise our full influence to raise the levels everywhere to the levels which we have tried to maintain in this country, and then to take them higher into the fields of that sort of association between those who employ labor and those who execute it as will make it a real human relationship and not a mere commercial relationship. The heart of the world has never got into this business yet. The conscience of the world has never been released along lines of action in regard to the improvement of the conditions of labor. And more than that, until we find such methods as I have been alluding to, we are never releasing the real energies of this people. Men are not going to work and produce what they would produce if they feel that they are not justly treated. If you want to realize the real wealth of this country, then bring about the human relationship between employers and employees which will make them colaborers and partners and fellow workers. All of that is open to us through the instrumentality of the league of nations under this great treaty, and still we debate whether we should ratify it or not.

"There is a great deal of pleasure in talking, I admit; and some men, even some men I do not agree with, I admit, talk very well, indeed. It is a pleasure to hear them when they are honest; it is a pleasure to be instructed by them when they know what they are talking about. But we have reached the stage now when all the things that needed to be debated have been debated and all the doubts are cleared up. They are cleared up just as thoroughly as the English language can clear them. The people of the United States are no longer susceptible to being misled as to what is in this covenant, and they now have an exceedingly interesting choice to make. I have said it a great many times, my fellow countrymen, but I must say it again, because it is a pleasant thing to testify about—the fundamental thing that I discovered on the other side of the water was that all the great peoples of the world are looking to America for leadership. There can be no mistaking that. The evidences were too overwhelming, the evidences were too profoundly significant, because what underlay them was this: We are the only Nation which so far has not laid itself open to suspicion of ulterior motives. We are the only Nation which has not made it evident that when we go to anybody's assistance we mean to stay there longer than we are welcome. Day after day I received delegations in Paris asking—what? Credits from the United States? No. Merchandise from the United States? Yes, if possible; but that was not the chief point. They were asking that I send American troops to take the place of other troops, because they said, 'Our people will welcome them with open arms as friends who have come for their sakes and not for anything that America can possibly in the future have in mind.' What an extraordinary tribute to the principles of the United States! What an extraordinary tribute to the sincerity of the people of the United States! I never was so proud in my life as when these evidences began to accumulate. I had been proud always of being an American, but I never before realized fully what it meant. It meant to stand at the front of the moral forces of the world.

"My fellow citizens, I think we must come to sober and immediate conclusions. There is no turning aside from the straight line. We must now either accept this arrangement or reject it. If we accept it, there is no danger either to our safety or to our honor. If we reject it, we will meet with suspicion, with distrust, with dislike, with disillusionment everywhere in the world. This treaty has to be carried out. In order to carry this treaty out, it is necessary to reconstruct Europe economically and industrially. If we do not take part in that reconstruction, we will be shut out from it, and by consequence the markets of Europe will be shut to us. The combinations of European Governments can be formed to exclude us wherever it is possible to exclude us; and if you want to come to the hard and ugly basis of material interest, the United States will everywhere trade at an overwhelming disadvantage just so soon as we have forfeited, and deserved to forfeit, the confidence of the world. I ask merchants, 'Who are good customers, friends or enemies? Who are good customers, those who open their doors to you or those who have made some private arrangement elsewhere which makes it impossible for them to trade with you?' I have heard Europe spoken of as bankrupt. There may be great difficulties in paying the public debts, but there are going to be no insuperable difficulties to rebeginning the economic and industrial life of Europe. The men are there, the materials are there, the energy is there, and the hope is there. The nations are not crushed. They are ready for the great enterprises of the future, and it is for us to choose whether we will enter those great enterprises upon a footing of advantage and of honor or upon a footing of disadvantage and distrust.

"Therefore, from every point of view, I challenge the opponents of this treaty to show cause why it should not be ratified. I challenge them to show cause why there should be any hesitation in ratifying it. I do not understand delays. I do not understand covert processes of opposition. It is time that we knew where we shall stand, for observe, my fellow citizens, the negotiation of treaties rests with the Executive of the United States. When the Senate has acted, it will be for me to determine whether its action constitutes an adoption or a rejection, and I beg the gentlemen who are responsible for the action of the United States Senate to make it perfectly clear whether it is an adoption or a rejection. I do not wish to draw doubtful conclusions. I do not wish to do injustice to the process of any honest mind. But when that treaty is acted upon I must know whether it means that we have ratified it or rejected it, and I feel confident that I am speaking for the people of the United States.

"When it is around election time, my fellow citizens, a man ought to be doubtful of what the meaning of his intercourse with his fellow citizens is, because it is easy for applause to go to the head; it is easy for applause to seem to men more than it does; it is easy for the assurances of individual support to be given a wider implication than can properly be given to them. I thank God that on this occasion the whole issue has nothing to do with me. I did not carry any purpose of my own to Paris. I did not carry any purpose that I did not know from the action of public opinion in the United States was the purpose of the United States. It was not the purpose of a party. It was not the purpose of any section of our fellow citizens. It was a purpose subscribed to by American public opinion and formally adopted by the Governments with which we had to deal on the other side, and I came back with a document embodying the principles insisted upon at the outset and carried by the American delegation to Paris. Therefore I think that I have the right to say that I have the support of

the people of the United States. The issue is so big that it transcends all party and personal things. I was a spokesman; I was an instrument. I did not speak any privately conceived idea of my own. I had merely tried to absorb the influences of public opinion in the United States, and that, my fellow citizens, is the function of all of us. We ought not in a great crisis like this to follow any private opinion; we ought not to follow any private purpose; we ought, above all things, to forget that we are ever divided into parties when we vote. We are all democrats—I will not insist upon the large 'D'—we are all democrats because we believe in a people's government, and what I am pleading for is nothing less than a people's peace."

THE PRESIDENT AT PUEBLO, COLO., SEPTEMBER 25, 1919.

"Mr. Chairman and fellow countrymen, it is with a great deal of genuine pleasure that I find myself in Pueblo, and I feel it a compliment that I should be permitted to be the first speaker in this beautiful hall. One of the advantages of this hall, as I look about, is that you are not too far away from me, because there is nothing so reassuring to men who are trying to express the public sentiment as getting into real personal contact with their fellow citizens. I have gained a renewed impression as I have crossed the continent this time of the homogeneity of this great people to whom we belong. They come from many stocks, but they are all of one kind. They come from many origins, but they are all shot through with the same principles and desire the same righteous and honest things. I have received a more inspiring impression this time of the public opinion of the United States than it was ever my privilege to receive before.

"The chief pleasure of my trip has been that it has nothing to do with my personal fortunes, that it has nothing to do with my personal reputation, that it has nothing to do with anything except great principles uttered by Americans of all sorts and of all parties which we are now trying to realize at this crisis of the affairs of the world. But there have been unpleasant impressions as well as pleasant impressions, my fellow citizens, as I have crossed the continent. I have perceived more and more that men have been busy creating an absolutely false impression of what the treaty of peace and the covenant of the league of nations contain and mean. I find, moreover, that there is an organized propaganda against the league of nations and against the treaty proceeding from exactly the same sources that the organized propaganda proceeded from which threatened this country here and there with disloyalty, and I want to say—I can not say too often—any man who carries a hyphen about with him carries a dagger that he is ready to plunge into the vitals of this Republic whenever he gets ready. If I can catch any man with a hyphen in this great contest I will know that I have got an enemy of the Republic. My fellow citizens, it is only certain bodies of foreign sympathies, certain bodies of sympathy with foreign nations that are organized against this great document which the American representatives have brought back from Paris. Therefore, in order to clear away the mists, in order to remove the impressions, in order to check the falsehoods that have clustered around this great subject, I want to tell you a few very simple things about the treaty and the covenant.

"Do not think of this treaty of peace as merely a settlement with Germany. It is that. It is a very severe settlement with Germany, but there is not anything in it that she did not earn. Indeed, she earned more than she can ever be able to pay for, and the punishment exacted of her is not a punishment greater than she can bear, and it is absolutely necessary in order that no other nation may ever plot such a thing against humanity and civilization. But the treaty is so much more than that. It is not merely a settlement with Germany; it is a readjustment of those great injustices which underlie the whole structure of European and Asiatic society. This is only the first of several treaties. They are all constructed upon the same plan. The Austrian treaty follows the same lines. The treaty with Hungary follows the same lines. The treaty with Bulgaria follows the same lines. The treaty with Turkey, when it is formulated, will follow the same lines. What are those lines? They are based upon the purpose to see that every government dealt with in this great settlement is put in the hands of the people and taken out of the hands of coteries and of sovereigns who had no right to rule over the people. It is a people's treaty, that accomplishes by a great sweep of practical justice the liberation of men who never could have liberated themselves, and the power of the most powerful nations has been devoted not to their aggrandizement but to the liberation of people whom they could have put under their control if they had chosen to do so. Not one foot of territory is demanded by the conquerors, not one single item of submission to their authority is demanded by them. The men who sat around that table in Paris knew that the time had come when the people were no longer going to consent to live under masters, but were going to live the lives that they chose themselves, to live under such governments as they chose themselves to erect. That is the fundamental principle of this great settlement.

"And we did not stop with that. We added a great international charter for the rights of labor. Reject this treaty, impair it, and this is the consequence to the laboring men of the world, that there is no international tribunal which can bring the moral judgments of the world to bear upon the great labor questions of the day. What we need to do with regard to the labor questions of the day, my fellow countrymen, is to lift them into the light, is to lift them out of the haze and distraction of passion, of hostility, out into the calm spaces where men look at things without passion. The more men you get into a great discussion the more you exclude passion. Just so soon as the calm judgment of the world is directed upon the question of justice to labor, labor is going to have a forum such as it never was supplied with before, and men everywhere are going to see that the problem of labor is nothing more nor less than the problem of the elevation of humanity. We must see that all the questions which have disturbed the world, all the questions which have eaten into the confidence of men toward their governments, all the questions which have disturbed the processes of industry, shall be brought out where men of all points of view, men of all attitudes of mind, men of all kinds of experience, may contribute their part to the settlement of the great questions which we must settle and can not ignore.

"At the front of this great treaty is put the covenant of the league of nations. It will also be at the front of the Austrian treaty and the Hungarian treaty and the Bulgarian treaty and the treaty with Turkey. Every one of them will contain the covenant of the league of nations, because you can not work any of them without the covenant of the league of nations. Unless you get the united, concerted purpose and power of the great Governments of the world behind this settlement, it will fall down like a house of cards. There is only one power to put behind the liberation of mankind, and that is the power of mankind. It is the power of the united moral forces of the world, and in the covenant of the league of nations the moral forces of the world are mobilized. For what purpose? Reflect, my fellow citizens, that the membership of this great league is going to include all the great fighting nations of the world, as well as the weak ones. It is not for the present going to include Germany, but for the time being Germany is not a great fighting country. All the nations that have power that can be mobilized are going to be members of this league, including the United States. And what do they unite for? They enter into a solemn promise to one another that they will never use their power against one another for aggression; that they never will impair the territorial integrity of a neighbor; that they never will interfere with the political independence of a neighbor; that they will abide by the principle that great populations are entitled to determine their own destiny and that they will not interfere with that destiny; and that no matter what differences arise amongst them they will never resort to war without first having done one or the other of two things—either submitted the matter of controversy to arbitration, in which case they agree to abide by the result without question, or submitted it to the consideration of the council of the league of nations, laying before that council all the documents, all the facts, agreeing that the council can publish the documents and the facts to the whole world, agreeing that there shall be six months allowed for the mature consideration of those facts by the council, and agreeing that at the expiration of the six months, even if they are not then ready to accept the advice of the council with regard to the settlement of the dispute, they will still not go to war for another three months. In other words, they consent, no matter what happens, to submit every matter of difference between them to the judgment of mankind, and just so certainly as they do that, my fellow citizens, war will be in the far background, war will be pushed out of that foreground of terror in which it has kept the world for generation after generation, and men will know that there will be a calm time of deliberate counsel. The most dangerous thing for a bad cause is to expose it to the opinion of the world. The most certain way that you can prove that a man is mistaken is by letting all his neighbors know what he thinks, by letting all his neighbors discuss what he thinks, and if he is in the wrong you will notice that he will stay at home, he will not walk on the street. He will be afraid of the eyes of his neighbors. He will be afraid of their judgment of his character. He will know that his cause is lost unless he can sustain it by the argu-

ments of right and of justice. The same law that applies to individuals applies to nations.

"But, you say, 'we have heard that we might be at a disadvantage in the league of nations.' Well, whoever told you that either was deliberately falsifying or he had not read the covenant of the league of nations. I leave him the choice. I want to give you a very simple account of the organization of the league of nations and let you judge for yourselves. It is a very simple organization. The power of the league, or rather the activities of the league, lie in two bodies. There is the council, which consists of one representatve from each of the principal allied and associated powers—that is to say, the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan—along with four other representatives of smaller powers chosen out of the general body of the membership of the league. The council is the source of every active policy of the league, and no active policy of the league can be adopted without a unanimous vote of the council. That is explicitly stated in the covenant itself. Does it not evidently follow that the league of nations can adopt no policy whatever without the consent of the United States? The affirmative vote of the representative of the United States is necessary in every case. Now, you have heard of six votes belonging to the British Empire. Those six votes are not in the council. They are in the assembly, and the interesting thing is that the assembly does not vote. I must qualify that statement a litle, but essentially it is absoluely true. In every matter in which the assembly is given a voice, and there are only four or five, its vote does not count unless concurred in by the representatives of all the nations represented on the council, so that there is no validity to any vote of the assembly unless in that vote also the representative of the United States concurs. That one vote of the United States is as big as the six votes of the British Empire. I am not jealous for advantage, my fellow citizens, but I think that is a perfectly safe situation. There is no validity in a vote, either by the council or the assembly, in which we do not concur. So much for the statements about the six votes of the British Empire.

"Look at it in another aspect. The assembly is the talking body. The assembly was created in order that anybody that purposed anything wrong should be subjected to the awkward circumstance that everybody could talk about it. This is the great assembly in which all the things that are likely to disturb the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations are to be exposed to the general view, and I want to ask you if you think it was unjust, unjust to the United States, that speaking parts should be assigned to the several portions of the British Empire? Do you think it unjust that there should be some spokesman in debate for that fine little stout Republic down in the Pacific, New Zealand? Do you think it was unjust that Australia should be allowed to stand up and take part in the debate—Australia, from which we have learned some of the most useful progressive policies of modern time, a little nation only five million in a great continent, but counting for several times five in its activities and in its interest in liberal reform? Do you think it unjust that that little Republic down in South Africa, whose gallant resistance to being subjected to any outside authority at all we admired for so many months and whose fortunes we followed with such interest, should have a speaking part? Great Britain obliged South Africa to submit to her sovereignty, but she immediately after that felt that it was convenient and right to hand the whole self-government of that colony over to the very men whom she had beaten. The representatives of South Africa in Paris were two of the most distinguished generals of the Boer Army, two of the realest men I ever met, two men that could talk sober counsel and wise advice, along with the best statesmen in Europe. To exclude Gen. Botha and Gen. Smuts from the right to stand up in the parliament of the world and say something concerning the affairs of mankind would be absurd. And what about Canada? Is not Canada a good neighbor? I ask you, Is not Canada more likely to agree with the United States than with Great Britain? Canada has a speaking part. And then, for the first time in the history of the world, that great voiceless multitude, that throng hundreds of millions strong in India, has a voice, and I want to testify that some of the wisest and most dignified figures in the peace conference at Paris came from India, men who seemed to carry in their minds an older wisdom than the rest of us had, whose traditions ran back into so many of the unhappy fortunes of mankind that they seemed very useful counselors as to how some ray of hope and some prospect of happiness could be opened to its people. I for my part have no jealousy whatever of those five speaking parts in the assembly. Those speaking parts can not translate themselves into five votes that can in any matter override the voice and purpose of the United States.

"Let us sweep aside all this language of jealousy. Let us be big enough to know the facts and to welcome the facts, because the facts are based upon the principle that America has always fought for, namely, the equality of self-governing peoples, whether they were big or little—not counting men, but counting rights, not counting representation, but counting the purpose of that representation. When you hear an opinion quoted, you do not count the number of persons who hold it; you ask, 'Who said that?' You weigh opinions, you do not count them, and the beauty of all democracies is that every voice can be heard, every voice can have its effect, every voice can contribute to the general judgment that is finally arrived at. That is the object of democracy. Let us accept what America has always fought for, and accept it with pride that America showed the way and made the proposal. I do not mean that America made the proposal in this particular instance; I mean that the principle was an American principle, proposed by America.

"When you come to the heart of the covenant, my fellow citizens, you will find it in article 10, and I am very much interested to know that the other things have been blown away like bubbles. There is nothing in the other contentions with regard to the league of nations, but there is something in article 10 that you ought to realize and ought to accept or reject. Article 10 is the heart of the whole matter. What is article 10? I never am certain that I can from memory give a literal repetition of its language, but I am sure that I can give an exact interpretation of its meaning. Article 10 provides that every member of the league covenants to respect and preserve the territorial integrity and existing political independence of every other member of the league as against external aggression. Not against internal disturbance. There was not a man at that table who did not admit the sacredness of the right of self-determination, the sacredness of the right of any body of people to say that they would not continue to live under the Government they were then living under, and under article 11 of the covenant they are given a place to say whether they will live under it or not. For following article 10 is article 11, which makes it the right of any member of the league at any time 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. I want to give you an illustration of what that would mean.

"You have heard a great deal—something that was true and a great deal that was false—about that provision of the treaty which hands over to Japan the rights which Germany enjoyed in the Province of Shantung in China. In the first place, Germany did not enjoy any rights there that other nations had not already claimed. For my part, my judgment, my moral judgment, is against the whole set of concessions. They were all of them unjust to China, they ought never to have been exacted, they were all exacted by duress from a great body of thoughtful and ancient and helpless people. There never was any right in any of them. Thank God, America never asked for any, never dreamed of asking for any. But when Germany got this concession in 1898, the Government of the United States made no protest whatever. That was not because the Government of the United States was not in the hands of high-minded and conscientious men. It was. William McKinley was President and John Hay was Secretary of State—as safe hands to leave the honor of the United States in as any that you can cite. They made no protest because the state of international law at that time was that it was none of their business unless they could show that the interests of the United States were affected, and the only thing that they could show with regard to the interests of the United States was that Germany might close the doors of Shantung Province against the trade of the United States. They, therefore, demanded and obtained promises that we could continue to sell merchandise in Shantung. Immediately following that concession to Germany there was a concession to Russia of the same sort, of Port Arthur, and Port Arthur was handed over subsequently to Japan on the very territory of the United States. Don't you remember that when Russia and Japan got into war with one another the war was brought to a conclusion by a treaty written at Portsmouth, N. H., and in that treaty, without the slightest intimation from any authoritative sources in America that the Government of the United States had any objection, Port Arthur, Chinese territory, was turned over to Japan? I want you distinctly to understand that there is no thought of criticism in my mind. I am expounding to you a state of international law. Now, read articles 10 and 11. You will see that international law is revolutionized by putting

morals into it. Article 10 says that no member of the league, and that includes all these nations that have demanded these things unjustly of China, shall impair the territorial integrity or the political independence of any other member of the league. China is going to be a member of the league. Article 11 says that any member of the league can call attention to anything that is likely to disturb the peace of the world or the good understanding between nations, and China is for the first time in the history of mankind afforded a standing before the jury of the world. I, for my part, have a profound sympathy for China, and I am proud to have taken part in an arrangement which promises the protection of the world to the rights of China. The whole atmosphere of the world is changed by a thing like that, my fellow citizens. The whole international practice of the world is revolutionized.

"But you will say, 'What is the second sentence of article 10? That is what gives very disturbing thoughts.' The second sentence is that the council of the league shall advise what steps, if any, are necessary to carry out the guaranty of the first sentence, namely, that the members will respect and preserve the territorial integrity and political independence of the other members. I do not know any other meaning for the word 'advise' except 'advise.' The council advises, and it can not advise without the vote of the United States. Why gentlemen should fear that the Congress of the United States would be advised to do something that it did not want to do I frankly can not imagine, because they can not even be advised to do anything unless their own representative has participated in the advice. It may be that that will impair somewhat the vigor of the league, but, nevertheless, the fact is so, that we are not obliged to take any advice except our own, which to any man who wants to go his own course is a very satisfactory state of affairs. Every man regards his own advice as best, and I dare say every man mixes his own advice with some thought of his own interest. Whether we use it wisely or unwisely, we can use the vote of the United States to make impossible drawing the United States into any enterprise that she does not care to be drawn into.

"Yet article 10 strikes at the taproot of war. Article 10 is a statement that the very things that have always been sought in imperialistic wars are henceforth forgone by every ambitious nation in the world. I would have felt very lonely, my fellow countrymen, and I would have felt very much disturbed if, sitting at the peace table in Paris, I had supposed that I was expounding my own ideas. Whether you believe it or not. I know the relative size of my own ideas; I know how they stand related in bulk and proportion to the moral judgments of my fellow countrymen, and I proposed nothing whatever at the peace table at Paris that I had not sufficiently certain knowledge embodied the moral judgment of the citizens of the United States. I had gone over there with, so to say, explicit instructions. Don't you remember that we laid down 14 points which should contain the principles of the settlement? They were not my points. In every one of them I was conscientiously trying to read the thought of the people of the United States, and after I uttered those points I had every assurance given me that could be given me that they did speak the moral judgment of the United States and not my single judgment. Then when it came to that critical period just a little less than a year ago, when it was evident that the war was coming to its critical end, all the nations engaged in the war accepted those 14 principles explicitly as the basis of the armistice and the basis of the peace. In those circumstances I crossed the ocean under bond to my own people and to the other governments with which I was dealing. The whole specification of the method of settlement was written down and accepted beforehand, and we were architects building on those specifications. It reassures me and fortifies my position to find how before I went over men whose judgment the United States has often trusted were of exactly the same opinion that I went abroad to express. Here is something I want to read from Theodore Roosevelt:

"'The one effective move for obtaining peace is by an agreement among all the great powers in which each should pledge itself not only to abide by the decisions of a common tribunal but to back its decisions by force. The great civilized nations should combine by solemn agreement in a great world league for the peace of righteousness; a court should be established. A changed and amplified Hague court would meet the requirements, composed of representatives from each nation, whose representatives are sworn to act as judges in each case and not in a representative capacity.' Now there is article 10. He goes on and says this: 'The nations should agree on certain rights that should not be questioned, such as territorial integrity, their right to deal with their domestic affairs, and with such matters as whom they should admit to citizenship. All such guarantee each of their number in possession of these rights.'

"Now, the other specification is in the covenant. The covenant in another portion guarantees to the members the independent control of their domestic questions. There is not a leg for these gentlemen to stand on when they say that the interests of the United States are not safeguarded in the very points where we are most sensitive. You do not need to be told again that the covenant expressly says that nothing in this covenant shall be construed as affecting the validity of the Monroe doctrine, for example. You could not be more explicit than that. And every point of interest is covered, partly for one very interesting reason. This is not the first time that the Foreign Relations Committee of the Senate of the United States has read and considered this covenant. I brought it to this country in March last in a tentative, provisional form, in practically the form that it now has, with the exception of certain additions which I shall mention immediately. I asked the Foreign Relations Committees of both Houses to come to the White House and we spent a long evening in the frankest discussion of every portion that they wished to discuss. They made certain specific suggestions as to what should be contained in this document when it was to be revised. I carried those suggestions to Paris, and every one of them was adopted. What more could I have done? What more could have been obtained? The very matters upon which these gentlemen were most concerned were, the right of withdrawal, which is now expressly stated; the safeguarding of the Monroe doctrine, which is now accomplished; the exclusion from action by the league of domestic questions, which is now accomplished. All along the line, every suggestion of the United States was adopted after the covenant had been drawn up in its first form and had been published for the criticism of the world. There is a very true sense in which I can say this is a tested American document.

"I am dwelling upon these points, my fellow citizens, in spite of the fact that I dare say to most of you they are perfectly well known, because in order to meet the present situation we have got to know what we are dealing with. We are not dealing with the kind of document which this is represented by some gentlemen to be; and inasmuch as we are dealing with a document simon-pure in respect of the very principles we have professed and lived up to, we have got to do one or other of two things—we have got to adopt it or reject it. There is no middle course. You can not go in on a special-privilege basis of your own. I take it that you are too proud to ask to be exempted from responsibilities which the other members of the league will carry. We go in upon equal terms or we do not go in at all; and if we do not go in, my fellow citizens, think of the tragedy of that result—the only sufficient guaranty to the peace of the world withheld! Ourselves drawn apart with that dangerous pride which means that we shall be ready to take care of ourselves, and that means that we shall maintain great standing armies and an irresistible navy; that means we shall have the organization of a military nation; that means we shall have a general staff, with the kind of power that the general staff of Germany had, to mobilize this great manhood of the Nation when it pleases, all the energy of our young men drawn into the thought and preparation for war. What of our pledges to the men that lie dead in France? We said that they went over there, not to prove the prowess of America or her readiness for another war but to see to it that there never was such a war again. It always seems to make it difficult for me to say anything, my fellow citizens, when I think of my clients in this case. My clients are the children; my clients are the next generation. They do not know what promises and bonds I undertook when I ordered the armies of the United States to the soil of France, but I know, and I intend to redeem my pledges to the children; they shall not be sent upon a similar errand.

"Again and again, my fellow citizens, mothers who lost their sons in France have come to me and, taking my hand, have shed tears upon it not only, but they have added, 'God bless you, Mr. President!' Why, my fellow citizens, should they pray God to bless me? I advised the Congress of the United States to create the situation that led to the death of their sons. I ordered their sons oversea. I consented to their sons being put in the most difficult parts of the battle line, where death was certain, as in the impenetrable difficulties of the forest of Argonne. Why should they weep upon my hand and call down the blessings of God upon me? Because they believe that their boys died for something that vastly transcends any of the immediate and palpable objects of the war. They believe, and they rightly believe, that their sons saved the liberty of the world. They believe that wrapped up with the liberty of the world is the con-

tinuous protection of that liberty by the concerted powers of all civilized people. They believe that this sacrifice was made in order that other sons should not be called upon for a similar gift—the gift of life, the gift of all that died—and if we did not see this thing through, if we fulfilled the dearest present wish of Germany and now dissociated ourselves from those alongside whom we fought in the war, would not something of the halo go away from the gun over the mantelpiece, or the sword? Would not the old uniform lose something of its significance? These men were crusaders. They were not going forth to prove the might of the United States. They were going forth to prove the might of justice and right, and all the world accepted them as crusaders, and their transcendent achievement has made all the world believe in America as it believes in no other nation organized in the modern world. There seems to me to stand between us and the rejection or qualification of this treaty the serried ranks of those boys in khaki, not only these boys who came home, but those dear ghosts that still deploy upon the fields of France.

"My friends, on last Decoration Day I went to a beautiful hillside near Paris, where was located the cemetery of Suresnes, a cemetery given over to the burial of the American dead. Behind me on the slopes was rank upon rank of living American soldiers, and lying before me upon the levels of the plain was rank upon rank of departed American soldiers. Right by the side of the stand where I spoke there was a little group of French women who had adopted those graves, had made themselves mothers of those dear ghosts by putting flowers every day upon those graves, taking them as their own sons, their own beloved, because they had died in the same cause—France was free and the world was free because America had come! I wish some men in public life who are now opposing the settlement for which these men died could visit such a spot as that. I wish that the thought that comes out of those graves could penetrate their consciousness. I wish that they could feel the moral obligation that rests upon us not to go back on those boys, but to see the thing through, to see it through to the end and make good their redemption of the world. For nothing less depends upon this decision, nothing less than the liberation and salvation of the world.

"You will say, 'Is the league an absolute guaranty against war?' No; I do not know any absolute guaranty against the errors of human judgment or the violence of human passion, but I tell you this: With a cooling space of nine months for human passion, not much of it will keep hot. I had a couple of friends who were in the habit of losing their tempers, and when they lost their tempers they were in the habit of using very unparliamentary language. Some of their friends induced them to make a promise that they never would swear inside the town limits. When the impulse next came upon them, they took a street car to go out of town to swear, and by the time they got out of town they did not want to swear. They came back convinced that they were just what they were, a couple of unspeakable fools, and the habit of getting angry and of swearing suffered great inroads upon it by that experience. Now, illustrating the great by the small, that is true of the passions of nations. It is true of the passions of men however you combine them. Give them space to cool off. I ask you this: If it is not an absolute insurance against war, do you want no insurance at all? Do you want nothing? Do you want not only no probability that war will not recur, but the probability that it will recur? The arrangements of justice do not stand of themselves, my fellow citizens. The arrangements of this treaty are just, but they need the support of the combined power of the great nations of the world. And they will have that support. Now that the mists of this great question have cleared away, I believe that men will see the truth, eye to eye and face to face. There is one thing that the American people always rise to and extend their hand to, and that is the truth of justice and of liberty and of peace. We have accepted that truth and we are going to be led by it, and it is going to lead us, and through us the world, out into pastures of quietness and peace such as the world never dreamed of before."

SCANDINAVIAN-AMERICAN BANK, FARGO, N. DAK.

Mr. SHERMAN. Mr. President, I present a press report taken from the Washington Post of October 3, 1919, under the date line of October 2, from Fargo, N. Dak., relating to the affairs of the Scandinavian-American Bank of Fargo, interwoven with which is a league of another kind which enthusiastically indorsed a large quantity of collateral. The bank examiners, however, did not receive it as valid for the loan, and they declared it necessary to put the bank into the hands of a receiver. The collateral was indorsed by the Nonpartisan League, not by the league of nations.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 3, 1919.]

FARGO, N. DAK., BANK HELD INSOLVENT—LOANS TO NONPARTISAN LEAGUE SAID TO BE UNSATISFACTORY.

FARGO, N. DAK., *October 2.*

The Scandinavian-American Bank of Fargo, with liabilities aggregating more than $1,600,000, was to-day declared insolvent by the banking board of North Dakota. It was ordered closed and placed in the hands of a temporary receiver.

The bank has an authorized capital of $50,000 and surplus of $10,000.

Citing a list of loans, mostly to the Nonpartisan League, aggregating $734,194.82, the report to the banking board by the examiners says:

"The above represents the excess loans carried by the bank and constitute more than 60 per cent of the total loans. Their general character is extremely unsatisfactory. The security in almost every case is entirely inadequate, and, in most instances, constitutes second liens on the property held as collateral. Total lack of judgment and unwarranted optimism is responsible for the extension of credit displayed by the list of 20 excess loans, which appears in each instance to be increasing rather than decreasing. In every case neither the financial standing of the makers nor the collateral held by the bank for the loans justifies the credit extended."

The list in question includes the following loans: Nonpartisan League, $148,824.26; Consumers Stores Co., $170,000; league exchanges, $66,182.28; Publishers National Service Bureau, $47,950.06. The last three are classed as subsidiary corporations of the Nonpartisan League, and the report cites that the collateral is largely post-dated checks and notes given by farmers, which, the report says, are controlled by an agent of the Consumers United Stores Co. and the Nonpartisan League.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I have studiously avoided presenting petitions either for or against this important measure, and I ask unanimous consent at this time, for a minute or two, to make a few remarks.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, during the last two or three months I have received, both for and against the ratification of the covenant for a league of nations, a number of letters and some petitions. As these letters and petitions have been addressed to me personally, asking me to vote either for the covenant or against it, without making any argument or giving any particular reasons why I should support or oppose this measure, I have not deemed it of sufficient importance to the Members of this body to have them printed in the RECORD.

I think it is fair to say that most of the letters that I have received in favor of the proposed pending covenant have come from professors of our educational institutions and from some of the preachers in the State.

I would assume that a minister, whose duty it is to preach the gospel of Christ, would naturally advocate treaties and covenants of peace, and no criticisms or comments would be warranted if such were the case, but the singular fact is that some of these ministers preached war with such vehemence and eagerness that one who abhors war would feel justified in at least commenting in a friendly way whether or not universal brotherhood and peace is desired or a one-sided made-to-order agreement shall be ratified.

About the time that Congress adjourned last March I commented upon the attitude of some of the preachers, and especially mentioned that some of the Lutheran ministers seemed to favor the proposed covenant for a league of nations. What I said at that time was greatly amplified and was considered by some of the Lutheran preachers to be an unjust criticism of their position. At that time I received a number of letters from prominent men who are members of the Lutheran Church, asking for an explanation as to why this criticism was made. I did not consider that I would be warranted in entering into a controversy—which, of course, would be printed in the newspapers—with the ministers of any particular church, and for that reason I purposely declined to answer the letters addressed to me upon this subject.

I might say in passing that I belong to the Lutheran Church, and I felt that it was not only a privilege but my duty to call to the attention of the preachers of that denomination the fact that I believed it was an unwarranted interference and that they should withhold their judgment until they had carefully considered this important measure. I did not say that all the preachers of that denomination favored it, and I explicitly stated that I had received letters from only a few.

I am in receipt of a letter dated Valley City, N. Dak., September 28, 1919, calling my attention to the fact that at a conference held at Valley City on the 24th day of September resolutions were passed asking me to use my influence against the league of nations in its present form and asking me to vote against it in its present form.

I want to state most emphatically that it was surely not my purpose to misrepresent or misquote the men who occupy the responsible position of preaching the true gospel of the Im-

maculate Master, and it is for that reason that I am making these few remarks. The letter is very brief, and I will read it.

VALLEY CITY, N. DAK., *September 29, 1919.*

Hon. A. J. GRONNA,
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.

DEAR FRIEND: A conference of 30 ministers, as representatives of the Lutheran Church of this State and of different parts of the State, were in conference at Valley City the 24th and 25th of September. They passed a resolution asking that you use all your influence so that the league of nations will not be passed in its present form, as we believe in America first and Americanism only. The league of nations in its present form is not in harmony with our forefathers, and it only means that we will be entangled with European affairs. It seems to us that some authority in Washington cares more for Great Britain than they do for our country. From what I can learn, as I travel throughout the State and from what these representatives heard and saw, the people in North Dakota are not in favor of the league of nations in its present form; and as we believe in a representative government, the wish of the people should be law.

Hoping that you see your way clear to serve the people, I am,
Yours, with regards,

J. F. L. BOHNHOFF.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a letter which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

LAKE VIEW, OHIO, *October 2, 1919.*

THOMAS R. MARSHALL, Vice President,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR FRIEND: I will ask you to do me a favor. I had a big, fine baby boy to come at my house last Monday morning, September 29. He weighed 12 pounds 8 ounces. I have no name for him. He is a big, fine-looking baby, and I want some bright man to name him. Will you please put this to the Senate and the House of Congress? The man who will give the baby the biggest prize can have the name. Dr. Barrett attended; E. L. Van Horn, Gusty Wales, and Martha Griffin present when the baby was born. This is no fraud. I said before the baby was born if it should be a boy, I would ask some Member of Congress to name him.

This is our first baby, Mr. Marshall. See what you can do for me in regard to getting the biggest prize for naming the baby. I will close for this time. Please let me know soon.

Yours, respectfully,

ANDERSON T. THOMAS.
NANCY J. THOMAS.

Mr. FLETCHER. I have received some petitions from merchants engaged in the grocery business and in general merchandise along the east coast of Florida, several at the following points: De Land, Sanford, New Smyrna, Titusville, City Point, Cocoa, Indian River City, Oak Hill, Lake Helen, De Leon, Mims, Hobe Sound, Salerno, Stuart, Fort Pierce, Vero, Melbourne, Malabar, Okeechobee, Jupiter, and Deerfield. I ask that one of the petitions be printed in the RECORD, it being brief, and that all be referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the petitions were referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, and one was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To our Senators:

We, the undersigned merchants of Florida, favor a measure to subject the big meat packers to regulation similar to that provided by the Kenyon bill. We are opposed to the existing monopoly of meat products, cheese, etc., and we believe that this monopoly should be regulated. We understand that the Kenyon bill provides for Government regulation, but not ownership or operation; that it allows the present owners to operate their plants so long as their operations are fair, nondiscriminatory, and competitive; that it provides for the separate operation of stockyards; and that it puts private refrigerator car lines on a common-carrier basis. We desire hereby to withdraw any petitions, letters, or telegrams in opposition to the Kenyon bill to which our names may have been affixed, for the reason that our former action was taken without an understanding of the contents of the bill and at the request of the packers.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I present a resolution adopted by the Federated Trades Council of Milwaukee, Wis., protesting against the dismissal from the public service of 11 members of the Postal Employees' Union for alleged activities within their union. I ask to have it printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MILWAUKEE, WIS., *October, 1919.*

Whereas it has come to our notice that 11 members of the Postal Employees' Union, Minneapolis, Minn., have been notified of their dismissal from the Postal Service for their activities in the labor movement; and

Whereas this is only another example of the autocratic attitude of Postmaster General Burleson in depriving employees of the Postal Service of their individual rights of citizenship, and if this practice is to go unheeded and unchallenged no Government employee in the future will be safe from persecution nor free to enjoy the liberties guaranteed them by the Constitution of these United States: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Federated Trades Council of Milwaukee, Wis., protests against the dismissal of these 11 employees, which dismissal is additional proof that in the person of Postmaster General Burleson the Government has an official whose very acts belie the fundamental principles of democracy and freedom of thought and speech upon which our Government is founded: And be it further

Resolved, That we herewith demand the reinstatement of these 11 postal employees, and that copies of these resolutions be forwarded to President Wilson and each of the United States Senators and Congressmen from Wisconsin, to the press, and the Postal Employees' Union.

[SEAL.] THE MILWAUKEE FEDERATED TRADES COUNCIL,
By FRANK J. WEBER, *Corresponding Secretary.*

Mr. SIMMONS presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from sundry citizens of Gastonia, N. C., praying for the adoption of the so-called league of nations treaty, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. CURTIS presented memorials of sundry citizens of Northbranch, Moundridge, Buhler, and Inman, all in the State of Kansas, remonstrating against universal military training, which were referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a memorial of the International Farm Congress, of Kansas City, Mo., remonstrating against the present policy adopted by strikers and labor leaders and requesting of the farmers more production and demanding of its members less production, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Wea Township, Miami County, Kans., remonstrating against the adoption of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented a petition of the Herkimer County Pomona Grange, Patrons of Husbandry, of Herkimer, N. Y., praying for the passage of the so-called Capper-Hersman bill granting collective-bargaining privileges to farmers and producers, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of Local Lodge No. 751, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen of America, of Topeka, Kans., and a memorial of Local Lodge No. 231, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, of Wichita, Kans., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Cummins bill providing for private ownership and control of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Wichita, Kans., praying for an increase in the salaries of postal employees, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

Mr. COLT presented a petition of the Board of Aldermen of Providence, R. I., praying that Italy be allowed to settle the Fiume question without interference, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. BRANDEGEE presented a petition of the Lithuanian Dramatic Society, of Waterbury, Conn., praying for the recognition by the United States of the independence of Lithuania, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I desire to announce that on Wednesday next, at the close of the morning business, if the convenience of the Senate will permit, I shall discuss the league of nations.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I gave notice the other day that immediately after the close of the morning business to-day I would ask the Senate for the privilege of discussing the Johnson amendments to the treaty, but I have been informed this morning that there are a number of Senators who wish to call up from now until 2 o'clock bills on the calendar. I therefore will wait until the expiration of the morning hour before proceeding with the discussion of those amendments.

STOLEN MOTOR VEHICLES.

Mr. CUMMINS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 171.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, before we get to that, have we had reports of committees? That is the next order, I believe. We have not reached the calendar yet.

The VICE PRESIDENT. We are on petitions yet.

Mr. CUMMINS. I withdraw my request, but will renew it. I will say it is a bill to provide for the punishment of persons stealing automobiles and other motor vehicles. I think everyone in the Chamber will agree that something ought to be done in this respect. It is a House bill and we ought to pass it.

Mr. FLETCHER. I shall not object to the consideration of the bill when it is in order to call it up.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

Mr. FLETCHER, from the Committee on Commerce, to which was referred the bill (S. 575) to establish load lines for certain vessels, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 246) thereon.

Mr. SMOOT, from the Committee on Public Lands, to which were referred the following bills, reported them severally without amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 46) for the protection of the water supply of the town of Sunnyside, Utah (Rept. No. 247);

A bill (S. 2189) to provide for agricultural entries on coal lands in Alaska (Rept. No. 248); and

A bill (S. 2789) for the consolidation of forest lands in the Sierra National Forest, Calif., and for other purposes (Rept. No. 249).

Mr. WADSWORTH, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to which was referred the bill (S. 2444) to create the Commission on Rural and Urban Home Settlement, reported it with amendments and submitted a report (No. 250) thereon.

Mr. McCUMBER, from the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (S. 2300) for the relief of the estate of Henry A. V. Post, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 245) thereon.

FRANCES SCOVILLE-MUMM.

Mr. STERLING. From the Committee on Immigration I report back favorably, without amendment, the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 90) to readmit Frances Scoville-Mumm to the character and privileges of a citizen of the United States, and I submit a report (No. 243) thereon. I call the attention of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS] to the joint resolution.

Mr. CURTIS. I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Kansas asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the joint resolution was considered as in Committee of the Whole, and was read as follows:

Whereas Frances Scoville-Mumm, daughter of C. C. K. Scoville, a citizen of the United States residing in the State of Kansas, being a native-born citizen of the United States, married in 1913 Walter Mumm, a subject of the then Emperor of Germany, and emigrated to Germany, becoming thereby, under the laws of Germany, a naturalized German subject, to be recognized as such by the United States, according to the provisions of the then existing treaties relating to naturalization between the United States and Germany; and

Whereas the said Frances Scoville-Mumm has since returned to the United States and renewed her residence therein and petitioned Congress to be readmitted to the character and privileges of a citizen of the United States under and by virtue of the power and laws of the United States of America: Therefore

Resolved, etc., That Frances Scoville-Mumm, daughter of the said C. C. K. Scoville, be, and she is hereby, on her own application, unconditionally readmitted to the character and privileges of a citizen of the United States.

Mr. KIRBY. I should like to know why a joint resolution has been introduced for this purpose?

Mr. CURTIS. The beneficiary married a man who had lived in France for about 20 years, but he had never taken out citizenship papers in France, and when the war broke out he was ordered back to Germany, and the French Government took possession of his property and also the property of his wife, who had never lived in Germany. This resolution should pass in order to protect her property rights.

Mrs. Mumm refused to live in Germany, and has since brought a suit for divorce against her husband in Germany, but because of the condition of the courts there she is unable to get any action. The husband and wife have entered into an agreement under which she is free to take any action she may please, go to any country she may please, and take up her residence in any country she may desire; and they entered into an agreement in regard to the property.

Mr. KIRBY. How long has she lived here?

Mr. CURTIS. She was born in the State of Kansas, lived there all her life until she married this man, and following her application for a divorce returned to her home.

Mr. KIRBY. Did the Senator say that she lived for 20 years in France?

Mr. CURTIS. No; she was in France and Switzerland for only about six years. I hope the resolution may pass in order that Mrs. Mumm's property rights may be protected.

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

The preamble was reported from the Committee on Immigration with an amendment to strike out "a subject of the then Emperor of Germany, and emigrated to Germany, becoming thereby, under the laws of Germany, a naturalized German subject, to be recognized as such by the United States, according to the provisions of the then existing treaties relating to naturalization between the United States and Germany," so as to make the preamble read:

Whereas Frances Scoville-Mumm, daughter of C. C. K. Scoville, a citizen of the United States residing in the State of Kansas, being a native-born citizen of the United States, married in 1913 Walter Mumm, an alien of German birth and parentage but at the time of, and for many years prior to, said marriage a resident of France; and

Whereas the said Frances Scoville-Mumm has since returned to the United States and renewed her residence therein and petitioned Congress to be readmitted to the character and privileges of a citizen of the United States under and by virtue of the power and laws of the United States of America.

The amendment to the preamble was agreed to.

The preamble as amended was agreed to.

RESTORATION OF EXCESS DUTIES.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I am directed by the Committee on Finance, to which was referred the bill (S. 495) for the relief of Walston H. Brown, sole surviving partner of the firm of Brown, Howard & Co., and of the Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co., to report it back favorably without amendment, and I submit a report (No. 244) thereon. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill. I would not do that, Mr. President, if I thought it would meet with objection or provoke any debate. If I may be permitted, I will make a brief statement as to the nature and character of the bill pending my request for unanimous consent. I will say that this bill is for the payment of a claim amounting to $92,192.83, as found by the Court of Claims. It is to reimburse the claimants for duties exacted from them by the Treasury Department many years ago in excess of the amount of duty which legally they should have been required to pay. The bill has been reported favorably and has passed the Senate four times. It has also been reported favorably from the Committee on Claims of the House. It has been referred to the Treasury Department, and I have incorporated in the report the approval of the Treasury Department for the payment of the claim. It was also sent to the Court of Claims to report the facts, which it did fully. Upon the question of laches on the part of the claimants, the Court of Claims found that they had paid the money into the Treasury under duress and fully acquitted them of any laches.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the bill. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the bill 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, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Walston H. Brown, sole surviving partner of the firm of Brown, Howard & Co., the sum of $65,792.53, and to the Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co. the sum of $26,400.30, these being the amounts severally found due the said Walston H. Brown & Co. and the Philadelphia & Reading Coal & Iron Co. by the Court of Claims, and transmitted to Congress on the 7th day of February, 1914.

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

ESTATE OF HENRY A. V. POST.

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Senate bill 2300, which was just reported by me from the Committee on Finance. It is one of three bills of similar nature to that which the Senate has just passed. A similar bill has passed the Senate the same number of times as the bill reported by the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] that has just been passed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

There being no objection, the bill 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, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the estate of the late Henry A. V. Post the sum of $50,359.35 for a refund of import duties paid by Henry A. V. Post, Archer N. Martin, Clarence H. Clark, and others, who com-

posed the late firm of Clark, Post & Martin, in excess of the duties imposed by law on steel blooms imported by them, in accordance with Senate Document No. 406, Sixty-third Congress, second session.

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

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 3163) to validate certain declarations of intention to become citizens of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KENDRICK:

A bill (S. 3164) authorizing the Northern Arapahoe Tribe and the Northern Cheyenne Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. KELLOGG:

A bill (S. 3165) for the relief of the widow of Bernard Cavanaugh; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 3166) for the relief of E. J. Hendrycks; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 3167) granting a pension to Caldona Vaughn (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 3168) granting a pension to Alice P. Knapp (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3169) granting a pension to Anderson Hogue (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 113) to appropriate money to the Fort Peck Indians, in the State of Montana, on behalf of delinquent homesteaders, and providing for reimbursement by such homesteaders; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 114) defining what shall constitute a crop failure under the rules and regulations issued by the departments of the Government in making loans of seed wheat to farmers for crop purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

FOREIGN TRADE ZONES.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I introduce a bill by request. I will simply say that there is a bill known as the free-zone bill which has been prepared and introduced by those interested in the proposition. The bill has been changed to a considerable extent, and it has been introduced in the House. Hearings are desired in the Senate, and they are very hopeful that the bill as introduced in the House would also be presented in the Senate, and I am glad to introduce it so that it may be before the committee when the hearings are held.

The bill (S. 3170) to provide for the establishment, operation, and maintenance of foreign-trade zones in ports of entry of the United States, to expedite and encourage foreign commerce, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Commerce.

ANGLO-PERSIAN TREATY.

Mr. McCORMICK. I offer the following resolution, and ask that it may be read and lie on the table.

The resolution (S. Res. 205) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of State be requested to inform the Senate, if not incompatible with the public interest, what representations, if any, have been made to the British Government relative to the Anglo-Persian treaty and what reply, if any, the British Government has made thereto.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will go over under the rule and be printed.

EMPLOYMENT OF ASSISTANT CLERK.

Mr. PENROSE submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 207), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

Resolved, That the Committee on Finance be, and is hereby, authorized to employ an assistant clerk at the rate of $1,800 per annum, to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate until otherwise provided by law.

EMMA GOLDMAN.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I offer a Senate resolution, and ask that it be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 206), as follows:

Whereas the following Associated Press dispatch appeared in the Washington Post of the issue of October 4, 1919, to wit:

"GOLDMAN CASE POSTPONED.

"NEW YORK, *October 3*.

"Emma Goldman, anarchist writer and lecturer, recently released from Missouri penitentiary, who was to have appeared to-day before United States immigration officials on Ellis Island to answer to the charge of being 'an undesirable citizen,' has had her case indefinitely postponed upon orders from Washington, it was stated here to-day at the offices of the commissioner of immigration."

Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Secretary of Labor be, and he is, requested, if not incompatible with the public good, to inform the Senate: (1) If it be true that, as reported, a case against Emma Goldman, as an undesirable citizen, has been indefinitely postponed upon orders from Washington; and if so, (2) for what purpose and cause and (3) by whose orders.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution. I have no remarks to make. I think it should be adopted without debate.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

ROBERT MINOR.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, in connection with the resolution which has just been adopted, I desire to inquire whether the War Department has answered a resolution which was adopted here many weeks ago inquiring as to the reasons why the charges against Robert Minor were withdrawn, why he was not prosecuted, or what steps were taken by the authorities of the War Department in Europe which led to the abandonment of the prosecution and the release of Robert Minor.

I am prompted to make the inquiry because, as I am advised, the War Department has treated with silence the resolution, and I see that Mr. Minor is now in the United States, appearing in various parts of the Union, carrying on a radical propaganda, of course in favor of Bolshevism and the radical elements of this and other lands. May I make bold to inquire whether any reply has been submitted by the War Department?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair always speaks with great hesitancy about such inquiries. When the replies come they are immediately handed down. The Chair has no recollection of any reply ever having come, or having been handed down.

Mr. KING. I would be very glad to call the attention of the War Department to their dereliction of duty. If a reply is not submitted within the next day or two, I shall present another resolution and ask that the Secretary of War be directed to immediately comply with the request involved in the first resolution.

CONTROL OF FOOD PRODUCTS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the action of the House of Representatives disagreeing to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 8624) to amend 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, and requesting a further conference with the Senate on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon.

Mr. GRONNA. I move that the Senate further insist upon its amendments, agree to the further conference asked for by the House, the conferees on the part of the Senate to be appointed by the Chair.

The motion was agreed to, and the Vice President appointed Mr. GRONNA, Mr. NORRIS, and Mr. SMITH of Georgia conferees at the further conference on the part of the Senate.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

The following bills were severally read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Claims:

H. R. 685. An act for the relief of Frank S. Ingalls;

H. R. 974. An act for the relief of W. T. Dingler;

H. R. 1761. An act for the relief of the Farmers' National Bank of Wilkinson, Ind.;

H. R. 1812. An act making an appropriation to compensate James M. Moore for damages sustained while in the service of the Government of the United States;

H. R. 1853. An act to reimburse E. T. Thing and S. A. Thing for losses and damages sustained by them by the negligent dipping of their cattle by the Bureau of Animal Industry, Department of Agriculture;

H. R. 5348. An act for the relief of Mrs. Thomas McGovern;

H. R. 5665. An act for the relief of Carlow Avellina; and

H. R. 6413. An act granting the sum of $549.12 to Clara Kane, dependent parent, by reason of the death of William A. Yenser, late civil employee, killed as a result of an accident at the Philadelphia Navy Yard.

The following bills were each read twice by their titles and referred to the Committee on Indian Affairs:

H. R. 396. An act to authorize the payment of certain amounts for damages sustained by prairie fire on the Rosebud Indian Reservation, in South Dakota; and

H. R. 400. An act authorizing the Sioux Tribe of Indians to submit claims to the Court of Claims.

NATIONAL PROHIBITION—CONFERENCE REPORT (S. DOC. NO. 118).

Mr. STERLING. I submit the report of the committee of conference on House bill 6810, being the national prohibition bill, which I ask to have printed as a document, printed in the RECORD, and lie on the table to be called up later for consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The report is as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to 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, having met, after full and free conference, have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 20, 25, 46, 47, 61, 66, 72, 90, 118, 123, 127, 133, 134, 164, 178, 184, 219, 232, and 233.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 21, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 30, 32, 33, 34, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 48, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 64, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 73, 75, 76, 78, 79, 82, 83, 84, 86, 87, 88, 89, 92, 93, 94, 96, 97, 98, 100, 101, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 119, 120, 121, 122, 124, 125, 126, 128, 131, 132, 135, 136, 138, 139, 140, 141, 143, 144, 145, 146, 147, 148, 149, 150, 151, 152, 153, 154, 155, 156, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 167, 168, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205, 207, 208, 209, 210, 211, 213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 220, 221, 222, 223, 224, 227, 228, 229, 230, 235, 236, 237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278, 279, 280, 282, 283, 284, and 285, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

" : *Provided*, That the foregoing definition shall not extend to dealcoholized wine nor to any beverage or liquid produced by the process by which beer, ale, porter or wine is produced, if it contains less than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol by volume, and is made as prescribed in section 37 of Title II of this act, and is otherwise denominated than as beer, ale, or porter, and is contained and sold in, or from, such sealed and labeled bottles, casks, or containers as the commissioner may by regulation prescribe."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

" : *Provided*, That the foregoing definition shall not extend to dealcoholized wine nor to any beverage or liquid produced by the process by which beer, ale, porter or wine is produced, if it contains less than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol by volume, and is made as prescribed in section 37 of this title, and is otherwise denominated than as beer, ale, or porter, and is contained and sold in, or from, such sealed and labeled bottles, casks, or containers as the commissioner may by regulation prescribe."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert the following: ", and the commissioner is authorized to make such regulations"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "Officers mentioned in said section 1014 are authorized to issue search warrants under the limitations provided in Title XI of the act approved June 15, 1917 (40 Stat. L., p. 217, et seq.)"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 35, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "to the end that the use of intoxicating liquor as a beverage may be prevented.

"Liquor for nonbeverage purposes and wine for sacramental purposes may be manufactured, purchased, sold, bartered, transported, imported, exported, delivered, furnished, and possessed, but only as herein provided, and the commissioner may, upon application, issue permits therefor: *Provided*, That nothing in this act shall prohibit the purchase and sale of warehouse receipts covering distilled spirits on deposit in Government bonded warehouses, and no special tax liability shall attach to the business of purchasing and selling such warehouse receipts."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 43, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following: " use as a beverage, or for intoxicating beverage purposes"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and preserved sweet cider"; and on page 11, line 15, of the engrossed bill strike out the words "other article"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 45, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "the articles named in paragraphs b, c, and d of this section which may be"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 49, and agree to the same with an amendment, as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "29"; and on page 12, line 7, of the engrossed bill strike out the words "the person"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 50, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "any known principal for"; and, on page 12, line 8, of the engrossed bill strike out the words "if any"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 58, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "and except that any person who in the opinion of the commissioner is conducting a bona fide hospital or sanatorium engaged in the treatment of persons suffering from alcoholism, may, under such rules, regulations, and conditions as the commissioner shall prescribe, purchase and use, in accordance with the methods in use in such institution, liquor, to be administered to the patients of such institution under the direction of a duly qualified physician employed by such institution"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 59, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "transport liquor, may be issued for one year, and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 60, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "*Provided*, That the commissioner may without formal application or new bond extend any permit granted under this act or laws now in force after August 31 in any year to December 31 of the succeeding year: *Provided further*, That permits to purchase liquor for the purpose of manufacturing or selling as provided in this act shall not be in force to exceed 90 days from the day of issuance. A permit to purchase liquor for any other purpose shall not be in force to exceed 30 days. Permits"; and on page 13, line 22, of the engrossed bill strike out the words "Every permit"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 62, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In addition to the words proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment, strike out, on page 13, line 25, of the engrossed bill the words "and shall not be in force more than"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 63, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "ten"; and beginning on page 13, line 25, of the engrossed bill, strike out the words "ten days from the day of its issuance," which end on page 14, line 1; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 65, and agree to the same with

an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: ", unless the sale is to be made through a pharmacist designated in the permit and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 74, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Nothing in this title shall be held to apply to the manufacture, sale, transportation, importation, possession, or distribution of wine for sacramental purposes, or like religious rites, except section 6 (save as the same requires a permit to purchase) and section 10 hereof, and the provisions of this act prescribing penalties for the violation of either of said sections. No person to whom a permit may be issued to manufacture, transport, import, or sell wines for sacramental purposes or like religious rites shall sell, barter, exchange, or furnish any such to any person not a rabbi, minister of the gospel, priest, or an officer duly authorized for the purpose by any church or congregation, nor to any such except upon an application duly subscribed by him, which application, authenticated as regulations may prescribe, shall be filed and preserved by the seller. The head of any conference or diocese or other ecclesiastical jurisdiction may designate any rabbi, minister, or priest to supervise the manufacture of wine to be used for the purposes and rites in this section mentioned, and the person so designated may, in the discretion of the commissioner, be granted a permit to supervise such manufacture."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 77, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "liquor. And no"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 80, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following: "unless after careful physical examination of the person for whose use such prescription is sought, or if such examination is found impracticable, then upon the best information obtainable, he"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 81, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In addition to the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment strike out, on page 15, lines 11 and 12 of the engrossed bill, the words "its use as a medicine by the one for whom he prescribes" and insert "the use of such liquor as a medicine by such person"; also on page 15, line 13, after the word "some," of the engrossed bill, insert the word "known"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 85 and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following: "the purpose or ailment for which it is to be used and"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 91, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following: "holding permits to prescribe"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 95, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following: "prescription blanks have been"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 99, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "except in cases of emergency, in which event a record and report shall be made and kept as in other cases"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 102, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "the judicial district and within"; and on page 17, line 16 of the engrossed bill, after the word "occurred," insert ", unless the parties agree on another place"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 111, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following: ", which shall at all times be open to inspection as in this act provided"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 129, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "of the"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 130, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "to purchase or ship the same, together with the name and address of the person using the permit"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 137, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert the following: "No one shall permit any sign or billboard containing such advertisement to remain upon one's premises"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 142, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "No"; and on page 22, line 12, after the word "receive" of the engrossed bill, insert the following: ", nor knowingly permit his employee to solicit or receive"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 157, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 23. That any person who shall, with intent to effect a sale of liquor, by himself, his employee, servant, or agent, for himself or any person, company or corporation, keep or carry around on his person, or in a vehicle, or other conveyance whatever, or leave in a place for another to secure, any liquor, or who shall travel to solicit, or solicit, or take, or accept orders for the sale, shipment, or delivery of liquor in violation of this title is guilty of a nuisance and may be restrained by injunction, temporary and permanent, from doing or continuing to do any of said acts or things.

"In such proceedings it shall not be necessary to show any intention on the part of the accused to continue such violation if the action is brought within 60 days following any such violation of the law."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 163, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert the following: "the containers thereof"; and, on page 27, line 17, of the engrossed bill, strike out the words "other property" and insert "such property so"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 165, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "unless the court shall otherwise order"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 166, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"The term 'private dwelling' shall be construed to include the room or rooms used and occupied not transiently but solely as a residence in an apartment house, hotel, or boarding house. The property seized on any such warrant shall not be taken from the officer seizing the same on any writ of replevin or other like process."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 185, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "brought for violation of law," and on page 30, line 13, after the word "of" in the engrossed bill, insert ", if not claimed within 60 days from the date this section takes effect"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 195, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"The penalties provided in this act against the manufacture of liquor without a permit shall not apply to a person for manufacturing nonintoxicating cider and fruit juices exclusively for use in his home, but such cider and fruit juices shall not be sold or delivered except to persons having permits to manufacture vinegar."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 206, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "reported, provided"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 212, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "the commissioner or any of his agents or by any public prosecutor or by any person designated by him, or by any peace officer in the State where the record is kept, and copies of such records and reports duly certified by the person with whom kept or filed may be introduced in evidence with like effect as the originals thereof, and verified copies of such records shall be furnished to the commissioner when called for"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 218, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out by the Senate amendment insert the following: "shall be assessed against, and collected from, the person responsible for such illegal manufacture or sale"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 225, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

": *Provided*, That such liquid may be removed and transported, under bond and under such regulations as the commissioner may prescribe, from one bonded plant or warehouse to another for the purpose of having the alcohol extracted therefrom. And such liquids may be developed, under permit, by persons other than the manufacturers of beverages containing less than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol by volume, and sold to such manufacturers for conversion into such beverages."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 226, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"Credit shall be allowed on the tax due on any alcohol so saved to the amount of any tax paid upon distilled spirits or brandy used in the fortification of the liquor from which the same is saved.

"When fortified wines are made and used for the production of nonbeverage alcohol, and dealcoholized wines containing less than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol by volume, no tax shall be assessed or paid on the spirits used in such fortification, and such dealcoholized wines produced under the provisions of this act, whether carbonated or not, shall not be subject to the tax on artificially carbonated or sparkling wines, but shall be subject to the tax on still wines only.

"In any case where the manufacturer is charged with manufacturing or selling for beverage purposes any malt, vinous, or fermented liquids containing one-half of 1 per cent or more of alcohol by volume, or in any case where the manufacturer, having been permitted by the commissioner to develop a liquid such as ale, beer, porter, or wine containing more than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol by volume in the manner and for the purpose herein provided, is charged with failure to reduce the alcoholic content of any such liquid below such one-half of 1 per cent before withdrawing the same from the factory, then in either such case the burden of proof shall be on such manufacturer to show that such liquid so manufactured, sold, or withdrawn contains less than one-half of 1 per cent of alcohol by volume. In any suit or proceeding involving the alcoholic content of any beverage, the reasonable expense of analysis of such beverage shall be taxed as costs in the case."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 231, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: ", except such executive officers as may be appointed by the commissioner or the Attorney General to have immediate direction of the enforcement of the provisions of this act, and persons authorized to issue permits, and agents and inspectors in the field service,"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 234, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "required"; and on page 37, line 5, after the word "act," in the engrossed bill, insert "including personal services in the District of Columbia, and for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of $2,000,000 for the use of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and $100,000 for the use of the Department of Justice for the enforcement of the provisions of this act, including personal services in the District of Columbia and necessary printing and binding"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 257, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following: "the use of any scientific university or college of learning, any laboratory for use exclusively in scientific research, or for use in any hospital or sanatorium"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 281, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate amendment insert the following:

"SEC. 20. That it shall be unlawful to import or introduce into the Canal Zone, or to manufacture, sell, give away, dispose of, transport, or have in one's possession or under one's control within the Canal Zone, any alcoholic, fermented, brewed, distilled, vinous, malt, or spirituous liquors, except for sacramental, scientific, pharmaceutical, industrial, or medicinal purposes, under regulations to be made by the President, and any such liquors within the Canal Zone in violation hereof shall be forfeited to the United States and seized: *Provided*, That this section shall not apply to liquor in transit through the Panama Canal or on the Panama Railroad.

"That each and every violation of any of the provisions of this section shall be punished by a fine of not more than $1,000 or imprisonment not exceeding six months for a first offense, and by a fine not less than $200 nor more than $2,000 and imprisonment not less than one month nor more than five years for a second or subsequent offense.

"That all offenses heretofore committed within the Canal Zone may be prosecuted and all penalties therefor enforced in the same manner and to the same extent as if this act had not been passed."

And the Senate agree to the same.

THOMAS S. STERLING,
KNUTE NELSON,
LEE S. OVERMAN,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

A. J. VOLSTEAD,
DICK T. MORGAN,
E. Y. WEBB,
Managers on the part of the House.

PREVENTION OF INFLUENZA.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 76) for the investigation of influenza and allied diseases, in order to determine their cause and methods of prevention. It is a joint resolution which must be passed immediately if benefits are to be derived from it. It proposes to appropriate $1,000,000 for use of the Public Health Service in investigating the cause and methods for the prevention of the spread of influenza. I believe it to be imperative that the joint resolution should be passed at once.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

Mr. SMOOT. I ask that the joint resolution be read.

Mr. KING. Reserving the right to object, I should like to have the joint resolution read.

The Secretary read the joint resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. I object to the present consideration of the joint resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It will go over. Morning business is closed.

STOLEN MOTOR VEHICLES.

Mr. CUMMINS. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 9203) to punish the transportation of stolen motor vehicles in interstate or foreign commerce.

Mr. SMOOT. Let the bill be read.

Mr. CUMMINS. I want Senators to know what the bill is. The favorite place for such thefts is near a State line, where vehicles are carried quickly across the State line, and there is very great difficulty in securing the punishment of the offender. The bill is for the purpose of giving the Federal courts jurisdiction for the punishment of such an offender.

Mr. FLETCHER. May I inquire of the Senator on what ground he bases the right of Federal authorities to prosecute for theft?

Mr. CUMMINS. It is found in section 3 of the bill, as follows:

That whoever shall transport or cause to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce a motor vehicle, knowing the same to have been stolen, shall be punished by a fine.

and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Utah has requested that the bill be read. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read the bill; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to its consideration. The bill had been reported from the Committee on Interstate Commerce with an amendment, on page 2, line 18, after the word "offender," to strike out the remainder of the bill in the following words: "A judgment of conviction or acquittal upon the merits under the laws of any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, of any defendant charged with stealing any motor vehicle shall, as against any such defendant, be a bar to a prosecution hereunder for transporting such motor vehicle in interstate commerce," so as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That this act may be cited as the national motor vehicle theft act.

SEC. 2. That when used in this act:

(a) The term "motor vehicle" shall include an automobile, automobile truck, automobile wagon, motor cycle, or any other self-propelled vehicle not designed for running on rails;

(b) The term "interstate or foreign commerce" as used in this act shall include transportation from one State, Territory, or the District of Columbia to another State, Territory, or the District of Columbia, or to a foreign country, or from a foreign country to any State, Territory, or the District of Columbia.

SEC. 3. That whoever shall transport or cause to be transported in interstate or foreign commerce a motor vehicle, knowing the same to have been stolen, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment of not more than five years, or both.

SEC. 4. That whoever shall, with the intent to deprive the owner of the possession thereof, receive, conceal, store, barter, sell, or dispose of any motor vehicle, moving as, or which is a part of, or which constitutes interstate or foreign commerce, knowing the same to have been stolen, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment of not more than five years, or both.

SEC. 5. That any person violating this act may be punished in any district in or through which such motor vehicle has been transported or removed by such offender.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I am heartily in accord with the object to be accomplished by the passage of such a statute. I notice in section 4, on page 2, the bill provides—

That whoever shall, with the intent to deprive the owner of the possession thereof, receive, conceal, store, barter, sell, or dispose of any motor vehicle, moving as, or which is a part of, or which constitutes interstate or foreign commerce, knowing the same to have been stolen, shall be punished by a fine of not more than $5,000, or by imprisonment of not more than five years, or both.

The previous section, 3, penalizing the transportation of such a vehicle by anybody knowing the same to have been stolen, does not contain the clause providing that the same must have been done "with the intent to deprive the owner of the possession thereof." I have no familiarity with the bill or with the testimony that was given in connection with the hearings, but I wondered, if you prove that a person knows the vehicle to have been stolen, why the Government also has to prove that it was stored or received with the intent to deprive the owner of the possession of it. I think that language might possibly be eliminated and strengthen the statute a little without conferring any hardship upon the thief or the receiver of the stolen goods.

Mr. CUMMINS. This is a House bill, and the Senate committee accepted in the main the work of the House. I see no substantial objection, however, to the point made by the Senator from Connecticut. The practice is to steal an automobile close to a State line and run it across the State line. The first section is intended to punish anyone who does that thing, knowing the vehicle to have been stolen. The further practice is, if possible, to dispose of the vehicle to some other party, confederate or otherwise, when it gets across the State line, and section 4 is for the purpose of punishing a man who barters or sells or disposes of the property with intent to deprive the owner of the possession thereof, or if he conceals it knowing it to have been stolen. I think that would probably embrace every case that could be reached.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not know that I would propose an amendment, if an amendment has not already been recommended by the committee which necessitates further action by the House. My first impression would be that a man who receives and stores or helps to transport goods he knows to have been stolen ought not to be able to require the Government to prove that he rendered this assistance with intent to deprive the owner of the possession thereof, because, I think, it would be very difficult to prove that a garage keeper, when he knew an automobile had been stolen and he was requested to receive it overnight and equip it and repair it and furnish it with gasoline to continue its flight, did it with intent to deprive the owner of the possession. He might well say that although he knew the automobile was stolen, he sheltered it to prevent it from being damaged, and if there was any chance for its recovery, it was certainly a benefit to the owner to have it restored to him in good condition rather than in the condition which would have resulted if he had not afforded it shelter. In other words, I think the insertion of the language to which I have called attention in section 4 throws a burden upon the Government which it is not necessary, in the interest of justice, to cast upon it, and provides a loophole for the accessory to the theft to escape penalty; and I wonder if the Senator would not agree to a suggestion to strike out those words for the purpose of letting the matter go to conference.

Mr. CUMMINS. We can at least let it go to conference.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. That was all I was going to suggest. In section 4, page 2, line 9, I suggest that there be stricken out the words "with the intent to deprive the owner of the possession thereof." I do that simply for the purpose of giving the conferees an opportunity to consider the advisability of striking that language out.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think the language would have to be changed a little further, for we could not very well make a criminal of a person who received the stolen vehicle, even though he knew it to be stolen, if he were holding it in order to enable the owner to recover it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. No; but the language is——

Mr. NELSON. If the Senator from Iowa will allow me, I desire to say that if he will examine the authorities he will find that one of the elements of the offense of stealing is the deprivation of the owner of the thing stolen without his consent, and the words referred to by the Senator from Connecticut do no harm, though they are really surplusage. Their meaning is implied in the word "theft" or in the stealing. If the Senator will look at the textbooks he will find that a part of the element of the offense is depriving the owner thereof without his consent.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think the Senator from Minnesota is entirely right about that, although the section covers persons other than those who commit the theft. That is the reason, I presume, the language referred to by the Senator from Connecticut is found in the bill.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. If there is a reason for the language being used there at all, I suggest for the consideration of the Senator from Iowa whether the section ought not to be so modified as not simply to provide as to depriving the owner of the possession but depriving the party who is entitled to the possession of the vehicle of such possession, for many of these vehicles are leased by the month.

Mr. CUMMINS. That probably is a case that may arise; and I am willing to accept an amendment along the line of that proposed by the Senator from Connecticut in order to bring the matter into conference.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I would not offer an amendment if the matter could be brought into conference without an amendment.

Mr. CUMMINS. But it could not be.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. No. Therefore, in section 4, page 2, line 9, I move to strike out the words "with the intent to deprive the owner of the possession thereof," simply for the purpose of bringing the subject before the conference committee.

Mr. CUMMINS. With that idea in mind, I shall not oppose the amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In section 4, page 2, line 9, after the word "shall," it is proposed to strike out the words "with the intent to deprive the owner of the possession thereof."

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from Connecticut.

The amendment was agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the committee amendment to section 5 is agreed to.

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

Mr. KING. I desire to inquire of the Senator from Iowa whether there was any amendment made to section 5 of the bill?

Mr. CUMMINS. Such an amendment to that section as the Senator has in mind, I think, was not thought necessary; and I do not think it would be wise if it were necessary.

Mr. KING. I desire to make an inquiry of the Senator. I have but hastily read the bill and was not present in committee when it was considered.

Mr. CUMMINS. This bill was considered by the Committee on Interstate Commerce. It was not considered by the Judiciary Committee.

Mr. KING. The language of the bill would indicate that the prosecution might be instituted in a State or district other than

that in which the defendant, who is charged with the reception and concealment of the automobile, resided.

Mr. CUMMINS. I do not catch the Senator's point.

Mr. KING. As I have hastily read the bill, section 5 would seem to indicate that if an automobile, for instance, were stolen in Maryland and were concealed by some person in New York, knowing it to have been stolen, if it passed through the State of Pennsylvania or Delaware en route to New York, the prosecution of the defendant who concealed the automobile in the State of New York might be instituted in Pennsylvania or in Delaware.

Mr. CUMMINS. It would only be a question of priority of jurisdiction. If a person steals an automobile or is alleged to have stolen an automobile and is prosecuted for that offense and is acquitted upon the merits, of course, he could not be convicted of transporting the stolen vehicle into any other jurisdiction. I think the Senator from Utah will agree with me upon that.

Mr. KING. I agree with the Senator as to that; but I do not think he comprehends the point I am trying to make. The question is, where would the action be brought against an offender where the vehicle had been taken from one State through a number of States and had finally reached the State in which the offender concealed it? Where would he be prosecuted?

Mr. CUMMINS. That question is answered by the first part of section 5, which reads:

> That any person violating this act may be punished in any district in or through which such motor vehicle has been transported or removed by such offender.

Mr. KING. That is the thing of which I am complaining. If I read that language aright, it would seem to indicate that some person who concealed an automobile in the State in which he resided might be punished in any one of the half dozen States through which the vehicle was conveyed after it had been stolen. If that is true, it seems to me it is very dangerous legislation. I think the venue in which the prosecution may be had ought to be where the defendant resides.

Mr. CUMMINS. Of course, that would destroy the bill entirely. I can not conceive how anyone could be unduly punished or punished in a jurisdiction in which he ought not to be punished under the provision—

> That any person violating this act may be punished in any district in or through which such motor vehicle has been transported or removed by such offender.

The person who takes an automobile or vehicle in his garage contrary to the provisions of section 4 and does not assist in the transportation of the vehicle into some other jurisdiction can not be punished save in his own jurisdiction, because the vehicle must be transported or removed by the offender in order to bring him within section 5.

Mr. KING. If that is the interpretation, I think that the section is all right.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think that is the interpretation that should be placed upon it.

Mr. KING. But I had in mind a person who merely received an automobile which had been conveyed through a half dozen States and concealed it in the State in which he resided and in the State where it was delivered to him, in which event it is obvious to me that he ought not to be prosecuted in some other State through which the automobile was carried.

Mr. CUMMINS. That would be objectionable, but I do not think that could happen under this provision because of the words I have just read, namely, "in or through which such motor vehicle has been transported or removed." If we stop there, the objection of the Senator from Utah would be sound, but it says further, "by such offender." Therefore, it can not reach the case suggested by the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. If Senators on the committee are clear that this would not permit the prosecution of a person who merely received, knowing it to be stolen, a stolen automobile, in some State through which it had passed rather than in the State where he resided, I would have no objection to the provision.

Mr. CUMMINS. I think that is the understanding of the committee.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. CUMMINS. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Would it not be possible to prevent the theft of automobiles by a method of Federal taxation? Suppose the Federal Government levies a tax upon the sale of every automobile and requires every sale, even of a second-hand vehicle, to be registered, say, with the postmaster of the community or with the internal-revenue officer, so that anyone in possession of an automobile must also be in possession of the certificate of purchase upon which a tax of a small amount has been paid, would not that, while it would raise perhaps a moderate amount of money, make it impossible for any person to operate an automobile without being in possession of the certificate of purchase?

Mr. CUMMINS. I can see that that might be a means of detection and possibly a great protection to the owners of automobiles; but, unfortunately, the House has not proposed a measure of that kind, and the Senate can not propose a measure of that kind.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I realize that what the Senator says is true; but it seems to me a large number of automobile thefts are chiefly for the purpose of sale; most of the men who steal automobiles sell them; it is a regular business. If every sale must be under a certificate and must be registered, without any regard to interstate commerce or passing from one State to another, it seems to me it might be possible to put a stop to that illegitimate business.

Mr. CUMMINS. That is a thought well worthy of consideration; but I am just advised by two members of the Finance Committee, who sit near me, that that has been found impracticable; that it has been considered and been rejected.

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

The bill was read the third time and passed.

RETIREMENT AS LIEUTENANT GENERAL.

Mr. KNOX. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of Calendar No. 173, being the bill (S. 2867) to authorize the President, when Maj. Gen. Crowder retires, to place him on the retired list of the Army as a lieutenant general.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I will not at this time object to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania, but I am going to ask as soon as the bill to which he has referred is considered that we go on with the calendar regularly, as this is Calendar Monday.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Pennsylvania?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Military Affairs with amendments on page 2, line 1, after the word "pay," to strike out "and emoluments," and in the same line, after the word "grade," to insert "as fixed by section 24 of the act of Congress approved July 15, 1870," so as to make the bill read:

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That in view of the long and faithful services of Maj. Gen. E. H. Crowder, Judge Advocate General of the United States Army, and especially his conspicuous services as Provost Marshal General in conjunction with the various State and Territorial executives and the local and district boards, in the execution of the selective-service law, the President is hereby authorized, when that officer retires, to place him on the retired list of the Army as a lieutenant general, with the pay of that grade as fixed by section 24 of the act of Congress approved July 15, 1870; and to grant him a commission in accordance with such advanced rank.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, the purpose of this bill may be expressed in a sentence. It would permit Gen. Crowder to be placed upon the retired list of the Army as a lieutenant general. This is in recognition of his long and faithful service of 42 years in the Army, and especially of his conspicuous services as Provost Marshal General in the execution of the selective-service law.

When we entered suddenly, all unprepared, into the Great World War the Nation was confronted with a thousand problems, none simple and many of such magnitude as to appear appalling and almost impossible of timely solution. Of all of these problems none was of greater magnitude than that one which involved the raising of armies. It was not a mere question of raising a sufficient number of brave and able men, however great that number might be. We doubted neither the courageous patriotism of American manhood nor the self-sacrificing encouragement of American womanhood.

But our experience in former wars, and particularly the experience of Great Britain in this war, had proven the great danger of permitting the volunteer system to strip the fields, to cripple the factories, and to deprive the wife and children of protector and breadwinner, while the slacker, the drone, and the unessential, failing in their paramount duty to their country, skulked behind to fatten on the profits of war. On the other hand, our own experience in the War between the States made most of us fearful of forcible conscription.

There was urgent and instant need, if we were to reach a correct and timely solution of this problem, for a man of almost unheard of qualifications, amounting, indeed, to those of genius. We must have not only a military man of exhaustive learning and experience in that field but a man so thoroughly trained in municipal and international law as to be able to propose, to draft, to interpret, and to administer laws; a man of such social and economic learning as to protect and preserve our social and economic institutions; a man of such broad

knowledge, such rich imagination, and such prescient vision as to foresee every danger and avoid every pitfall.

The question has American genius produced such a man had already been answered. Early in 1913, before war or the rumor of war had begun to convulse the world, the then President of the United States, about to retire from the White House, was impelled to spread upon the official and public records of the War Department his official estimate of a man whose service to the Nation had, for many years and in many climes, been performed under his personal observation. In a letter addressed on January 9, 1913, to Secretary of War Stimson, President Taft, after relating the long and brilliant military, governmental, and international career of an officer of the United States Army, said of that officer:

Whenever contingency arises in which it is necessary to have a man of great experience, a law administrator and a lawgiver, Gen. Crowder would be peculiarly fitted to satisfy the governmental need. I regard him as the best Judge Advocate General we have had in a long time. He is a real lawyer; his opinions are based on his own judgment and do not respond merely to the wishes of the man who asks his opinion. He is a student of law and politics and economics, and therefore makes a rare combination in that reserve of useful men available for governmental exigency which fits a nation to meet any crisis.

In placing upon the public records of the War Department this official recognition of Gen. Crowder's efficiency, Secretary Stimson also placed himself on record by writing to the President:

All that you say of his ability and efficiency has been confirmed by what I have seen of him during the year and a half that I have been in this department. In the many acute questions of Army reorganization which have come up in connection with the legislation of last year, as well as in connection with the number of bills of proposed legislation which have as yet not become law, he has evinced a sound judgment, a capacity, and a reliability which are beyond all praise. Upon him have fallen the legal problems of a very difficult period, and his opinions have been thoroughly independent as well as sound and broad. I quite concur with your view of his possession of a combination of rare qualities which place him "in that reserve of useful men available for governmental exigency which fits a nation to meet any crisis."

And so when the crisis arose the present Secretary of War turned to Enoch H. Crowder to solve the great problem of the day. Without an instant's hesitation Gen. Crowder, with an exhaustive and all-inclusive knowledge of our own experience and that of the British, declared himself for selective conscription as against the volunteer system; and before the ink was well set upon our declaration of war the Secretary of War and the President had approved Gen. Crowder's plan and forwarded to the Congress his draft of an act destined to achieve complete success and perfect popularity, and now come by common and universal consent to be known by its true name, the selective-service law.

It has been well and truly said that Enoch H. Crowder was the architect of this law and the genius of its execution. I shall not endeavor to relate the brilliant history of this superb accomplishment. Let me rather read to you the expressions of the mature judgment of those men best fitted to speak of it because of their intimate knowledge and broad vision. On June 7, 1917, two days after the first registration, the Secretary of War, in a public letter, said to Gen. Crowder:

You have done the biggest thing of its kind we have ever been called upon to try and you have surrounded it with an atmosphere which not only created the success but made of it a stimulating demonstration of our national solidarity and patriotism.

A little more than a month later the Secretary of War again expressed in a public letter to Gen. Crowder official recognition and appreciation of his great work. He said:

When this letter reaches you the actual drawing of the numbers selecting the men for the first National Army of 500,000 men will have been completed and the third stage in your great task brought to a successful conclusion. First, you drafted the law for this great undertaking; second, you perfected with extraordinary accuracy the registration; and third, you worked out with infinite patience and zeal the arrangements for the great choice which affects the careers and lives of so many of the young men of our country.

It is not necessary for me to recount the embarrassments and difficulties which you have had to face; they would have discouraged, if not appalled, one having less devotion or less clear and serviceable knowledge.

There remain, of course, the difficulties of applying the exemptions provided by the statute, and to this task I know you will give the same splendid service; but I can not allow this epoch-making achievement to pass even this stage of its accomplishment without tendering you my personal and official thanks and expressing my judgment that the country owes to you the success which has attended the steps so far taken.

And a month later, on August 19, 1917, when the task of selecting the first increment of our armies had begun to show tangible results, only three months after the passage of the law, that great American, Theodore Roosevelt, speaking for all Americans, said:

I regard Gen. Crowder's work with the draft as one of the best specific bits of work our Army has done in my time. I knew he would do it well, but I had no idea of how very well it would be. Of all our people in the first six months of the war, he is the man who has actually accomplished most, the man to whom all good Americans should be most grateful. I respect—and I fear that I envy—the man who has earned the right to have this said of him.

Three months later, when the first half million selected Americans had been mobilized, the Secretary of War, in a public address in New York, again gave Gen. Crowder ungrudging and unstinted credit for the great work he was accomplishing.

As the civilian head of the War Department—

He said—

I have had an intimate, a most intimate, opportunity to observe the writing and working out of the selective-service law. I know better than anybody else who wrote it, who interpreted it, and who accomplished in the main its success. There are in the lives of all men some moments which, above all others, are supreme, and this moment is justly entitled to be a supreme moment in the life of Gen. Crowder.

From the first moment when this matter was considered it absorbed his attention. It was a period of labor most abundant, of devotion most complete and entire, bringing a long and brilliant military career and a wide, intimate acquaintance with military law and a deep knowledge of human nature to the perfection of a task believed to be impossible, and perhaps in anybody else's hands many times more difficult. And the United States has achieved this great victory, for this is a victory in this war. We are entitled to-night to lay the credit where it belongs and to salute the draftsman of this law and its interpreter as our guide, our counselor, and our helper in the entire matter.

Mr. President, allow me to quote one other man who, as a former Secretary of State, as a former Secretary of War, and as a great citizen, has the right to speak for the American people.

At the end of August of last year, when our great endeavor was reaching fruition, in an address to the American Bar Association, Elihu Root said:

It was a fortunate circumstance that the President placed in the hands of the head of the law department of the Army the application of the law for conscription and for the raising of the vast army already in France and the still greater army which is about to follow, for, in the first place, the Judge Advocate General, Gen. Crowder, when he became Provost Marshal General, applied the new law under the war power of the Constitution to the people of the country with a just sense of their legal rights and the legal principles to which they were accustomed. I do not want to pass his name without expressing a sense of satisfaction and doing honor to that admirable and able and effective officer, Gen. Crowder. We have had much criticism, many things have necessarily gone wrong, many things have made us unhappy, but we could always turn to him and to his work as proof that virtue still remained in the American people. Whatever has gone wrong it has not gone wrong with him, and the result of his work is a million and a half of American soldiers in France to-day, and a million and more that are yet to go. Gen. Crowder, as I say, applied the new law under war powers to the American people with a just sense of their legal rights. The result is that the draft has taken its place throughout America with the good will and the satisfaction and the undiminished patriotism and the enthusiasm of the entire people, and the boys who have been drafted and have gone into the National Army are as full of patriotism as any man that ever marched in any army.

If we look abroad, Mr. President, for unbiased estimates of America's accomplishments, we are immediately confronted with unhesitating recognition of the great work of this great soldier and citizen. When the end of the fighting came and the world paused to measure results, Lord Northcliffe, with the keen insight of a skilled journalist and the impartial judgment of an outside observer, spontaneously proclaimed to all the world that America had performed the two greatest miracles of modern days—the one, the raising by scientific selection of her gigantic and invincible armies without a disastrous effect upon her social or economic life; the other, the safe and speedy transportation of those armies to the far-flung lines of battle.

Mr. President, little remains for me to say. I have called the witnesses and they have made the case. My personal and official acquaintance with Gen. Crowder began when, as Secretary of State, I had the pleasure of conferring with him about those grave and intricate questions upon whose correct solution depended the fate and fortune of the young Republic of Cuba. I then formed the same opinion of his great ability, of his broad learning, of his superior wisdom, and of his disinterested loyalty and patriotism as that expressed by those whom I have quoted. As the years have passed and those characteristics have led him from great to greater accomplishment so has my high opinion grown higher.

His long and brilliant military career of 42 years, succinctly set out in the report furnished to the committee by the War Department, shows his full and rich experience as a soldier, as a lawyer, as a diplomat, and as an executive. From the young lieutenant of the early eighties, with long and active service in the Indian wars, he ran the gamut until he became a member of the General Staff, whence he went to Manchuria to serve as our military observer for a year with the first army of Kuroki in the Russo-Japanese War; after which he was chief of the first division of the General Staff. From the position of military instructor at the University of Missouri, where he studied law upon his native heath, he went through all the legal

experience of the Army officer, including service as an associate justice of the Supreme Court of the Philippine Islands, until he became Judge Advocate General.

Time forbids further reference to this bald but extensive record of his career, and I shall ask that it be printed as part of these remarks.

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

CROWDER, ENOCH H.

Cadet, United States Naval Academy, September 1, 1877.
Second lieutenant, Eighth Cavalry, June 11, 1881.
First lieutenant, July 5, 1886.
Major, judge advocate, January 11, 1895.
Accepted, January 24, 1895.
Lieutenant colonel, judge advocate, June 22, 1898.
Accepted, June 24, 1898.
Vacated, August 18, 1899.
Lieutenant colonel, Thirty-ninth United States Infantry, August 17, 1899.
Accepted, August 18, 1899.
Honorably discharged, May 6, 1901.
Lieutenant colonel, judge advocate, May 21, 1901.
Brigadier general, June 20, 1901.
Accepted, June 21, 1901.
Honorably discharged, June 30, 1901.
Colonel, judge advocate, April 16, 1903.
Brigadier general, Judge Advocate General (act Feb. 2, 1901), February 15, 1911.
Accepted, February 15, 1911.
Major general, October 6, 1917.

Served on frontier duty at Fort Brown, Tex., September 29 to October 30, 1881; Santa Maria, Tex., to December 28, 1881; Fort Brown, Tex., to April 1, 1882; Santa Maria, Tex., to June 2, 1882; and Fort Brown, Tex., to July 21, 1884; on leave of absence to October 1, 1884; on duty at Jefferson Barracks, Mo., to June 30, 1885; as professor of military science and tactics at the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., to July 23, 1886; scouting in New Mexico to October 7, 1886; as professor of military science and tactics at the University of Missouri, Columbia, Mo., October 11, 1886, to September 1, 1889; and on frontier duty at Fort Yates, N. Dak., to April 19, 1891; captain and acting judge advocate, headquarters department of Platte, from April 21, 1891, to January 11, 1895; at Omaha, judge advocate, department of Platte, until March 13, 1898; at same place, judge advocate, department of Missouri, to April 17, 1898; judge advocate, First Independent Division, and Fourth Army Corps, Mobile, Ala., April 17 to May 22, 1898; judge advocate, expeditionary forces, May 28 to June 23, 1898; judge advocate Department of Pacific, and Eighth Army Corps, June 23, 1898, to June 3, 1899; associate justice of supreme court, Philippine Island, May 29, 1899 to ——; detached service, Iloilo, P. I., with verbal instructions from corps commander, December 26, 1898, to January 8, 1899; member of commission to determine capitulation of Manila and Spanish Army, August 14, 1898; commissioner to treat with commission appointed by Gen. Aguinaldo, January 9 to February 1, 1899; commissioner to receive records of Royal Spanish Court at Manila, April 17 to June 26, 1899; President board of claims, Philippine Islands, April 18 to ——; special duty, law department, military governor's office in the Philippines, June 4, 1899, to November, 1901; on commission to receive surrender of Manila, and as judge advocate Department of the Pacific and Eighth Army Corps; judge advocate Philippines Division; associate justice of the supreme court (civil branch); legal adviser and secretary to the military governor; president board of war claims; on board of officers for conference with commissioners of Aguinaldo; on board of officers for revision of customs, tariff, and regulations, Philippine Islands; counsel for the Government, 1902, in the Deming case in the United States circuit court and circuit court of appeals, and on appeal therefrom to the Supreme Court of the United States; assigned to the General Staff, August 15, 1903; detached for duty in 1904, as observer with the armies of Japan, being with the First Army of Kuroki from May 15, 1904, to April 1, 1905; returned to duty with the General Staff, War Department, and served as Acting Judge Advocate General from May 16 to September 7, 1906; was assigned as chief of staff Atlantic Division September 21, 1906, and shortly thereafter was detailed for duty with the Provisional Government of Cuba, serving as legal adviser to the Provisional Government since October 2, 1906; supervisor of the departments of state and justice since that date; president of the advisory commission since January 3, 1907; and in charge of the electoral administration in Cuba since April 1, 1908; returned to the United States from Cuba February 2, 1909, and thereafter on the duty in the office of the Judge Advocate General, Washington, D. C., until June 16, 1909; judge advocate Department of California from July 23 to October 22, 1909; and on duty as assistant to Judge Advocate General, United States Army; appointed delegate to fourth Pan American conference, Buenos Aires, Argentine, March 5, 1910; in the office of the Judge Advocate General, Washington, D. C., to March, 1919 (Judge Advocate General of the Army from Feb. 15, 1911); detailed as Provost Marshal General in General Orders, No. 65, War Department, May 22, 1917, to July 15, 1919, the functions of that office having terminated; reappointed Judge Advocate General of the Army February 15, 1919; detailed as special representative of the United States to assist in the revision of Cuban electoral laws March, 1919, and was relieved from that duty on completion of same, August 15, 1919, in Washington, D. C., to date.

By direction of the President awarded distinguished-service medal for especially meritorious and conspicuous service as Provost Marshal General in the preparation and operation of the draft laws of the Nation during the war by General Orders, No. 144, War Department, December, 1918.

Mr. KNOX. In transmitting this record the Secretary of War has written:

MY DEAR SENATOR WADSWORTH: The clerk of the Senate Military Affairs Committee has brought to my attention Senate bill 2867, by Mr. KNOX, "to authorize the President, when Maj. Gen. Crowder retires, to place him on the retired list as lieutenant general."

I beg leave to inclose herewith a copy of the record of Gen. Crowder from September 1, 1877, when he entered the United States Military Academy as a cadet, to the present date. It would be idle for me to attempt to illustrate a record of service so long, so zealous, and so distinguished.

My own contact with Gen. Crowder, of course, began when I became Secretary of War in March, 1916, from which time until America's entry into the World War he continued actively in charge of the duties of Judge Advocate General and was in daily conference with me about difficult legal problems. I then conceived an admiration, which has daily increased, for his great range of knowledge and experience in questions of law, military and civil, and the detailed history of the Military Establishment of the United States. In 1917 Gen. Crowder prepared in consultation with me the selective-service law, and I appointed him Provost Marshal General to execute that law, a service delicate and intricate, requiring the institution of Nation-wide machinery which would function harmoniously and with such visible and obvious justice as to commend both the law and its execution to public favor. This service he performed with conspicuous ability, and it is one of the outstanding features of America's military mobilization that although we resorted to conscription there is a general consensus of opinion to the effect that the law was executed without fear or favor, and that justice and wisdom characterized its interpretations and applications.

I am very happy to be able to assure the committee of my belief that the services rendered by Gen. Crowder merit the recognition of Congress, and the bill proposed by Mr. KNOX seems to me a suitable reward for a great service rendered self-sacrificingly by a soldier as the latest act of a life devoted to the service of his country.

Cordially, yours,

NEWTON D. BAKER,
Secretary of War.

Even now, after 42 years of splendid service, and hardly free from the most arduous and most successful work of his long career, he has just concluded for the Cuban Republic a revision and amplification of its electoral laws, for which the Cuban Congress voted him the thanks of that Republic, and the University of Cuba conferred upon him the degree of doctor of laws, as have also the leading universities of this country.

Will the Congress of his own country fail to honor and reward him? It can not be so. Republics are not always ungrateful. Therefore I have no doubt that this bill will pass, and I hope it may pass without a dissenting voice, because I believe it is the universal desire of the American people that this honor and reward, at least, should be bestowed upon the man who has served them so long, so faithfully, and so well.

It has been asked why Gen. Crowder's case should be acted on now and in advance of taking up the rewards due to other officers for distinguished service. The answer is twofold: First, and least important, because the bill does not propose to promote the general while he is on the active list, in which case he would receive the pay and emoluments of the advanced rank, whereas under the bill he would receive but two-thirds of the pay and no emoluments upon retirement. I do not understand that there is any case which in this particular is like Gen. Crowder's case. The other promotions suggested have been for men who will remain in active service and receive the full benefits of their advanced rank.

But the real reason that justifies considering this case by itself and on its own merits is the nature of the duties Gen. Crowder performed in the construction of the Army, which has been so much appreciated by the distinguished men I have quoted and by the people at large. In this work the general officers whose claims rest upon distinguished service in the field had no part. They, as individuals, commanded fractions of the great organization which Gen. Crowder was charged with the onerous duty of constructing. His labors began long before theirs. The draft act was passed May 18, 1917, and this was weeks after Gen. Crowder began to prepare it and the machinery for its enforcement. Our first troops under Gen. Pershing landed in France June 27, 1917. Gen. Pershing has received his reward, and properly enough, without connecting it with or making it dependent upon what is to be done for others. His relation to the war was likewise distinctive and different from that of any others. Gen. Crowder's is equally distinctive and perhaps more fundamental. There was no one else in his class and no one else except those whom he had gathered around him for his assistance that were connected with the vast subject with which he was charged with responsibility.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, I understand that the Senate gave unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It did.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I desire to offer two amendments to the bill. I send to the desk the first of them, and ask to have it stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. In line 1, page 2, it is proposed to insert the word "retired" before the word "pay," so that, if amended, it will read "with the retired pay of that grade."

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. It may be that the Senator from Pennsylvania will accept that amendment, because in his statement to the Senate he said that the officer was to receive retired pay in case the bill takes effect. My reason for offering it is

that as a matter of fact there is a distinction between pay of a soldier and retired pay, and I wanted to cure that.

Mr. KNOX. My recollection is that we discussed that in committee, and I thought there had been an amendment inserted.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I do not think it was quite broad enough.

Mr. KNOX. I accept that amendment.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the amendment offered by the Senator from Oregon.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I now present the second amendment, and upon this and other phases of the bill I desire to make some observations. I ask that it be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to add at the end of the bill the following proviso:

Provided, That these officers of the Army who now hold or previously during the present war held the rank herein set before their respective names, to wit, Lieut. Gens. Hunter Liggett and Robert L. Bullard and Maj. Gens. James W. McAndrew, James G. Harbord, Ernest Hinds, Merritte W. Ireland, Harry L. Rogers, William C. Langfitt, William L. Kenly, Henry P. McCain, Charles P. Summerall, and Leonard Wood, shall, when retired from active service, have the rank of lieutenant general and the pay hereinbefore provided for an officer retired with said rank.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN addressed the Senate. After having spoken for a few minutes,

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, I ask the Senator, if he will be kind enough to permit me to do so, in view of the fact that we have been in the habit of proceeding to the consideration of executive business at 2 o'clock for the purpose of taking up the treaty, whether he has any suggestion to make as to whether action can be had upon this bill before that time? Does the Senator wish to conclude his remarks, or what will be the course of procedure? I do not want in any way to defeat action upon the pending bill, if it can be passed within a reasonably short time.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I believe that it is customary, unless the rule is invoked, when a bill is taken up by unanimous consent, to conclude the debate on it before any other business is taken up, even when there is unfinished business pending. But I do not want to invade the rule of the Senate.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The only rule I am aware of covering this situation is that the morning hour expires two hours after the Senate has convened, which to-day will be at 2 o'clock. I was not here when the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] called up this measure, and I do not know its parliamentary situation. Is it before the Senate by unanimous consent?

Mr. KNOX. It is before the Senate by unanimous consent. I have always understood the rule to be as stated by the Senator from Oregon, that if a matter is taken up by unanimous consent it shall be disposed of before any other business is taken up.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. There is no unfinished business, strictly speaking; it is simply a course of procedure we have been pursuing, to take up the treaty at 2 o'clock. Of course, a motion to proceed to the consideration of executive business, while a privileged motion, can not be made unless a Senator has the floor to make it, and the Senator from Oregon would have to yield for that purpose, I assume.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I have no disposition at all, I may say to the Senator from Connecticut, to claim any such privilege as that, but I shall yield to the wishes of the Senate. I made no objection to taking up the bill, because the Senator from Pennsylvania was anxious to have it disposed of, although I reserved the right to object to it. I readily assented to the request for unanimous consent. I am willing now to yield the floor for the purpose of going into executive session, but I reserve the right still to conclude my argument on this measure.

Mr. KNOX. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. President. Referring to the statement I made a moment ago, what is the rule if a bill is taken up by unanimous consent? Is it superseded at the end of the morning hour by anything but unfinished business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The pending question before the Senate at the present time is the amendment of the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN]. The bill, of course, was taken up by unanimous consent.

When a question is pending, no motion shall be received but—
To adjourn.
To adjourn to a day certain, or that when the Senate adjourn it shall be to a day certain.
To take a recess.
To proceed to the consideration of executive business.

A motion to proceed to the consideration of executive business will be in order at any time.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. But the Senator who makes the motion must have the floor, I assume.

The VICE PRESIDENT. He must get the eye of the Chair.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator who has the floor, I understand, can not be swept off his feet by some one rising and shouting out that he moves to proceed to the consideration of executive business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understand the Senator from Oregon has already expressed a willingness to yield for the purpose of allowing the Senator from Connecticut to make the motion if he can continue his address, as he undoubtedly has the right to do.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. He has so stated, Mr. President. As far as I am concerned, that is perfectly satisfactory; but when the Senate has gone into executive session, I do not see how this bill could be passed except by unanimous consent and as in legislative session. I simply wanted to submit these views to the Senate for its consideration, to see if we could, by unanimous consent, arrive at any understanding.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Now, let the Chair express his view, which I feel compelled to restate. This must be the rule. There is no unfinished business. This bill has been taken up by unanimous consent. There is a pending question before the Senate, to which the Senator from Oregon is addressing himself. If he yields to a Senator to make a motion to go into open executive session, the motion is in order, and the Senate would probably go into open executive session; but the Chair would be compelled to rule, unless I have additional light on the subject, that when the German treaty is laid before the Senate, it being an executive session and this being a legislative matter, the Senator from Oregon can not discuss a legislative matter in an executive session of the Senate without unanimous consent.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I presume the Senator from Oregon could undoubtedly say he was discussing the German treaty and continue his observations on whatever view he took of that instrument. My only point is that I do not think the Senator from Pennsylvania could secure action upon the bill, if that course were taken, without the unanimous consent of the Senate to do it as in legislative session, in which case the Senator from Oregon could exercise his prerogatives in such line as he saw fit.

Mr. KNOX. I would have very little doubt about the action of the Senate. This is going to be a very short matter, anyhow. The Senator from Oregon told me he was going to speak only a short time, and I have nothing further to say. I think that when the Senate gave its unanimous consent to have it heard at all it could certainly renew that consent, even though it was in executive session, and allow it to be heard as in legislative session.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of executive business in open executive session for the purpose of considering the treaty of peace with Germany, if the Senator from Oregon will yield to me for that purpose.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield for that purpose. I am yielding because I realize the importance of the treaty. I know how anxious the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. KNOX] is to dispose of this bill, and I consented to have it taken up for that reason, but I am willing to yield.

Mr. McCUMBER. May I inquire what the motion is?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion is to proceed to the consideration of executive business in open executive session.

Mr. McCUMBER. For the consideration of the treaty?

The VICE PRESIDENT. Yes.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Have I the floor when the treaty is before the Senate?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Oregon has the floor and, in the judgment of the Chair, has the right to proceed unless there is objection. If there is objection, the Chair does not think he has a right to discuss the bill in open executive session.

Mr. McCUMBER. Inasmuch as notice has been given to take up a certain phase of the treaty at this time, and inasmuch as the Senator is desirous of going on with the discussion of another matter, may I be bold enough to ask how long he expects to discuss it?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I will say to the Senator from North Dakota that I am willing to resume my discussion of the bill after his discussion of the peace treaty. I do not want to interfere with that at all. Or I assume that the Senate will permit me, in the morning hour to-morrow, to resume my address on this subject. I am perfectly willing for that reason to suspend now.

Mr. McCUMBER. I rather assume that the address of the Senator from Oregon will take some little time yet?

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Probably an hour.

Mr. McCUMBER. If that be true, it would seem to me that we ought to go on with the treaty at this time.

Mr. KNOX. As the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] has given notice that at 2 o'clock he would begin discussion of one phase of the treaty, and as I know of no one else who has given notice of an intention to speak this afternoon on the treaty, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota we may proceed as in legislative session with the consideration of the bill.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I shall be compelled to object to that. It is a short enough time that has been allotted for the consideration of the treaty, from 2 o'clock on. My own judgment is that we ought to begin the consideration of the treaty earlier in the day. I do think it would be a very simple matter for the Senator from Oregon [Mr. CHAMBERLAIN] to continue his remarks in the morning hour to-morrow if the Senator from Pennsylvania will call up the bill. So far as I am concerned, there will be no objection to its consideration at that time.

Mr. KNOX. If the parliamentary situation is such that I may call it up before 2 o'clock to-morrow, that is quite satisfactory, though I was afraid I might run into a similar situation to-morrow.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. That might possibly be true to-morrow, but other bills have been considered and passed within the morning hour recently, and I think the Senator, no doubt, can accomplish the same result within the next two or three days.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. That course will be perfectly satisfactory to me.

Mr. KNOX. If the Senator from Nebraska has that thought about the matter, I will consent. It would do no good if I felt otherwise, because objection would no doubt be made. I give notice that to-morrow morning, at the conclusion of morning business or during the morning hour, I shall call up this measure.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. I yield the floor then, and will conclude to-morrow what I have to say.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

The Senate, as in Committee of the Whole and in open executive session, resumed the consideration of the treaty of peace with Germany.

Mr. McCUMBER. Mr. President, I shall confine these remarks exclusively to the so-called Johnson amendments to the peace treaty, and I purpose to demonstrate not only the lack of necessity for such amendments to balance any supposed inequality in the voting strength of any power but also the great injustice, the gross wrong, such proposed amendments would do to Canada, Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa.

Mr. President, of all the many false declarations that have been made concerning the league of nations covenant, none has been so persistently indulged in as the one concerning the voting power of Great Britain. And from the letters I have received and the press reports I have read, these unfounded assertions concerning this voting power have taken a deeper root in the mind of the public than any other criticism aimed at the league. The press of the country publishes the bald declaration of the enemies of peace by concord of nations that Great Britain will have upon every dispute between nations six votes and the United States but one, without ever informing their readers of the real truth concerning this matter. Even Senators who in private conversation would never dream of attempting to deceive one another seem unable to resist the temptation to take advantage of a prejudice created by this deception and, with studied avoidance of the real and full truth, give this prejudice another boost.

The public, Mr. President, can not be blamed if it draws false conclusions from false premises. If any one of us had not read the treaty, and a Senator should declare, as has been declared again and again on this floor, that in any dispute between the United States and Great Britain, or between the United States and Canada or Australia, the United States would have one vote and Great Britain would have six votes, he would very naturally be misled. And he would most naturally say: "That is unfair and we will not stand for it." So, Mr. President, a misled public would say the same thing. The difference, however, between the position of the Senator and that of the public is that the Senator has the treaty on his desk before him and can readily correct any misstatement of the terms of that treaty. The public has not the treaty and can not refute the assertion.

I know the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD is too voluminous to be of much use in overcoming the prejudice created by speakers throughout the United States in thus unfairly presenting this phase of the subject. Though one had the greatest amount of leisure, he could not read the one-hundredth part of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, and the number who ever see the RECORD are infinitesimal.

But slight as is this opportunity for publicity through the medium of the RECORD, the questions involved in the treaty are so momentous that I am impelled to adopt this meager opportunity to place the truth of this question of the voting strength of the several nations before the American people.

Mr. President, the average man, busy with the perplexing problem of how to make his income—or what is left of it after the tax collector has taken his share—square with the present cost of living, has little time to apply even first principles of his reasoning powers to the subject. If he did so, this question would immediately present itself to his contemplative mind: Why did France agree that Great Britain should have six votes and France only one? France has been the most persistent stickler for her rights and her safety of all the nations which signed this compact. This average citizen would be compelled to say to himself: Is it not strange that France should have consented to this great disparity in voting strength without even a dissent? Next to France comes Italy, a country with a population as great as that of Great Britain, and partially surrounded by about as disorderly and eruptive a set of States as there are on the face of the earth. Is it not strange that Italy, represented by one of the most able statesmen in Europe, never said one word about being outvoted 6 to 1 by Great Britain? Is it not equally strange that Spain and Portugal made no protest? Is it not wonderfully strange that in a matter of such transcendent importance it never occurred to any one of these old astute nations that they were giving to Great Britain a power in their councils six times as great as any one of them would have? Is it not wonderfully strange that nations which have seen alliances and friendships change almost annually during the last century—nations that have seen their allied friends change to allied enemies in a single day—nations which live in this hotbed of international broils—never gave a thought to the fact that they were putting their heads into the lion's mouth, that they were giving in some instances to another power with which they had been in death grips time and again a voting strength six to their one in all their future disputes?

Well, Mr. President, the conclusion of this average citizen, after cogitating over the awful and dire results that would follow this disparity in voting strength, would be that there must be some mistake—that it could not be true that such extraordinary favors should have been granted to one nation without protest—that it was too absurd to be true. And, Mr. President, his conclusion would be correct. It is not true. If it had been true that this covenant gave Great Britain six votes to one given each of the other members in disputes with her, or in fact in any dispute, the other members to this compact never would have signed it.

What are the real facts in relation to this voting strength? To clearly understand them we must first understand just what powers the council or the assembly has. We must understand:

First. That neither the council nor the assembly is a board of arbitration.

Second. That neither of them decides international disputes at all.

I wish those two simple propositions could be understood by all the American people.

Third. That the only jurisdiction which either the council or the assembly can have over a dispute between nations is the right to investigate and report what the true facts are concerning the dispute and make recommendations in regard thereto.

Fourth. That even in the matter of determining what these true facts are and what the recommendations should be for a peaceful settlement, both parties to the dispute are excluded.

Fifth. That a dispute with a part of a nation or an empire is a dispute with the whole, and a dispute with the whole must necessarily be a dispute with each part. Therefore, a dispute between one country and another country composed of a dominant power and its dominions or possessions is a dispute with each and every part of such country, and, hence, that in a dispute between the British Empire or any member thereof and any other country, all parties to the dispute would be excluded even in determining the facts of the dispute under article 15.

Sixth. That the British Empire, being a member of the council which consists of nine nations, has but one vote in such council; that as neither Canada nor any other British dominion or possession has a separate membership in such council, of course neither could have a vote therein.

Seventh. That if the investigation of the facts concerning the dispute should be transferred to the assembly, then Canada, Australia, and other British dominions would still have no vote if either the British Empire or any one of its constituent parts was a party to the controversy.

Eighth. Here is the only kind of a case in which Canada or other self-governing dominion of the British Empire would be entitled to a vote: If the case is transferred from the council to the assembly, and if neither the British Empire nor any one of its dominions or possessions is a party to the dispute, as, for instance, if the dispute were between Serbia and Roumania, then Canada and these other self-governing dominions mentioned could vote, not in settlement of the dispute, but on the question of what are the true facts bearing on the dispute, and also on what should be recommended to the disputants as a basis of settlement of the dispute.

In such case Canada, Australia, or other wholly self-governing dominion would have a right to have a voice in the ascertainment of those facts and the making of such recommendation equal to that of Haiti, or Liberia, or Hejaz, or Cuba, or Panama. Can anyone see any possible danger to the United States in according to Canada such equal right in the investigation and report? On the contrary would we not select Canada in preference to any of these mentioned nations?

Ninth. Great Britain can not and will not control the vote of Canada on any question on which Canada would be entitled to vote. As Canada controls her own foreign as well as domestic affairs, by her own parliament, and wholly independently of Great Britain, she will cast her vote with equal independence on any subject on which she would have a right to vote. And as she would have no right to vote on any question in the council, not being a member of that body, and no right to vote in the assembly on any question in which the British Empire or any of its dominions or possessions would be a party, and as the only dispute she could vote on at all would be limited to disputes between other nations, and further limited to the mere ascertainment of the facts of the dispute and recommendations for its settlement, it is worse than idle, it is absolutely false, to say that she will not control her own vote. In such case Great Britain would be no more liable to control the vote of Canada than would the United States. And what is true of Canada is equally true of Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa. Great Britain would have no voice in appointing the representatives of these dominions and the appointees would be responsible only to their own governments. In the case of India the relation may be more close, but I am certain that this relation will not be more close than that which exists between the United States and Cuba, or Panama, or Haiti, or Honduras.

I purpose to make a very short explanation and elucidation of these declarations.

What is the procedure under this league of nations in case of a dispute between nations which would be liable to lead to war?

First. Members agree to submit the dispute either to arbitration or to an inquiry by the council (article 12). Mark you, they do not agree to submit the matter to arbitration *by* the council, but merely either to submit the case to arbitration by arbitrators entirely outside the council, or to submit it to an inquiry by the council. If the matter is submitted to arbitration, that takes it out of the council and out of the league of nations, and it remains out unless a party against whom an award is made by these outside arbitrators fails to abide by the award, which would again raise another dispute, which dispute could not be submitted to the council except for the purpose of investigating the facts as to why the award was not complied with.

Second. They agree that if they recognize that a dispute is suitable for arbitration they will arbitrate it. That arbitration, however, is to be by such method as shall be agreed upon by the parties and entirely outside and independent of the council or league of nations.

Nearly every nation now has by treaty with other nations made provision to arbitrate such differences, and they will remain outside of the jurisdiction of the council or the assembly.

Third. They further agree that if the matter is not suitable for arbitration—and each nation must itself determine whether the matter is suitable for arbitration—they will first attempt to settle the dispute by diplomacy; that is, through their own diplomatic officials. That is an agreement which they make with each other.

So, Mr. President, up to this time neither the council nor the assembly has acquired any jurisdiction over the dispute. The members themselves have mutually agreed that they will make these efforts on their own part without submitting anything to the council or assembly. In ninety-nine cases out of a hundred the disputes will be so settled. Their agreement, faithfully observed, that they will attempt the settlement by diplomacy, will bring about the settlement.

Fourth. But there may arise a dispute where the disputants, through stubbornness or selfishness, have failed to settle by diplomacy and where one or both claim that the matter is not suitable for arbitration; that is, that it is not a justiciable question. What then is to be done? The parties then agree, under article 12, that they will submit the matter for inquiry only to the council. Here the council obtains its right to act; but to act how? To what end and to what extent is the matter submitted? It is submitted to the end that (a) the council may endeavor to bring about a settlement through the friendly offices of the council; (b) that if the persuasive powers of all these nations in the council can not induce the parties to come to an agreement, a report containing a statement of the real facts of the dispute shall be published so that the people of each country, understanding what the real facts are, would not permit their country to wage war for a wrongful purpose; and that as one side or the other must be wrong the wrongfully inclined Government would be compelled to back down by the force of public opinion. This, in my opinion, would take care of the other one case out of the hundreds of national disputes.

To effectuate such peaceful settlement, the members agree among themselves, that if the council fails through persuasion to effect a settlement of the dispute, it may either unanimously or by a majority vote make and publish a statement of the facts of the dispute and recommendations which it deems just and proper. (Art. 15, 3d paragraph.)

This report has no binding effect on any party. Its purpose is simply to apprise the people of both disputing countries what the real facts are, and to trust to the sense of justice of the people themselves to prevent a wrongful war.

That if all the members of the council, other than the disputants, join in the report on the facts and the recommendations for its just settlement, then all the members agree that none of them will go to war against the disputant that complies with the recommendations. (Ib., 5th paragraph.)

That if the council fails to reach a unanimous agreement, exclusive of the disputants, as to what are the true facts of the dispute or what ought to be done in settlement, then again no one is bound, and the members of the league—not the council or the assembly but the members of the league themselves separately—can take such steps as they deem necessary for the maintenance of right and justice. (Ib., 6th paragraph.) That means that the several nations through diplomatic channels will make still another attempt to compose their disputes when the council and the assembly of the league of nations shall have failed to do so.

Mr. President, almost every argument made on the floor of the Senate, and every one without exception made to the public by Senators opposed to any league of nations, has given the impression to the people of the world that the council or the assembly, as the case might be, is a sort of court or tribunal that decides the disputes between nations, and it is because of these misstatements of the facts and the misapprehension of many of our people arising therefrom that the ground is made fertile for the development of about all the animosities toward this league and especially toward the claimed voting power of Great Britain. I have no doubt the letter read by my colleague [Mr. GRONNA] this morning from the State of North Dakota was entirely founded upon that general misapprehension.

I wish the public could just once fully understand, first, that not one case of dispute out of a hundred would ever go to the council or assembly; second, that even if all other efforts provided for the settlement of disputes should fail, the only thing submitted to the council or assembly is the right to investigate and report the facts to the public. If, despite all these efforts, a nation, criminally inclined, insists upon making war of aggression on another country, all the council or all the assembly can do is to report that fact and recommend to the other countries the military or naval force the other members ought to furnish to prevent one country from destroying another. And, Mr. President, that will prevent war, because no country will ever attempt to fight the world. The league compact simply applies to world relations the same rules that govern individual relations in every community.

To illustrate: Suppose a community should consist of 100 families of different physical power and strength, and, like nations at the present time, each is perfectly independent of any of the others and may commit any act of aggression it has the power to commit. If driven by the exigencies of self-protection, three of these stronger families should ally themselves for offense and defense against three other strong families, that

might check offenses for a time against any one of these six families, but it would allow the families which had thus prepared themselves for aggression toward each other to direct their war machinery against the weaker families, and through annexations disturb the balance of power and thereby bring about the very thing the alliance sought to prevent. But, on the other hand, if all these 100 families enter into a compact, each one with the 99 others, that they will join to prevent any one family from doing a wrong to another, any family inclined to do such a wrong would desist from so doing, not through inclination, perhaps, but perhaps because it would know it would be defeated and ultimately punished for the attempt.

Now, every community, large and small, in every civilized country is governed entirely by such a compact. Every man in every city and county and State is under a legal obligation, by the very form of the government of his community, to protect the life, liberty, and property of every other citizen. Is he ever called upon to do this? Why, there is not one man in a thousand that would be called upon once in a thousand years to use his physical efforts to accomplish this result. The fact that he is ready to do it, the fact that he is bound to do it, and the would-be offender knows that he is ready and bound to do it, is what maintains peace throughout every civilized community on the face of the earth. The same rule will work exactly the same way between nations, which are but bigger collections of individuals, and if we will have the courage just once to establish the rule, there will be no calling upon the soldiery of all nations to carry on distant war. That is the key to the whole situation—national courage to do what individual courage has done in every community. I have never been summoned to Denver or San Francisco to quell a disturbance, and I will never be summoned to Pittsburgh or Cleveland for such purpose.

So, Mr. President, you will see that even if it were true that Canada had a vote in the assembly, the only thing on earth the Canadian representative could vote on would be the question of what are the facts in any given dispute, and he could not even exercise his judgment on that if the dispute were one in which Canada or any other part of the British Empire had an interest.

What awful danger, therefore, is there or would there be in allowing this fully self-governing country to exercise a vote on this simple proposition of what are the facts in a given dispute, or what ought in fairness to be done to secure peace and tranquillity?

But you say Canada might be added to the council. Mr. President, that is an impossibility under any reasonable construction of this compact. The power to admit new members to the council is contained in the second paragraph of article 4, which reads:

> With the approval of the majority of the assembly, the council may name additional members of the league—

Keep that in mind—

> whose representatives shall always be members of the council; the council with like approval may increase the number of members of the league to be selected by the assembly for representation on the council.

I call special attention to the fact that the countries whose representatives shall be so selected by members of the council are to be "additional members of the league." As these self-governing dominions are, by the terms of the instrument itself, already made members of the league, they could not be included in the phrase "additional members of the league." Therefore, neither Canada nor any other British dominion could, by any possibility, be made members of the council.

It is clearly evident that the purpose of the framers of this instrument was to permit the inclusion of Germany and Russia as soon as they should become fit for membership in the council. But, Mr. President, there seem to be those who claim that Canada or other British dominions could be voted into the council. They can only adopt that construction by insisting that the word "additional" related to the council and not to membership in the league when it speaks of "additional members of the league," a meaning that would grossly violate the true meaning of the language used.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALL in the chair). Does the Senator from North Dakota yield to the Senator from Illinois?

Mr. McCUMBER. I have stated that I would rather not yield until I get through, because I wish to make my remarks as compact as possible. Then I will gladly yield.

Mr. McCORMICK. Very well.

Mr. McCUMBER. But even if that could be done, it would still require a unanimous vote on the part of every member of the council, including the United States.

Let us look a moment to see how any new member can be placed on this select committee of nine constituting the council. The first five can never be removed. They are the United States, the British Empire—not Great Britain—France, Italy, and Japan. Article 4, relating to the other four members of the council, whose membership in this important body is not quite absolute, says:

> These four members—

That is, the four to be selected for membership in the council—

> shall be selected by the assembly from time to time in its discretion.

That discretion can be exercised only by a unanimous vote, because article 5 provides that—

> Except where otherwise expressly provided in this covenant or by the terms of this treaty, decisions at any meeting of the assembly or of the council shall require the agreement of all the members of the league represented at the meeting.

And this is not one of the cases where it is "otherwise expressly provided."

Suppose, now, Canada wishes to secure this place, even giving it that wrong construction, and that Spain or Brazil or Belgium or Greece must be removed. Then the member which must be displaced must vote for its own displacement, and the United States must also vote that Canada must come in, and Brazil or some other nation must go out. Such a thing never can and never will take place, even if that construction were possible.

But, it is said, you may add to the membership of the league and thereby give those additional members a place on the council without displacing an old one. Yes; but I insist that this selection can be only from additional members of the league, and not from those who are upon the original membership roll, because it always speaks of "additional members of the league." But here again, even adopting the contrary construction, you are up against the requirement for unanimity of vote in the council. The second paragraph of article 4 provides:

> With the approval of a majority of the assembly the council may name additional members of the league, whose representatives shall always be members of the council.

You will observe here, again, that two steps are necessary to name additional members of the league who shall always be members of the council: First, a majority of the assembly must approve the addition. This is one of the cases "otherwise expressly provided," where less than a unanimous vote is required. Second, the council must also name such approved additional members and the vote of the council is not "otherwise expressly provided," and must, therefore, be unanimous to become effective. Therefore, such newly proposed member can obtain admission to the council only by unanimous vote of that council. That relates to those who are to have a permanent place in the council.

This same second paragraph of article 4 also provides:

> The council with like approval may increase the number of members of the league to be selected by the assembly for representation on the council.

Undoubtedly this last provision means the possible addition to the four transient members of the council. The vote of the council in admitting additional members to the transient class, for the same reason, must also be unanimous.

Mr. President, though I have never heard the paragraph explained I can see the unexpressed purpose, the expectation that Germany and Russia shall soon be added to the class of unremovable members of the council. And this is as it should be. The Germans are a great as well as a powerful people, numerically and otherwise. And when that nation shall have renounced its diabolical doctrine that a State can commit no wrong except the offense of failure, justice as well as world peace demands that she should hold her place among the nations, not as a disturber but as a protector of world tranquillity.

Is there a case in which a dominion of the British Empire could have a vote separately from the Empire itself? Of course it could not in the council because it is not a member of the council and can not become a member. But could Canada vote in the assembly, and if so under what circumstances?

Once more I must caution Senators, as well as the American public, that neither council nor assembly is constituted a board of arbitration. Neither ever enters a judgment or an award. All that either can do under the covenant, so far as disputes are concerned, is to say what the facts are concerning those disputes.

Every member of the league is a member of the assembly. Therefore, the British Empire is a member of the assembly, as well as of the council. Canada is also a member of the league (see article 1 and Annex). Therefore Canada is a member of the assembly. Article 3 provides that each member of the assembly shall have one vote. Therefore Canada has a vote in the assembly. But on what has she that one vote? Mr. President, if the assembly is deciding what the facts are between Czechoslovakia and Turkey, both the British Empire and Canada would, I think, have a vote. If the

question were one in arriving at the facts pertaining to a dispute between any member of the British Empire and any other nation, neither that nation nor any member of the British Empire would have a vote. Why? Because the parties to a dispute are eliminated from the decision by the provisions of article 15, and the dispute with a part of an empire, as I have stated, is a dispute with the whole empire, and a dispute with a dominant member is necessarily a dispute with each part. I do not think anyone seriously questions that conclusion on that proposition.

But to eliminate any possibility of doubt, I have suggested a reservation which reads as follows:

Sixth. That the United States understands and construes the words "dispute between members" and the words "dispute between parties" in article 15 to mean that a dispute with a self-governing dominion, colony, or dependency represented in the assembly is a dispute with the dominant or principal member represented therein and that a dispute with such dominant or principal member is a dispute with all of its self-governing dominions, colonies, or dependencies; and that the exclusion of the parties to the dispute provided in the last paragraph of said article will cover not only the dominant or principal member but also its dominions, colonies, and dependencies.

Mr. President, that proposed reservation does not change the true intent of article 15, which excludes representatives of the parties to the dispute. It simply makes certain that construction which everyone has given to this section, except a few opponents who would prefer the other construction in order to bolster up their opposition, namely, that a dispute with a part is a dispute with the whole, and a dispute with the whole is necessarily a dispute with every part. It is intended to make absolutely certain that in a dispute with any member of the British Empire every part of that Empire would be excluded from participation.

But the opponents of any league of nations are not satisfied with this exclusion. They wish to obtain for the United States a power on every occasion six times as great as that of any other country. If there should be a dispute between Great Britain and Austria, neither Great Britain nor her colonies nor her dependencies could cast a vote in the assembly. They, together with Austria, would be excluded in the findings of fact. But the United States, France, Italy, and Spain, and every other country would each have one vote as the league provisions now stand. They would be absolutely equal.

And now comes the Johnson amendment and demands that the United States shall have six votes on every dispute and each of these other countries but one vote. And, Mr. President, the very Senators who are making this most selfish demand are shouting from the housetops that Great Britain has packed the jury because Canada and Australia, not as a part of Great Britain but as wholly self-governing nations, who fought this grim war to a finish, demand and receive a recognition on matters to which Great Britain is not a party, a recognition equal to that of a score of other little insignificant states that never turned a hand to safeguard the world when all that civilization holds dear was at stake. The only nation that would hold a real advantage over the other nations in this league is the United States of America.

By virtue of our peculiar situation we would have an advantage over not only Great Britain but over every other nation in the world. We not only enter this league with special reservations in our favor, such as that relating to the Monroe Doctrine, but also other proposed reservations intended to relieve us from duties imposed on our allies. But these are the least important of our advantages. The far greater advantage lies in the fact that we shall, by reason of our relationship with other countries, control an overwhelming voting strength in every controversy.

At a mere nod from the United States our begotten child Panama, our foster-child Cuba, our wards Nicaragua, Haiti, Guatemala, Honduras, Uruguay, Ecuador, Bolivia, Peru, and even Brazil declared war on Germany. If by the mere raising of a finger these 10 countries declared war against a country that had certainly committed no offense against them, can any unprejudiced mind fail to understand that in every controversy that can affect our interest in the remotest degree the votes of all these States will be cast en bloc for whatever we may desire?

Yes, Mr. President, not only these countries but practically every country in the Western Hemisphere would follow our lead.

Talk about Great Britain having an advantage. Why, Mr. President, if Great Britain should have a quarrel with Guatemala about an oil lease, Great Britain and her dominions would be eliminated. But these children and stepchildren and wards of the United States, numbering a score, would follow the lead of this great country just as surely as the satellite follows the course of the planet.

We all know very well that if we should ask this further advantage of six votes every other country would ask the same. France and Italy and Greece would ask the same, and finally you would get back to Guatemala and Haiti and Liberia, and each of them would ask and demand their six votes, to be equal as a national unity. Mr. President, no world conference having a sense of gratitude in its heart or of justice in its soul would deny to Canada or Australia or New Zealand or South Africa also six votes. Our position will always make us a dominant power. But notwithstanding this advantage, the other nations are willing to rely upon our national honor. With that advantage can we not accord therefore to these other nations some confidence of integrity?

But, Mr. President, let us for a moment look at this subject from the standpoint of the right of Canada to admission as a separate self-governing nation, and I use Canada as typical of Australia, New Zealand, and South Africa.

I would like to put this question straight to every American man, woman, and child: Has Canada, a fully self-governing, independent dominion, earned by her sacrifices in blood and treasure through more than four years of this bloody war a right to a seat in the assembly that would give her a voice in effect equal to Haiti, or Hejaz, or Honduras, or Liberia, or Nicaragua, or Panama, or Peru, or San Salvador, or Guatemala, not one of which ever sacrificed a single soldier or a single dollar in defense of this great world principle? I know what the American people would answer if it were put directly to them.

Every delegate in that great peace conference declared that Canada had earned this recognition. Every nation signatory to this compact declared that it had no fear of Canada. The Senate of the United States is the first body that has ever challenged this slight recognition to Canada for her great sacrifices in this war.

Why were all these other little South or Central American States included in this compact? They were included because they had made a paper declaration of war against Germany. Why did they make this paper declaration of war against Germany? Who asked them to do so? The United States requested them to do so. Would any one of them have declared war except to please the United States and to show that they were on the same side? Did any one of them declare war until after we had declared it? Has any country in Europe complained that the United States, by reason of her position as the protector of all these Central and South American States against European aggression, has a control over every one of them, and would exercise a control over the votes of every one of them by a much stronger pressure than the pressure which even Great Britain could exercise upon Canada on the only questions on which Canada could exercise judgment?

Canada, a country whose population is about one-fourteenth that of the United States, furnished about 500,000 soldiers. If I remember rightly her losses were about 100,000, exclusive of the wounded and permanently injured. Her expenses were enormous. Her debts will be a heavy burden for many years. You say Great Britain controls the Canadian vote. Does she control the Canadian vote any more than the United States controls the Cuban vote or the Panaman vote or any Central American vote? Did Great Britain vote Canada into this war, or did Canada vote herself into it? Does Great Britain govern Canada's vote in the matter of tariffs? If Great Britain did control her there would be no tariffs levied against British goods. Does Great Britain control the action of Canada against the immigration of Asiatics, or does Canada control her own domestic affairs? When Canada made an agreement for reciprocity with the United States some years ago, was the agreement made with Great Britain or was it made with Canada? All you can say is that by reason of the relationship Canada still holds a kindly sympathy for the mother country. So do the German-Americans for Germany. So do the Irish-Americans for Ireland. So do the Scandinavian-Americans for Scandinavia. But do you disfranchise them because of that kindly feeling toward the fatherland?

Compare Canada with all these other nations that have signed this agreement. In territory she is the greatest of all. In population there are but 9 countries that exceed hers, and 22 which have a less population. Some of these countries have a population less than the city of Washington, and yet you give them a vote simply because they declared a paper war. And yet you say that Canada, who did so much to win this war, whose declaration was sealed with the blood of 100,000 of her sons, must be excluded.

All over the country Senators are shouting day and night that Great Britain, with a diplomacy which had outwitted every other country, had secured an advantage of a six-to-one vote over each and every other country represented in this world conference. What a compliment that is to the intelligence of the representatives of every other country!

As a matter of fact Great Britain never asked that these self-governing dominions of hers should have separate membership in the league at all. She was quite willing to assume the responsibility of representing them. But, Mr. President, they preferred to represent themselves just as they had represented themselves in declaring war—just as they had represented themselves on every field of carnage during the four long years of the bloodiest battles this old earth has ever witnessed. These nations, rising from the battle trenches, bleeding and blood begrimed—these nations with the fever of battle yet in their hearts—these nations which for four years had witnessed their brave sons mowed down by the merciless machine guns and mangled by bursting shells—these nations standing by the sanctified graves of their noble dead—these nations that have passed through the mouths of a thousand hells that this earth might be made safe for free people and free governments, demanded of their own right the privilege of sitting in the council chambers of the assembly, demanded the modest right to speak on the affairs of the world they had fought to save, with a voice as potent as that of Haiti or Uruguay or Liberia.

Mr. President, no nation represented at this great world conference had the conscience or the right to deny them this little recognition. And as an American who honors heroism and loves justice I shall never cast a vote of distrust against a single one of these brave little nations.

Mr. President, these nations were allowed a separate vote, independent of the British Empire, in this assemb.y, not in the council, but in the lower body, because, measured by what they had done, no nation could deny that they had earned this right. Every nation recognized Canada to all intents and purposes as an independent, self-governing nation. Every nation knew that if you were to deny nations a vote because of their sympathy with other nations and because other nations might influence them, you would deny the right of practically all but the greatest nations to vote in this assembly.

Strange as it may seem when we stop to contemplate it, every country engaged in this war thinks that it was the particular country that won the war. Not only this, but each subdivision of each army thinks that it was the particular subdivision whose efforts won the war. Great Britain says the war never could have been won except by her Navy, which held the command of the seas. France is certain that she won the war; the United States that the war could not have been won without her sons at Chateau-Thierry; and Canada, whose soldiers fought so valiantly on every field of contest, feels exactly the same. Well, the whole truth of the matter is that they all won this war, and each, acting with the others to win this war, is entitled to the same credit and the same honor for what each one did and the same place in any forum established to discuss world troubles.

Sometimes in arriving at a conclusion as to what particular army gave the final blow that broke the enemy, it might not be out of place to consult the enemy. I have been reading Ludendorff's history of the war. Gen. Ludendorff says that in the British offensive which started on the 8th day of August, 1918, the great assault made that day by the Canadians and the Australians was the blow that initiated the final defeat of the German armies. That may or may not be conceded by other nations, but it is an enemy admission that at least pays a high compliment to our neighbor, Canada, and our friend, Australia.

Senators opposed to this league seem to be imbued with the idea that we ought not to enter into this compact unless we can so dominate the situation that there never can be any possibility of any decision against us, even if we should be in the wrong. They are not even willing to take a chance where, excluding the parties to the dispute, the vote must be unanimous even as to what the facts are in the case—to have the force even of a moral suggestion.

From all these debates against the league one would conclude that the moment the armistice was declared last November we became the allies of Germany and Turkey and Bulgaria, and our old allies in this awful carnage, those who had stood the brunt of the war and suffered all its horrors for four years before we could be prepared to joint them, became our deadly enemies; that the thousands of brave seamen who dared the hidden mine and the deadly submarine, and whose comrades went down to watery graves by thousands that ships so sorely needed by their own countries might transport our soldiers to perform their great part in this war for human rights, are now enemies at heart of the United States; and that while all these other allied nations trust each other and trust us, we can not afford to put the slightest trust in their honor or integrity. We ought to be ashamed to harbor such everlastingly selfish motives and distrust against our allies.

There were in the Senate gallery when the Senator from New Jersey was making an address the other day a number of New Zealand officers who were on their way home from France, and who, landing at New York, decided they would take advantage of the opportunity to visit the Senate of this country, their great, strong, and friendly ally in this war, with whose sons they had so often fought and bivouacked on the fields of France. There were some Canadian officers with them. I can appreciate their feeling of disappointment as they heard from this eloquent Senator words that breathed distrust and hatred against them and their mother country. I was particularly struck by the expression of sadness which I saw on the face of each one as they departed after listening to this speech, though none said a word. The Senator in that speech said he would deprecate any Anglo-Saxon misunderstanding, and yet he would kick this great Anglo-Saxon self-governing Canada out of this league because in a dispute between Belgium and Germany, or between Italy and Austria, this neighbor of ours and our good Australian friend would have a vote on what the truth of those facts in dispute might be. He would not have any Anglo-Saxon misunderstanding, but he would have Australia out of this league as unfit to associate in the assembly with Hejaz, with black Liberia, or blacker Haiti, with effervescent Guatemala, or discordant Honduras.

Now, do you want to give Canada a place anywhere in this league? Do you believe that by her sacrifices she has earned a right to sit in the assembly with Uruguay or Haiti? If you do, then let her have that voice in the assembly. Let her have it upon questions in which neither Canada nor Great Britain is a party. Let her have it on the only question that can really be decided, so far as disputes are concerned, the question of what the facts are in any given dispute, a question that binds no one, but the decision of which appeals only to the conscience of the people of any country.

Give her, whose blood commingled in unstinted stream with her allies on every battle field of Europe, whose soldiers fought and bled and died side by side with our brave American boys, this slight honor. In the name of the brave and the true of all nations who fought the battle for human rights, in the name of the noble dead and the wounded and bleeding survivors of this awful conflict, let us accord to Canada what France and Belgium, the graveyards of her heroic sons, have accorded her—a confidence in her integrity and sense of justice and a place of honor among the nations of the world that dared to die to save that world from military slavery.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. BALL in the chair). Does the Senator from Montana rise to make a request? The Chair had promised to recognize the Senator from Illinois [Mr. McCORMICK].

Mr. McCORMICK. I do not desire to prevent the Senator from Montana addressing the Senate at this time, if he so desires.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, I am in the same frame of mind with reference to the Senator from Illinois. I have no desire to claim any precedence at all. I am very glad to yield to the Senator from Illinois if he desires to address the Senate.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, I had intended to speak very briefly upon the resolution which I introduced during the morning hour and upon no other phase of the general question before the Senate, but I do not feel that I can allow the remarks of the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER] to pass without comment.

It is an unhappy circumstance of this debate that Senators find it necessary to impute bad faith to those who differ from them; to insinuate that they are wittingly misrepresenting facts; to challenge, by innuendo, the patriotism which has animated Senators of the United States through the long years. When last he spoke, the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], whose amendment the Senator from North Dakota has discussed this afternoon, expressly disclaimed for himself and for others who are supporting his amendment any desire to withdraw from Canada the vote accorded her under the terms of the covenant or to deny to the other self-governing dominions of the British Empire or even to deny India the votes which the covenant bestows upon them. As I recall his speech, the Senator from California asserted then that what he sought through this amendment was not the denial of votes to any of the component parts of the British Empire, but an equal vote for the United States, which has twice the self-governing population of the British Empire.

The Senator from North Dakota has ascribed to the supporters of this amendment not only the desire to deny Canada and the other self-governing dominions a vote in the assembly of the league, but has categorically denied that there was any possibility of Canada or any other of the dominions being

represented in the council of the league. If that be true, why the letter addressed to Sir Robert Borden? If that be true, why should the Prime Minister of Great Britain, the president of the council of France, and the President of the United States join in an unequivocal assertion to the contrary? Surely the Senator from North Dakota does not ascribe to the three signers of the letter addressed to Sir Robert Borden any want of intellectual integrity or any intention to deceive the Canadian Parliament in order that it might be induced to ratify the covenant. The letter itself, if one may judge from the debate in the Canadian House of Commons, was obviously a part of the negotiation which led to the inclusion of the dominions and of India as voting powers in the assembly of the league. It was to make manifest to the parliaments of the dominions that they came in on a legal or constitutional equality with other members of the assembly; that they were represented not by voices only but by equal votes and enjoyed equal rights.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President——

Mr. McCORMICK. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MOSES. I should like to ask the Senator if the question has not obviously been discussed and disposed of in the course of the genesis of the covenant of the league as presented to us by reason of the fact that in the earlier draft proposed for the covenant of the league the representatives of the constituent nations were to be the diplomatic representatives of those nations, accredited to a certain unnamed capital? It being apparent that Canada, Australia, New Zealand, South Africa, and India had no diplomatic representatives, and therefore could not have representation in the league under that basis, the entire structure of the league as originally proposed was changed in order to give these dominions, colonies, and parts of the Empire a clear and unequivocal representation in the league, with the ultimate privilege, as pointed out in the letter of the big three to Sir Robert Borden, of seats in the council itself.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator from New Hampshire, if he will permit me to say so, merely adds evidence to evidence which is already conclusive on that point. Nobody would deny Canada a vote. There is no one here who belittles her splendid sacrifices, nor is there anyone here who belittles the great and splendid part in the war played by Great Britain when during the long years, while she awaited the coming of the conquering legions from overseas, she held the bloody breach. Never in her greatest days was England greater than she was during the long agony of this war; but, Mr. President, I do not think that any proponent of the covenant as it stands or that even any among those who believe that the British Empire should have six votes to one for the United States would hold that the measure of sacrifice, actual or relative, should be the gauge of representation, whether in the assembly or the council of the league.

It would be invidious to draw comparisons in this regard, but among those who first made sacrifice upon the altar of liberty and those who spent most liberally of their treasure and their blood France ranks as chief, and yet nowhere have Frenchmen ever asserted that on that score France should enjoy a primacy in the league.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President——

Mr. McCORMICK. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. MOSES. May I ask the Senator if it is not a fact that others of the nations constituting the league have colonies or dependencies quite as much entitled to representation as the British dependency of India? Is it not a fact that, upon the basis of Indian representation in the assembly of the league, the French, if they saw fit to do so, could quite as well demand representation for their African and Asian dependencies, and Belgium also for her African colonies?

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, the Senator's question is opportune at this moment. In connection with the remark of the Senator from North Dakota that no one save Senators of the United States has challenged the disproportionate representation of the British Empire in the league, Sir Robert Borden, who is a credible witness, remarked during the course of the debate in the Canadian House of Commons that the representatives of every great power had challenged the proposal that the dominions of the British Empire be represented in the league. If he is to be believed, the representatives of the United States, then, as well as those of the other powers, challenged the very representation which now they support upon the stump and in the Senate of the United States.

The Senator from New Hampshire, who, like myself, has followed the debates in the French Chamber through the Journal Officiel of the French Chamber of Deputies, will bear me out when I say that not once but repeatedly critics of the treaty in the French Chamber have based their criticisms, in part, upon that disproportionate representation.

M. Angagnew, in a speech which might be characterized as bitter, argued that French colonies no less than those of Britain deserved representation in the assembly if British dominions and dependencies were there to be represented.

M. Franklin-Bouillon, who is known to many Senators, who himself is a graduate of an English university, and who is the chairman of the committee on foreign relations in the French Chamber, has twice spoken against the treaty on the score of the representation of the British dominions and the Empire of India in the assembly of the league.

It is the habit of men when they are engaged in debate, and especially when they are supporting a cause which hitherto they have opposed in principle, to become more royalist than the king. In this case they are prone to be, as a distinguished British editor has pointed out, more English than the English themselves.

Mr. MOSES. Mr. President——

Mr. McCORMICK. I yield to the Senator from New Hampshire.

Mr. MOSES. I hope the Senator will not pass from his interesting discussion of the debate in the French Chamber without permitting me to call attention to the fact that the French critics of the treaty in regard to the disproportionate representation of the French Republic and the British Empire felt constrained not to press that criticism to the point of textual amendment of the instrument because they hesitated to add further irritation to a strained situation between the French and British, already well-nigh to the breaking point, growing out of incidents connected with the publication of the British-Persian agreement, and that it was only because they hesitated to see themselves flying in the face of their allies that they desisted.

Mr. McCORMICK. Oh, no; the Senator is not quite accurate on that point. They forbore to press textual amendments because, under the French constitution, the Parliament is forbidden to amend a treaty.

Mr. MOSES. Ah, yes, Mr. President——

Mr. McCORMICK. If you please, during the debate their criticism was restrained in view of the bitterness engendered by the treaty. They substituted for amendments resolutions, of which more will be heard during the debate in the Senate.

Mr. MOSES. Yes, Mr. President; but that particular resolution was not pressed at the moment in the French Chamber because of the situation which I have described.

Mr. McCORMICK. I think that is true.

I was saying, Mr. President, when the Senator from New Hampshire interrupted me, that in the course of this debate Senators have become more royalist than kings and more English than the English themselves. The most conspicuous supporter of the league covenant in England, who has not held office under the coalition government, is A. G. Gardiner, until recently editor of the London Daily News, which is the foremost of the so-called "cocoa" press in London, widely read, and as influential as any of the organs of liberalism in England—the most powerful, perhaps, of the British liberal organs.

Great Britain—

Writes Mr. Gardiner—

doesn't want any loaded dice; the British Empire is a unit, one and indivisible.

Admitting—

And I now quote the correspondent—

that the present draft of the league of nations covenant gave the Empire a preponderance of votes in the assembly, A. G. Gardiner, editor of the London Daily News, advocated to-day an amendment—

Not a reservation, but an amendment—

stipulating expressely that when one section of the British Empire is involved in a matter all other sections be prevented from voting.

"If asked to accept such an amendment, I am sure the British people willingly would do so," Gardiner said.

"The spirit of the covenant certainly contemplates the British Empire as a unit. But it fails to specify this, probably, because the omission never came to the attention of the peace conferees. Now that the issue has been raised, however, it will not be difficult to make the wording conform to the spirit and to eliminate America's cause for fear. Perhaps the wording could be changed without resubmitting the covenant to the nations concerned if Great Britain, as the interested party, would request the change."

Here, Mr. President, the English are purposing to do in our behalf what Senators shrink from doing in the service of the United States.

Mr. Gardiner continues:

"Although the intention of the conferees obviously was not to give the British Empire more votes than the United States, the text of the covenant justifies Senator REED's assertion. He believes that in case of a dispute between the United States and one section of the Empire, the other sections would be sitting in judgment on the matter. Personally, I think it is debatable how much the scales would be loaded.

It is conceivable that Canada's or South Africa's interests might be opposed to those of the Empire, or even allied with America's. But I readily understand the American concern in the matter and recognize it as a real objection which should be met. Perhaps the best way would be to insert a ruling in the covenant specifically covering this exigency."

Mr. President, unless the grounds for differences in the covenant, in the treaty, or in diplomatic negotiations and instruments which have been consummated contemporaneously with the treaty be debated now and with candor we shall enter the league, if enter we do, threatened from the beginning with bitter controversies.

The dice, some of the parties to the covenant will feel, are loaded. It is, perhaps, one of the penalties of intimate association between powers that acrimonious disputes should arise which do not arise between powers whose relations are few and are simple. It is for that reason that many of us shrink from entering into intimate bonds with the old powers, whose European interests have engendered recurring animosities and recurring wars for generations.

If I have ventured to quote so distinguished a supporter of the league as Mr. Gardiner, so unwavering and so unqualified a supporter of the President as is Mr. Gardiner, on the matter of equal representation of the great powers in the assembly of the league, it is because Mr. Gardiner's position demonstrates what happily may prove true in the future as in the present—that when differences arise between countries candid, courageous, and fair-minded men will speak out, wherever they may be found. At present public opinion in Europe is aroused over the Anglo-Persian treaty in a degree——

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President——

Mr. McCORMICK. I yield to the Senator from Wisconsin.

Mr. LENROOT. Before the Senator leaves this discussion of inequality of voting, I want to ask him whether he thinks the best remedy for this inequality is to increase the number of votes of the United States?

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin knows, of course, that I am opposed to the terms of the covenant as they stand; but if the covenant is to remain a political instrument I am inclined to believe that that is the better remedy.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator, then, tell me how, in his opinion, an increase in the number of votes of the United States would protect the United States in any matter in which she was vitally interested? If the Senator will permit me to give him an illustration——

Mr. McCORMICK. I was going to ask the Senator from Wisconsin to elaborate his point.

Mr. LENROOT. If the vote of the United States is increased to six in a given case, and we should have a dispute with some member other than Great Britain—because there is another amendment which takes care of that—what difference could it make to the United States in that dispute whether it had one vote or a hundred? None of them could be utilized in any case in which she was a party to a dispute.

Mr. McCORMICK. I think the Senator from Wisconsin means to ask me if I believe that the addition of five to the number of votes of the United States would be protection enough. I do not.

Mr. LENROOT. In any case where we were a party to a dispute we would have no vote at all, whether one or five.

Mr. McCORMICK. Precisely. I was saying, Mr. President, that I had ventured to quote the former editor of the London Daily News in this connection, because I believed that one of the promises of better relations between the powers lies in the increasing readiness of candid and courageous and fair-minded men to speak out upon these differences.

The Anglo-Persian treaty has provoked more bitterness and more discussion in Europe than it has in the United States. It has engendered a sharp difference of opinion in England, no less than in France. During a recent debate in the Senate upon the relation of Persia to the British Empire under the proposed covenant, and under the treaty consummated between Persia and the British Empire, allusion was made to the disclaimers on the part of the British Government, disclaimers of any intent to impose a protectorate upon Persia or to establish one by negotiation. In order that there may be no assumption, on the part of those who defend the British course more unequivocally than do the British themselves, that I for one seek to impute to the British Government a dishonorable motive, or to the British people an all-conquering lust of territory, I want to read, in part, Lord Curzon's statement. It is the more interesting because of his long study and long experience in Egypt, in the Levant, and in India, where he served as viceroy. Speaking of Persia and the establishment of a protectorate over Persia, Lord Curzon says:

On the contrary, she would have resented and resisted it. I should have been opposed to it because it would have been contrary to our repeated engagements, and, in the last resort, because I should have regarded it as inimical to British interests.

We have, or shall have, as a result of this war, enough to do in the eastern parts of the world. If a nation assumes a protectorate, it also assumes certain responsibilities which have a tendency to attain the weight of a heavy burden. Above all, it is compelled to give financial assistance on a scale which may ultimately be overwhelming. Therefore, neither I nor my colleagues would have consented to or acquiesced in anything like the creation of a British protectorate over Persia.

Mr. Cecil Harmsworth, under secretary for foreign affairs, in the House of Commons spoke as follows:

The policy of His Majesty's Government is to assist Persia to reestablish herself on a sound basis. There is not the slightest foundation for a suspicion that the Government proposed, or that the Persian Government would have consented, to create anything in the nature of a protectorate.

Before I advert to similar disclaimers in the past I beg leave to read from current comment in the British press. The British Manchester Guardian, which in the north of England is the fellow of the London Daily News, says:

If these things had been done by any other power, we should say that they amounted to a veiled protectorate.

The Daily News, presumably under its new editor, bitterly dissents from the disavowal of the Government, saying:

Our record up to the present in this matter is anything but creditable. We have committed ourself to an agreement with France incompatible with any genuine belief in the efficacy of the league. We have concluded an agreement with Persia constituting an open mockery of the principles that the league embodies. We have announced a scheme for the preference for mandate territories no less incompatible with the spirit underlying the whole covenant.

The London Post, which represents the opposite pole of British political opinion, speaks in the same vein.

I have here the English Review for September of this year:

The first test—

Of the new era among peoples, says the editor—

is the petty controversy between France and Britain over the small division of the spoils that has its "spiritual home" or material oil fields in Persia. There we have at least neutral territory. Persia did not come within the zone of war, but Persia is to come within the settlement, and so for £2,000,000, invested at the comfortable return of 7 per cent, we are to guarantee Persian integrity and self-determination. Those who remember the Persian delegation knocking at the door of the "big three" at Paris must indeed smile when they read of this accord so profiteeringly yet happily arranged "on the spot," far from the importunities of the league of nations, for though to the general public the deal may signify little, to those who have oil shares it means much, and to the diplomatists of the old secret school it is a master stroke. Persia is settled. We assume responsibility. Persia enters the British imperial orbit.

The trouble is France, for the French are logical, and, looking at Persia, they not unnaturally ask where they come in, seeing that oil is good business and Persia occupies a highly important strategic position, the railways for which they, at any rate, would like to control or contract for pari passu.

I said a few moments ago that I quoted Mr. Harmsworth and Lord Curzon in order that none of the supporters of the Anglo-Persian treaty in the Senate might attribute to me the assumption that the British Government was not speaking in good faith.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. McCORMICK. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, of course I am very much interested in the exposition the Senator is giving of the action of Great Britain with reference to the negotiation of the Persian treaty; and it is also interesting to know the views of the liberal press in Great Britain relative to the action of their Government; but this is the question I am about to propound to the Senator—and I do not do it with any purpose to be offensive——

Mr. McCORMICK. Although that may be the consequence.

Mr. KING. What does the Senator suggest should be done by this Government? How are we, in the view of the Senator, to interpose ourselves to prevent the execution of the terms of that treaty? If Persia is satisfied, is the Senator from Illinois dissatisfied with the treaty; and if so, is it the purpose of the Senator from Illinois to suggest that our Government should intervene and try to set aside the treaty and interpose itself or the league of nations to bring Great Britain and Persia within the league of nations as a subject of review?

Mr. McCORMICK. In the language of Francis, answering that other incomparable philosopher and parliamentarian, the friend of Sir John Falstaff, I say "Anon." I will touch upon that point later. But let me ask if the Senator has read the text of the resolution which I introduced this morning?

Mr. KING. I heard it read this morning from the desk.

Mr. McCORMICK. The Senator doubtless has noted in the press that the State Department has made representations to the British Government on the score that the Anglo-Persian

treaty was not in consonance with the negotiations which have been so happily consummated at Paris.

Mr. KING. I recall that the newspapers published something respecting the attitude which the State Department had taken, and yet I was curious to know upon what theory the State Department of our Government was interposing and was calling to account either Persia or Great Britain for the negotiation of a treaty which seems, so far as I can ascertain, to be quite satisfactory to both England and Persia.

Mr. McCORMICK. I am not less curious than the Senator from Utah as to the terms which our State Department addressed to the British Government. Perhaps he may be more successful than other Senators have been, and perhaps than I shall be, in eliciting those terms.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

Mr. McCORMICK. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I think perhaps I can shed some light on the question in answer to the inquiry of the Senator from Utah. The covenant of the league of nations provides that any treaty contrary to its provisions, and in violation of its spirit, shall be void; and consequently the United States, if the existing treaty should be adopted and the league of nations become effective, would be entirely within its rights in calling the attention of Great Britain to the fact that the Persian treaty was in violation of the covenant. But if it were not for the present treaty, as a matter of course the United States would be guilty of questionable propriety in making any suggestion of the kind. I take it, therefore, that the Senator from Illinois, who protests so vigorously against the Anglo-Persian treaty, is quite pleased that the Government of the United States has this opportunity to call attention to the inconsistency between it and the present treaty.

Mr. McCORMICK. I have said to the Senator from Utah, "Anon." I will say to the Senator from Montana—

> There are more things in heaven and earth, Horatio,
> Than are dreamt of in your philosophy.

But I wish to dwell upon the aspects of the Persian treaty as they were discussed here upon the floor the other day in connection with the guaranties under article 10.

When the Senator from Utah interrupted, I had referred to the statements of Lord Curzon and Mr. Cecil Harmsworth, and I wish to recall at this time that thirty-odd years ago similar statements were made by Lord Granville and Lord Dufferin, and more notably by Lord Salisbury and Mr. Gladstone, in connection with a like situation. British troops were in occupation of Egypt, as they were quartered in Persia at the time the recent treaty was negotiated. An anomalous diplomatic relation, a sort of irregular political intimacy, had been established between the Egyptian and British Governments, as now one has been established between the Persian and British Governments. Mr. Gladstone remarked at the time that occupation prolonged would be an annexation.

> We are against it—

Said he—that is, against annexation—

> on the ground of the specific and solemn pledges given to the world in the most solemn manner and under the most critical circumstances—pledges which have earned for us the confidence of Europe at large during the course of difficult and delicate operations, and which, if one pledge can be more sacred and solemn than another, special sacredness in this case binds us to observe.

It was Lord Salisbury who retorted in the House of Lords to the suggestion that the occupation should become permanent, that a protectorate should be established or that Egypt should be annexed to the Empire—

> My noble friend pays an insufficient regard to the sanctity of the obligations which the Government of the Queen have undertaken and by which they are bound to abide.

In Egypt, as in Persia, the British entered into political relations and economic relations with the native Government, to assure the payment of the Egyptian bonded debt, to restore and establish order, to advance the economic interests of the country, to insure its development.

Senators will recall that French opinion at the time was restive, as it was at intervals, until ultimately, when Commander Marchand crossed the Sahara and arrived at Eashoda, France and Britain were at swords' points. There was engendered an animosity and a tension as great as that which preceded the outbreak of the Great War, greater than that which followed the Agadir incident by far. It was only relieved when France renounced the explorer's title to the countries discovered by Marchand.

There were British advisers appointed, as British advisers are to be appointed in Persia, to the vast material benefit of Egypt; advisers in the administration of the railway; in irrigation; in agriculture; advisers civil and advisers military. British capital was sought to encourage the economic development of the country. The material development of Egypt under Lord Cromer is a monument to the administrative genius of Britain and to the impartial justice meted out under the heavy hand of the occupying power. Egypt blossomed like a garden, enjoyed a peace and a prosperity unequaled since the time of the Ptolemies, prospered until during the war cotton lands at the mouth of the Nile Delta rose to a value of something like $2,000 an acre. The fellaheen were glutted with profits, assured by their support of the Allies as well as by the peace and the order established by Britain. Then there was given to the world as a panacea the self-determination of peoples, prescribed ad libitum, with equal doses for all, no matter whether or not their stomachs were habituated to democracy and representative institutions. Egypt, witnessing self-determination in the Hedjaz and wherever else the addition of a machine gun to the breechclout made possible the vindication of that doctrine, decided for self-determination, too.

I do not argue that Egypt was ready, but Egypt thought so and attempted to assert its sovereign right. The league has denied the sovereignty of the Egyptian people, and, in cynical contradiction of our course in Costa Rica, for example, our administration, recognized the right of Britain to nominate the sovereign head of the Egyptian government. The British protectorate over Egypt was recognized by this Government and then by the peace treaty to which the powers have become signatory.

I have made this long excursion to show what very well may be in store for Persia. Civil and military advisers are to be appointed, moneys are to be advanced, government is to be organized, all by the greatest of colonizing powers, which has carried civilization further afield than any power since Rome. The spokesmen for that great power have disclaimed any intention to infringe the sovereignty of Persia. Oh, I have heard it said that Persia agreed to the terms of the new treaty. So did Egypt. I hear it said that Persia will vastly benefit by the occupation. I dare say; I do not doubt it; but the secretary of the Persian delegation in Paris, from whom the negotiation of the treaty and its consummation were privy, protested at length, even though the foreign minister, who signed the treaty in Teheran, defended it. I do not believe that anyone will argue that the treaty came into being under conditions which made for the free choice of Persia, nor will any British statesman argue that there was no selfish impulse on the part of Britain in the negotiation of the treaty. It makes for the security of Persia's northern frontier. It completes the "sanitary cordon" to the south of Russia. It supplies the missing link in the chain which is to bind Calcutta to Cairo, and links India with the other all-red route from Cairo to the Cape.

Now, the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], who is worn with long waiting for my answer to his question, has gone, and must read to-morrow, if he will, what I have to say on the point.

Great lawyers will assert that Persian sovereignty is unimpaired. I dare say so. Also unimpaired is the sovereignty of Haiti, which is fast in the grip of 1,100 American marines, while the Haitien President never moves within or without his palace unless accompanied by his body guard, a gunner's sergeant of the Marine Corps.

If any of those who are interested in the Anglo-Persian situation have followed the financial columns of the British press they will have noted certain consolidations of oil interests. The Royal Dutch and Shell have consummated a union and are seeking capital in the United States, where the great international bankers have an interest purely altruistic in article 10 of the league. The smaller Scottish oil companies are being united in one corporation, which is to become the Scottish selling agent of the Anglo-Persian Oil Co., which is going to bring together the oil interests of the Persian Gulf and the Burmese-Siamese Peninsula. We need not take too seriously the London gossip that the British Government's support of the Anglo-Persian Oil Co. was one of the precipitant causes of the war; but here are material interests, obviously of enormous importance in the current development of oil, growing up in Persia precisely as they did in Egypt. Whatever the technical situation of Persia, however intact may be its sovereignty, de jure de facto, we have Britain already exploiting to the advantage of mankind the Persian oil fields and making ready to supply fuel for the development of Mesopotamia. We have here the establishment of tremendous material interests, the safeguarding of which, the public supervision of which, will be in fact the charge of the stronger party to the Anglo-Persian treaty. The usufruct will belong to that power.

It was said during the debate to which I have alluded that, under article 10, we would not be guaranteeing Persia to the British Empire. We would, however, be guaranteeing the status quo in which Persia finds herself under the treaty. I see the

Senator from Montana [Mr. WALSH] nodding denial of the statement, and I shall be interested to hear his argument on that point.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President——

Mr. McCORMICK. I yield to the Senator from Montana.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I had not intended to say anything at all upon that subject, but I am quite ready to express my views about the matter very briefly, although they were so clearly expressed by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] the other day that I can not conceive that there can be very much doubt about the views entertained on this side of the Chamber.

The question was presented whether Great Britain could call upon the United States, under the provisions of article 10, to protect her in her occupancy of Persia. The Senator from Nebraska clearly pointed out that the treaty provides—whether that is hypocritical or otherwise—that Persia remains a sovereign country, and consequently Great Britain could not possibly claim that any war would be calculated to deprive her of independence or territorial sovereignty if it were directed in any wise against Persia.

Mr. McCORMICK. Yes, Mr. President, and the Persian minister of foreign affairs, coifed with an astrakhan fez, robed in a single-breasted frock coat, with Shah orders on his bosom, will act upon the advice of a blonde gentleman in a pith helmet and cotton suit, and invite the guaranty of Persian territory by American troops if it should be invaded by a power which could not be repelled by the force organized by Britain under the treaty. If this treaty were as innocent as its face, why were the negotiations conducted in secret? Why were they conducted privy from the Persian delegation at the Paris peace conference?

There are material objections to the covenant and to the treaty, but I think there are none greater than the dark circumstances which environed the negotiation of the treaty of peace and of the Anglo-Persian treaty. Nothing can militate more against the success of the ambassadors of good will everywhere, whether they be accredited diplomatic agents or merely travelers; nothing can do more to negative the mission of the greatest and most distinguished of all ambassadors, Lord Grey, accredited to this Government by Great Britain, than the secrecy in which the Persian treaty and the treaty of peace have been negotiated.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, on Friday last the junior Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] undertook to call the attention of the Senate to what he conceived to be an inconsistency between the interpretation given to article 10 of the covenant for the league of nations by the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WOLCOTT] and that which had been previously given it by myself. This was quite in keeping with a very noticeable effort to point out what are alleged to be ambiguities and uncertainties in this document as a justification either for rejecting the entire treaty or for the introduction of amendments or reservations. Often these ambiguities and uncertainties are magnified where doubt exists and oftentimes created where none can possibly arise. In that connection the Senator called attention to my attitude upon the significance of article 10 as recorded in the RECORD. I am quoted as saying, and quite correctly:

> Under the first sentence of article 10, I repeat, our obligation is absolute and perfect whenever a war of aggression is made against any other member of the league.

And again:

> I assert that whenever this country is in any manner called upon, or it is suggested that its obligation under article 10 has arisen, the Congress of the United States determines whether the condition set out under article 10 exists, namely, whether the territorial integrity and existing political independence of another member of the league is threatened by aggression. If it is, then it is the duty of the United States, under this treaty, to do whatever is reasonably necessary upon its part to prevent that threat from being accomplished.

I followed with some degree of care, Mr. President, the exceedingly able address of the Senator from Delaware as it was being delivered in the Senate, and I was not able then to perceive, nor am I able now to recognize, any inconsistency whatever between the position taken by him at that time and my own position as expressed in the brief extract from my remarks just quoted. The Senator from Delaware, among other things, said:

> These considerations therefore prompt me to take the view that, considered in the light of the whole covenant and its purposes, several action on the initiative of the respective nations in keeping article 10 is in nowise contemplated. In other words, whatever is done or suggested to be done in keeping the obligations of article 10 is to be the result of the common judgment of the council, arrived at after joint deliberation.

And again:

> Therefore it seems clear to me that when the external aggression has been committed by one nation in violation of the provisions of article 10, no duty rests on any member of the league to immediately rush to the defense of the aggrieved nation; that the council, in considering the case, can only give advice, in which case still there is no duty upon any particular nation to follow the advice.

The Senator from Delaware was meeting, and very successfully, the idea, to inculcate which no little effort has been made, that the real obligation of this whole article rested upon the United States. The article in question, article 10, is continually discussed as though the obligation thereof rested upon the United States alone; that whenever war broke out in any quarter of the globe, however remote, the duty fell upon the United States, as the general policeman of the whole world, to go there and quell the disturbance. It is never even suggested that the same obligation rests upon every other nation which is a member of the league; but the United States is obligated no more than any other nation here.

Mr. President, there is not the slightest doubt in the world that whenever a war of aggression is actually precipitated or threatened, all the nations of the earth—at least, those who are members of the league; and the council, being in session, will be the appropriate body to represent them—will confer together in relation to the means by which the obligation shall be carried out according to the provisions of the second sentence of the article; so that, while the obligation rests upon the United States, and rests upon every other member of the league, in all reasonable probability no one will take action with reference to the matter until after the council considers the matter and outlines a procedure by which the disturbance is to be quelled and the aggressor is restrained in his criminal designs.

Why, Mr. President, when we went into this war we did not start off on our own account, outlining a plan of campaign, devising a system under which we, independent from all the other nations involved in the contest upon our side, were going to undertake to suppress Germany or overcome her pretensions. We simply went in with the other nations; we conferred with them by our proper representatives; we had our representative upon the general war council sitting in Paris; and concerted action was taken. Of course, that is the model for the procedure that will occur under article 10; and undoubtedly this country, as well as every other country bound by the obligation, will await the advice which is given by the council.

But, Mr. President, it must be borne in mind that the council acts only by unanimity. It starts in with nine members. Those may increase from time to time. Now, I do not think it can be fairly argued that if the offending nation is able to secure the adherence of only one member of the nine, so that there can not be any unanimous decision, thereby it will be able to paralyze and destroy the effect of article 10.

For instance, Mr. President, the capacity of Germany for intrigue has been sufficiently demonstrated. She starts a war of aggression against some neighboring country—Poland, for instance. I do not think anybody can reasonably contend that if Germany is only able to get one nation out of the nine represented upon the council to disagree to the plan that is proposed by the other eight, she will thus escape the risk she runs under the provisions of article 10, nor that thereby all the nations of the earth will be exonerated from their obligation thereunder. I scarcely believe that anyone who feels that there is any force or efficacy whatever to article 10 will make that contention; but if there be any such, Mr. President, he must then confess that article 10 thunders in the index but is woefully silent in the body of the book, because it is not at all improbable that there will be disagreement with respect to one; and how easily a purpose to aid the aggressive nation in its purpose could be concealed under a mere disagreement to the plan of action that is proposed by the other eight members of the council. If that is the case, the other members are not released from their obligations, to my mind at least, in any degree whatever; but the obligation still rests upon them to repress, so far as they can, the nation which has broken the common peace by uniting, if they can, outside of the provisions of article 10, pursuing a concerted plan other than that which was proposed in the league, but which was not assented to.

In that view, Mr. President, I do not conceive that there is the slightest difference of opinion between the Senator from Delaware and myself. In other words, I agree fully with the Senator from Delaware that that would be the course that would be pursued; but I can not agree that no obligation rests upon any member of the league under the provisions of article 10 provided you can not get a unanimous action of the council.

The Senator from Wisconsin then asks, if the Senator from Delaware entertains the view concerning the significance of article 10 which he, the Senator from Wisconsin, attributes to him, why he, the Senator from Delaware, should object to a

reservation which would expressly so state; and then he adds, if the construction given to the article by the Senator from Montana is correct, how any nation should ever bind itself to such an obligation. I have no means of knowing just exactly what answer the Senator from Delaware would make to the inquiry addressed to him by the Senator from Wisconsin. He is here, I observe, and will undoubtedly be able fully to satisfy the Senator from Wisconsin; but if the question were addressed to me, if I had the same idea of it that the Senator from Wisconsin seems to think the Senator from Delaware has, I would say to the Senator from Wisconsin that I should object to a reservation so stating, and I should object to a reservation so stating for the sole reason that if you attach any such reservation to your ratification, Germany is not bound by her signature or her act of ratifying the treaty. In other words, if you attach any such reservation to your resolution of ratification, you put Germany, so far as the United States is concerned, in exactly the position that these two countries would occupy with relation to each other if, immediately upon the cessation of hostilities, every soldier except the few that are there now were withdrawn from German territory. You put us in the same situation that we would be in if we had no means of compelling Germany to sign the treaty on the 11th day of November, 1918. You put us in exactly the position we would be in if we had recalled every soldier forthwith to this country, even before the armistice was signed.

It is true that, by reason of the commanding position which the United States now holds as the center of the financial world, we can exercise commercial pressure upon Germany which may possibly compel the acceptance of such a reservation, or of other reservations; but, Mr. President, every advantage which we secure by reason of our military triumph over Germany has gone to the winds.

I do not see how any Senator who really attends to the fundamental legal principles can take the view that a change may be effected in part 1, constituting the covenant of the league of nations, without the assent of Germany. It seems to be conceded that the assent of the other signatories to the treaty, at least of those who become members of the league, is necessary either if any substantial change is made in the text or if any substantial addition is made to the resolution of ratification, either by way of reservation or proviso or amendment. But it is said that the consent of Germany to such changes is not necessary because Germany is not a member of the league. I pointed out the other day, however, that many provisions of the treaty of the most vital concern to Germany introduce the league of nations and the council of the league of nations. The council of the league of nations determines a vast number of questions in which Germany is interested. Consequently she is interested in the constitution of the assembly as well as the constitution of the council; and any amendments or changes that in any manner interfere with the constitution of either of these bodies, or with the powers they exercise, is a matter of the greatest concern to Germany.

Mr. LENROOT rose.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If the Senator will pardon me for just a minute, after Germany has signed this treaty or ratified it she then becomes bound by every provision, and she has consented that the covenant may be modified without her consent; but on fundamental principles she is not bound either by her signature or by her ratification, so far as we are concerned, unless we sign and ratify.

Mr. President, this does not require any intimate acquaintance with the principles of international law. It addresses itself to the plain judgment of the ordinary business man. A has certain negotiations with B concerning some business matter. A sits down and writes out a contract and signs it and sends it to B, saying, "This, I believe, is the agreement which we entered into, at least as I understand it. I have signed it. I send it to you in duplicate. You sign it and return to me a duplicate with your signature, if you are satisfied." B, however, signs with certain reservations, and sends it back to A. A is not bound. He can say, "No; I shall not agree to the reservations you suggest, and I will not abide by the thing even as I proposed it to you in the first place." He can not even be held to his original proposition, and after A has signified his attitude with reference to the matter, B is too late to say, "Well, I will withdraw the reservations." His day of grace has gone.

So, Mr. President, if there were no other reason, and I were taking the attitude with respect to article 10 that is attributed to the Senator from Delaware, I would say, "No; I am satisfied that that is the meaning of article 10. I do not want to give Germany an opportunity to get out of the obligations which we forced her to accede to at the close of a successful war."

But, Mr. President, the Senator asks why any nation should ever care to obligate itself in that way if the interpretation given to the article by myself is the correct one. Speaking for myself, I am quite willing that the United States should obligate itself in that way, because I believe that by so obligating itself, together with all the other members of the league—bearing in mind that it is not the United States alone that is obligating itself, but all the members so obligating themselves—there will be no war until, indeed, the world is again divided into two hostile camps, neither of which will observe any obligation to the requirements of this covenant.

Why do I say so? Mr. President, it has been said before, but it will bear repeating, that that is exactly what the Monroe doctrine is. The United States published to all the world 100 years ago that if any nation should attack any Republic on the Western Hemisphere we would make war upon them. That has served to keep all Europe and all Asia from any act of aggressive warfare upon any Republic on this continent, and we never had to spend a dollar, nor did it cost us the life of a single American citizen.

What is the reason for doubting that, if we and every nation in Europe say that if any nation shall attempt to invade the sovereignty of another in aggressive warfare all the world will proceed to engage them? I referred some time ago to our treaty with Panama. We have asserted the Monroe doctrine by the treaty with Panama, by which we have guaranteed the territorial integrity and political independence of that State. No nation dare attack the Republic of Panama without hearing the screams of the eagle, and no nation will, Mr. President, on this continent or upon any other continent. It has preserved the peace of that country ever since. Colombia long since would have made war upon Panama did she not know that the moment she put her troops across the border, whether in a righteous war or in an unrighteous war, whether in a just war or in an unjust war, whether with provocation or without provocation, we would be there with all our power, all our military, all our financial resources, and all our resources in men. Thus there is not the slightest fear about anybody making war upon the Republic of Panama, whether on this continent or any other continent.

The other day the Senator from New York [Mr. WADSWORTH] made a very impressive speech, and a very temperate one, in which he presented the case of Greece making war against Bulgaria over the boundary between those two countries, the outgrowth of the controversy over the division of Thrace. He called attention to the fact that there are 700,000 Greeks in this country, and to the provisions of article 16, as follows:

> Should any member of the league resort to war in disregard of its covenants under articles 12, 13, or 15, it shall ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the league, which hereby undertake immediately to subject it to the severance of all trade or financial relations, the prohibition of all intercourse between their nationals and the nationals of the covenant-breaking State, and the prevention of all financial, commercial, or personal intercourse between the nationals of the covenant-breaking State and the nationals of any other State, whether a member of the league or not.

He called attention to the fact that a most deplorable state of circumstances would arise here in this country if Greece, in view of these provisions, should make war upon Bulgaria. The Senator stated, in that connection, that it would be a violation of law for one to go into a Greek delicatessen store to buy a pound of cheese or into a Greek shoe-shining parlor to have his shoes shined. So it would. That would be exceedingly distressing to the 700,000 Greeks in this country. I suppose the probabilities are that there are at least three times 700,000 Greeks scattered all over the civilized world, in Great Britain and in her colonies, and in the States along the Mediterranean Sea; and in each one of those States every Greek would be subjected to exactly the same disadvantages and annoyances that the 700,000 Greeks would in this country. And yet it seems never to have occurred to the Senator from New York at all that the Government of Greece, realizing the plight in which it would place all of its nationals all over the world by going to war with Bulgaria, might be deterred from going to war against Bulgaria.

Moreover, Mr. President, when Greece recognizes that not only would her nationals be thus placed in peril in all the countries of the world, but she herself, by such an act, would bring down upon her possibly the military forces of all the world, not of the United States alone, but of Italy, France, Spain, Great Britain, Japan, Belgium, Norway, Sweden, Denmark, and of all the world, how can we conceive that Greece would go to war with Bulgaria over the dividing line? In all reasonable probability Greece would say, under those circumstances, "Well, the best we can do is to submit this controversy to the council of the league of nations, under the provisions of article 15, which are as follows:

"If there should arise between members of the league any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, which is not submitted to arbitration in accordance with article 13, the members of the league agree that they will submit the matter to the council."

That is the way Greece would act.

The Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], whose eloquence we all admire, according to the newspaper reports was applauded generously and vigorously at a meeting held at one of the churches in this city a short time ago, when he propounded to his listeners the question, "Suppose China should make war upon Japan to get back Shantung; would you be willing to send your sons over to Japan to help Japan beat off the Chinese?"

Mr. President, how could such a thing occur? China is no match for Japan as it is. They tried conclusions some 12 or 15 years ago and the contest did not last long. It would not be necessary now, nor at any time in the future that the mind can very readily conceive of, for Japan to call upon anyone for aid in beating off China.

But if she were impelled to call upon anyone, she would not only call upon the United States but she would call upon every other member of the league, and all would be called upon to respond—Brazil, Argentina, Peru, Great Britain, and all her colonies, Canada, Australia, France, and Italy. Nations never go to war unless there is some chance at least of emerging successfully. Nations do defend themselves against overwhelming odds, determined to do or to die, to preserve their liberties or to expire in the effort. But when it comes to waging aggressive war upon another nation, they never undertake it without a careful calculation of means and ends. How, under these circumstances, is China going to war with Japan? The thing is impossible, if article 10 is operative at all. In other words, if it calls upon us to rush, as it is expressed, to the aid of the country attacked, so it does all other nations of the earth. And then there is not going to be the war that a great many of the Senators apprehend.

I spoke of the Senator from Idaho, who expressed some considerable horror a few days ago at the view I then expressed that if an act of aggression actually exists, the Congress of the United States does not stop to inquire into the justice or the injustice, the right or the wrong, of the war, but goes to the aid of the country attacked. Mr. President, why should anybody entertain any sentiments of horror at such an idea? In the view of this covenant there are no righteous wars of aggression; there are no just wars of aggression. They are all wrong. Of course, I understand that many people do not agree with that. Apparently the Senator from Idaho entertains views somewhat similar to those, or at least related to those, expressed by Bernhardi, that wars are great public benefits, that they are the civilizers of the earth. Perhaps there was a time when there were some righteous wars. The crusades were preached as a matter of course to all the nations of the earth as holy wars, and I am not undertaking to say that they did not result in much benefit. But we have undertaken to propose a different plan in this covenant for settling the disputes that arise between nations.

Article 13 of the covenant provides:

The members of the league agree that whenever any dispute shall arise between them which they recognize to be suitable for submission to arbitration and which can not be satisfactorily settled by diplomacy, they will submit the whole subject matter to arbitration.

Article 15 provides:

If there should arise between members of the league any dispute likely to lead to a rupture, which is not submitted to arbitration in accordance with article 13, the members of the league agree that they will submit the matter to the council.

Article 16 provides:

Should any member of the league resort to war in disregard of its covenants under articles 12, 13, or 15, it shall ipso facto be deemed to have committed an act of war against all other members of the league.

Article 17 provides:

In the event of a dispute between a member of the league and a State which is not a member of the league, or between States not members of the league, the State or States not members of the league shall be invited to accept the obligations of membership in the league for the purposes of such dispute, upon such conditions as the council may deem just.

Thus, Mr. President, we offer a tribunal for settlement of these international disputes, without allowing them to be determined by the arbitrament of war.

When a nation violates its covenants under this league and makes war against a neighbor for the purpose of despoiling it of its territory or overturning the liberties of its people and its independence, we do not stop to inquire whether upon any theory of moral right or wrong the war is justifiable or unjustifiable, righteous or unrighteous. We say to them: "Submit your matters to the tribunal which has been constituted by the league."

When the Hatfields go out to shoot up the McCoys or the McCoys to shoot up the Hatfields, as the case may be, we do not stop to inquire whether the Hatfields deserve shooting or the McCoys deserve hanging. In all probability they do. Their crimes, perhaps, amply justify whatever punishment they get. We do not permit them to execute their own vengeance. We do not stop to inquire whether they have a righteous cause or an unrighteous cause, upon any theory of morals whatever. We seize the man or the body of men who break the general peace, and incarcerate them, and their acts are regarded as murder. If the McCoys have any criticism to make of the Hatfields, if they have suffered any wrongs at their hands, the courts are open to them.

Just a word more, Mr. President. There has been some criticism of article 10 made by the eminent statesman, formerly a Member of this body, Mr. Elihu Root. He advises that article 10 ought to be stricken from the covenant, because, he said, there are many different races in this country, our citizenship is made up of men with European connections, descendants of Europeans, and the question would always be presented as to whether the war was a righteous one or an unrighteous one, and those dissensions would spring up among our people.

I agree that if you have reposed in Congress the power to determine whether the war is a righteous war or an unrighteous war, a just war or an unjust war, those differences will crop out.

Of course, if Germany invades Poland every German in this country, or at least a very considerable number of Germans, will be sure that it is a righteous war and consequently would endeavor by every artifice, by every persuasion that they can command, to have Congress so determine and not enter into the controversy under article 10. Of course, if France desires to prosecute a war against Germany all those of French descent, or at least a very considerable number of them, will be naturally predisposed to regard the war as a righteous one and thus induce Congress to withdraw.

Mr. President, we are not called upon to enter into that question at all. If it is the fact of aggression that fixes our liability, as I insist it does, then it is utterly immaterial, and then all these supposed differences and strifes and contentions among our own people will disappear, when once we adhere to the proposition that all these wars are wrong and that the proper solution of international troubles and disputes is in accordance with the other provisions of the covenant.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, with reference to the argument the Senator from Montana has just made, we need not call up an imaginary case as to what the obligation of the United States would be under article 10, if the treaty should be ratified without reservations relieving us of that obligation. Let us take this case which is present to-day. Suppose the Fiume controversy shall be settled in such way as is dictated by the United States. Suppose that controversy is settled against the claim of Italy, and agreed to by the other parties to the conference because the United States says that it must settle it this way. Suppose Italy some time in the future, strong and powerful, begins a war of aggression to get back Fiume. Is it not entirely possible that the other nations will say, "The United States committed this; let the United States defend with her men the boundaries of Jugo-Slavia," and it will be the appeal from the country upon whom aggression is made that will come to us, and if we remain a self-respecting Nation, pretending to keep pledges that we have made, we will keep our obligation exactly as the Senator from Montana says article 10 should be construed. So it is not an imaginary case in any degree. If the treaty is to be ratified with the obligations of article 10 remaining as they are, it is well within the probabilities that within 12 months we will be called upon to fulfill our obligations under article 10, with our khaki-clad boys crossing the seas to die.

So much for that, Mr. President.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But let me ask the Senator why he reaches the conclusion that every other nation will not accept and fulfill the same obligation?

Mr. LENROOT. I stated that if the controversy should be settled according to the dictation of the United States, and it looks to-day as if it might be, the other countries being willing to settle it upon a different basis, if the United States dictates the boundaries the other nations are very likely to say to the United States, "The nation that dictated these boundaries must defend them."

Mr. WALSH of Montana. If the Senator believes Great Britain or France would endeavor to escape every obligation on such a flimsy pretext as that, as a matter of course, there is no basis for a league at all.

Mr. LENROOT. Perhaps the Senator may have a higher opinion of the honor of those nations, but after what happened with reference to Shantung I should think even the Senator from Montana would be somewhat skeptical.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I merely desire to say that I am not one of those who believe that in every controversy the

United States will be actuated by high and holy motives and every other country by the reverse.

Mr. LENROOT. I shall not pursue that further, but I do want very briefly to refer to another matter before I get to the Senator's reply to a statement that I made the other evening.

The Senator from Montana has repeatedly said that no amendment to the league of nations covenant, or part 1 of the treaty, can be made without its being assented to by Germany.

Mr. President, I have been opposed to amendments to other portions of the treaty, and whether I shall oppose any amendments to the league of nations portion of the treaty will depend upon the merits of the proposition, but I shall not oppose them for the reason that I have opposed other amendments, because amendments can be made to the league of nations portion of the covenant irrespective of any assent or dissent upon the part of Germany.

Let us see if that is not true. This treaty becomes effective, so far as Germany is concerned, whenever three of the principal allied and associated powers have ratified it. That is to say, the treaty will be effective, so far as Germany is concerned, when it is ratified by the British Empire, by France, and by Japan.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Will not the Senator concede that it will be effective only between Germany and those countries?

Mr. LENROOT. I will come to that if the Senator will just have a little patience. The treaty becomes effective as to those three nations when ratified by them, and I think we will all concede that before this body votes upon final ratification of the treaty it will have been ratified by those three great powers and will be effective. Then when it is ratified by those three great powers the league of nations comes into being, consisting of such members as have ratified the treaty or have accepted the invitation to become members of the league, so that when France, the British Empire, and Japan have ratified the treaty the league of nations will consist of the representatives of those three powers, assuming that none others have ratified it, and those three powers, under Germany's agreement in the treaty, can rewrite and amend the league of nations covenant in any way that they see fit. They might rewrite the entire covenant and Germany could not for a moment object, because Germany has agreed that any amendment that may be made to the league covenant will be accepted by her so long as they are made by those who subscribe to the league. Inasmuch as the reservations in the resolution of ratification that will be proposed will, I assume, require that those reservations be assented to by three of the principal powers, those three powers, before our ratification becomes effective, can themselves amend the league, making it read word for word as we desire to have it read.

Has Germany anything to say about it? Can Germany complain or object if our resolution of ratification is in the exact language of the league covenant as the league covenant stands at the time our ratification is deposited? Why, of course not. There can be no doubt about it, unless the Senator takes the position that the league of nations does not come into being until all the nations recited in the preamble as members of it have ratified it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Of course, the Senator does not take any such position.

Mr. LENROOT. I supposed not.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But this is a treaty. We become a member of the league by virtue of the treaty which we make with Germany and we can not be a member of the league if we refuse to sign the treaty with Germany.

Mr. LENROOT. Let us see then. Suppose to-day the treaty is ratified by three of the principal powers——

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Let me ask the Senator, suppose the United States absolutely rejects the treaty, is it the contention of the Senator from Wisconsin that under those circumstances the United States could sit as a member of the council and pass upon German questions or German interests?

Mr. LENROOT. Of course not. We can not sit as a member of the council unless we go into the league in the way provided in the treaty. That is very plain. But suppose that to-day three of the principal nations have ratified the treaty, that the treaty was to-day effective as between those nations and Germany, and to-morrow those nations should amend the league covenant, does the Senator from Montana say that we could not make a treaty of peace with Germany unless we ratified that covenant in the form that it was before it was amended, and if that be so that we could not get into the league of nations because when we amend it it is not the covenant that we entered into? The Senator can take either horn of the dilemma that he chooses.

There can not be any doubt about it, Mr. President. Germany's assent is not required, provided those nations that have ratified before we ratify desire to have us in the league, because they can amend the treaty, Germany has specifically agreed that they may amend the covenant in any way they see fit, and if they see fit to amend it in the way we want to have it amended, Germany has no right to complain.

One word more. The Senator, if I understood him correctly—and it does not seem possible that I could have understood him correctly—said that he saw no inconsistency between his position as to the construction of article 10 and the position of the Senator from Delaware. Why, Mr. President, the only difference between these two distinguished lawyers—and I wish to repeat what I said on Friday, that they are two of the ablest and most distinguished lawyers in this body—is that one of them says that here is a several obligation binding upon the United States; that the only inquiry that the United States can make is whether there has been unlawful external aggression, and if there has been, it is our duty to protect the nation invaded to the full extent and with all the power we have. That is the position of the Senator from Montana, while the position of the Senator from Delaware is simply that there is no obligation of any kind. He says that there is no individual obligation upon the part of the United States. The Senator from Montana says there is. The Senator from Delaware says that the only obligation is to consider the advice of the council, and that we are under no obligation to follow that advice. Mr. President, the positions of the Senator from Montana and the Senator from Delaware are as far apart as the poles; and yet the Senator from Montana would ask the Senate to ratify a treaty as to which upon the most vital matter that has ever confronted the United States in any treaty he and his colleague, the Senator from Delaware, give entirely different constructions.

Mr. CURTIS. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate, as in legislative session, adjourned until to-morrow, Tuesday, October 7, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

MONDAY, *October 6, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Our Father in heaven, fountain of light and life and love, we realize our weakness, the foibles of human nature, and come to Thee at the beginning of the new week which stretches before us with its opportunities and possibilities; that we may drink deep of the fountain, receive new light to guide us, new life to sustain us and larger love, that it may go out in sympathy to our fellow-men in all the conditions and circumstances of life; that Thy kingdom may come in all our hearts and Thy will be done and our work be of the highest order. Under the leadership of the world's great Redeemer. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday was read and approved.

STRIKING CERTAIN MATTER FROM THE RECORD.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday last the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], who had apparently spent a pretty bad night, found in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a poem by Israel Zangwill, inserted by me. If he had looked in the RECORD on pages 6194, 6195, 6196, he would have found three pages by Zangwill, also inserted in another body.

The gentleman from Massachusetts had been away on a trip in the far West and, I thought, had returned full of joviality and good spirits; but, lo and behold! he seizes the first opportunity to demonstrate his ability as a statesman by moving in my absence to expunge the poem. I do not deny for a moment that he could have exercised his privilege to do so; but, lo and behold! some other gentlemen also participated in the discussion. If they are satisfied and contented with the kind of record they made after they read it, I am.

On Saturday last the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS] rose on the floor of the House and made inquiry about the same matter. That gentleman, with his statesmanlike ability, two years ago on the floor of this House said:

Briefly I want to call my colleague's attention to the fact that the high cost of living is getting higher, the price of clothing is increasing, the price of groceries continues to soar, and flour will soon pass the high-water mark established of approximately $15 per barrel. I trust the day is not far distant when the able statesmen upon the floor of this House will give their best thought and lend their best efforts in working out some relief.

More than two years have run away and the gentleman from Florida, notwithstanding his wisdom and his statesmanship, has produced no bill, has produced no resolution, has produced nothing to reduce the cost of living. But he rose on Saturday and asked why action had not been taken to strike out the poem.

In the same speech appears the following:

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SEARS. I refuse to yield to the gentleman or any other gentleman. Fickle fate has indeed been unkind, Mr. Chairman, when it selected the distinguished gentleman from California to lead the fight for Prussianism. I have read of the oppression of his people, and as an American citizen my heart has gone out to them, and it ill befits that gentleman to try to place upon my people, and now his people, the militarism that will, in my opinion, be harder on them than any his people have ever been subjected to.

These people to whom he refers left in France 3,100 of their best who lie buried over there. It ill becomes any man on the floor of this House, or any other place, to deride or ridicule either the Irish people or those of Jewish faith.

Now, Mr. Speaker, in order that I may relieve the minds of these gentlemen, big and broad-minded, in order that they may be able to rest in peace over night and carefully repose during the daytime, I ask unanimous consent that the poem may be omitted from the permanent RECORD. The newspapers of the country have discussed it editorially and given it a wider circulation than could ever be possible to obtain through the RECORD. The poem is not in cold storage, as some of my friends here think it is, but it has gone down in the history of the world much further than some actions and deeds of these gentlemen, small as they are. As the years roll away perhaps they will be contented with the record, but I think their consciences will eventually lead them to regret.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that the poem he has inserted in the RECORD be omitted from the permanent RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to address the House for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, upon what topic?

Mr. HEFLIN. In regard to an election held in Alabama, replying to a statement in the Post.

Mr. WALSH. Is it a statement reflecting on the gentleman from Alabama?

Mr. HEFLIN. It misstates the facts about a campaign that I participated in, and I want to correct it.

Mr. WALSH. I object.

The SPEAKER. To-day being the first Monday in the month, it is for the consideration of bills on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent. The Clerk will report the first bill on the calendar.

ADJUSTMENT OF DISPUTES ARISING FROM FAULTY SURVEYS IN FLORIDA.

The first bill on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 55) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to adjust disputes or claims by entrymen, selectors, grantees, and patentees of the United States against the United States and between each other, arising from faulty surveys in townships 36, 37, and 38 south, ranges 29 and 30 east, Tallahassee meridian, in the State of Florida.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of this bill?

There was no objection.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to equitably adjust disputes and claims by entrymen, selectors, grantees, and patentees of the United States, their heirs or assigns, against the United States and between each other, arising from faulty surveys in townships 36, 37, and 38 south, ranges 29 and 30 east, Tallahassee meridian, in the State of Florida, the said surveys having been shown to have been faulty by the resurvey of certain lands in said townships, and for this purpose the said Secretary is authorized to accept conveyances from and grant patents to any such entrymen, selectors, grantees, patentees, their heirs or assigns, of any of the lands of the United States in the said townships open to entry or settlement which, in the judgment or discretion of said Secretary, it shall be just and equitable to grant or convey to such parties or any of them, to make up any deficiency or loss sustained by any such parties by reason of such faulty surveys, or by the meander lines, location, or existence of lakes or other bodies of water, not shown or incorrectly shown by such original faulty surveys of the United States in said townships, to the end that such entrymen, selectors, grantees, patentees, their heirs or assigns, may be duly vested with the title to such part of the lands of the United States as shall be necessary or proper to make up any deficiency in acreage or loss, as far as possible, due to such faulty survey, as shown by the resurvey of the said townships, preserving to the owners who have lands shown by the former faulty surveys to be actually bounded by lakes or other bodies of water, as far as practicable, the right to have patented to them the lands shown by such new resurveys to lie between their holdings and such lakes or bodies of water: *Provided*, That in the said adjustment no greater area shall be patented to any claimant than that which is surrendered by him or of which he is deprived by the fact that, under the corrected survey, the area to which title, derived from the United States, is now asserted by the entryman, selector, grantee, patentee, his heirs or assigns, is found to have no existence in fact, or to be covered by water and to have been so covered at the time of the faulty survey: *Provided further*, That nothing herein shall be construed as authorizing the Secretary of the Interior in the said settlement to patent to any entryman, selector, grantee, or patentee, or his heirs or assigns an area which, when added to the area retained by the said entryman, selector, grantee, patentee, or his heirs or assigns, shall give a larger acreage than that originally entered or thought to be acquired from the United States, or any grantee of the United States.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman from Florida [Mr. DRANE] if he agrees with the contention of the Secretary of the Interior that section 3 of this bill is unnecessary and whether it is expected that that would be eliminated.

Mr. DRANE. Mr. Speaker, in reply to the gentleman, I would state that at the time I introduced the twin measure, it being introduced simultaneously in the House and in the Senate, I was perfectly willing that that section should be stricken out. When my bill came up for consideration before the Committee on the Public Lands, it was found that the Senate bill was also pending there, having passed the Senate, and that it contained section 3, which it had originally been suggested should be stricken out. I presume the Senate committee left it in there so as to make assurance doubly sure. It does not hurt the bill and it does not make any difference whether it stays in or not.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman state when these original surveys were made, and just how they came to get into this mix up?

Mr. DRANE. The history of that survey in Florida is this: In the late fifties surveys were made of certain public lands in the country in which I have since lived, which at that time contained almost no people at all, except a few of the remnants of the Indian fighters. The survey was made under contract. The contract, as I have been told, was to be paid for at so much per mile. The probabilities are that there was no survey made there at all. I am told in the Land Department that it was simply a pretense at a survey; that it was so faulty as to appear fraudulent upon its face. Be that as it may, a lot of innocent people went in there and established themselves, made their homes and raised their orange groves there, and were not disturbed in their possession until probably within the past two or three years. Within the past two or three years that land, which was supposed in the old days to have had no value, has been penetrated by railroads. It is now rapidly settling up and is of great value.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DRANE. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. Was this survey made by Government surveyors or by private people?

Mr. DRANE. It was made by the Government.

Mr. HICKS. It says in the report that in places that the original monuments are impossible of identification.

Mr. DRANE. A few of them are shown, but none are, in the opinion of the Land Department, absolutely dependable.

Mr. HICKS. Is it the fact that there have been monuments, or were there none established at all?

Mr. DRANE. There were a few established in one or two places, but it seems were never completely located and a reliable survey completed.

Mr. HICKS. What harm is being done at the present time? Is it the fact that the different landowners can not identify their parcels of land?

Mr. DRANE. If the House will indulge me for a few moments, I will read from the report of the Secretary of the Interior as made to the chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands. He makes it very much clearer than I can make it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. DRANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DRANE. Under date of June 12, 1919, the Secretary of the Interior wrote to Mr. SINNOTT, chairman of the Committee on the Public Lands, in part, as follows:

In reporting upon this proposed legislation I am advised by the Commissioner of the General Land Office that the matter of the resurvey of the above-named townships was initiated in January, 1916, by formal application submitted by the settlers and interested landowners. The petition contains the following caption:

"We hereby bind ourselves to fully cooperate in the effort that is now being made to get the United States Land Office to order a resurvey and relocation or retracement of township, range, and section lines in the township above mentioned, and others, if there be such as known to be in error."

The application was supported by certain maps, field notes, and exhibits submitted by the applicants as evidence both of the conditions then existing and of the necessity for resurvey.

After consideration of the data presented, and after conference with the proponents of the resurvey, the Commissioner of the General Land Office reached the conclusion that no general resurvey of the townships in question was necessary or desirable, particularly on account of the fact that the interest retained in the premises by the United States appeared to be so small as to render the petition inadmissible under the departmental ruling of May 22, 1909.

It appeared, however, that the obliteration of the evidences of the original survey was so general as to preclude the possibility of restorations by local surveyors, and that there was considerable confusion and uncertainty as to the boundary lines which the settlers, entrymen, and owners were unable to overcome. Under the circumstances the commissioner was disposed to grant whatever relief could properly be offered short of a general resurvey, and was of the opinion that inasmuch as practically all of the individual entries and unpatented lands were confined to a highly restricted area, the execution of a corrective survey limited to the western portions of townships 36, 37, and 38 south, range 30 east, would be sufficient to clear the situation and accomplish the purpose of the applicants. No action appeared to be necessary in townships 36, 37, and 38 south, range 29 east.

A field examination was accordingly authorized and it was developed that only a small portion of the monuments of the original surveys could be identified with any degree of certainty, sufficient in number, however, and bearing a satisfactory relation to one another to afford a satisfactory control for the reestablishment of the lines of the original surveys.

It was shown by the applicants for the resurvey and by the examiner who made the preliminary investigation that very large discrepancies existed in townships 36 and 37 south, range 30 east, with respect to the position of numerous lakes which exist in these townships. The original township plats show several lakes, but these lakes were not represented in their correct position—i. e., the lakes are located in a different position from that represented on the approved township plats, and with different sinuosities of the shore lines. There are also numerous lakes in these townships which are not represented on the original township plats. The information before the department indicated that much of the doubt and confusion of the settlers in regard to the true position of their boundary lines was due to the discrepancies in the position of the lake areas in these townships. The resurvey of certain lines and boundaries in which the Government has an interest in the proper location of public lands, was, therefore, authorized by the department on December 11, 1916. Such resurvey has been made, and it shows conclusively that the old survey was erroneous in certain details, particularly with reference to the location and identification of numerous lakes in this region, such lakes being in some instances entirely omitted from the original plats, and in other cases not correctly located.

This condition complicated the resurvey, but in no measure disqualifies the identification of the position of the original section lines. Careful technical examination of the resurvey demonstrates that only one position can result from the control based upon the best available evidences of the original survey to be found upon the ground.

A condition developed by the resurvey heretofore made is that an extension of the resurvey to include adjoining areas will probably disclose additional areas of unsurveyed public land, and likewise show that areas disposed of as land will prove to be lake, or that areas shown on the original plats as lake will be found to be land. It is this condition that has led to the introduction of this bill.

While the Land Department may, under existing law (2372 R. S.), by amendment of entries and patents, correct mistakes in descriptions to the end that the Government's patents shall convey the land intended to be entered, such law is hardly broad enough to cover what I understand is desired to be done here, namely, to authorize an exchange of the areas originally entered now found to be lake for vacant areas of public land. As the provisions of the bill appear to be entirely discretionary with the Land Department, I see no objections to it, and it may enable us to make equitable adjustments which might otherwise result in loss or damage by reason of these old erroneous surveys.

I do not think section 3 is necessary, and it best be omitted from the bill, for the President has ample authority under the act of June 25, 1910 (36 Stat., 847), as amended by the act of August 24, 1912 (37 Stat., 497), to make withdrawals in aid of legislation or for other purposes, and I have already submitted to the President a proposed Executive order for the temporary withdrawal of the areas that may be affected by this legislation until the adjustments contemplated may be brought about.

Cordially, yours,

FRANKLIN K. LANE, *Secretary.*

Mr. SINNOTT. Is not that the real trouble, that lakes were shown to be land and land shown to be lakes?

Mr. DRANE. And there were lakes which were shown in an imaginary way; that is, the sinuosities of the lakes were not shown. The whole thing, in brief, is this: The settlers and nonresident landowners in there are at loggerheads with each other. They are going into court, and there is very great confusion. There is no place for proper relief except through the Land Department. The Land Department says this bill will afford the proper relief.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. How much of this land is still in possession of the Federal Government?

Mr. DRANE. I could not tell, except this, that the report of the Secretary says that the amount of land in which the Government is interested is not large enough to make the resurvey of the whole country desirable, and therefore he suggests this as the remedy to save expense to the Government.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. If the Government is interested very little, in very few parcels of land, in fact has very little interest in the entire proposition, why should the Government be asked to do this and how will it in any way be binding upon those who have an interest in the matter?

Mr. DRANE. In this way: Whatever the faulty survey is, the fault was originally caused by a Government surveyor.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. But as far as my information extends, when the Federal Government has parted with its interest in lands it has thereafter nothing whatever to do with it, and the conflicting claims thereafter are private claims and must be settled by the respective contestants. If they can not settle they must go into the courts. After the Government has parted with its interest it washes its hands of the matter entirely. In my judgment the Government ought not to be asked to go to this expense. If it does and establishes new lines they will have no force whatever except as the individual owners down there may be willing to abide by the result of the Government survey.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Florida yield?

Mr. DRANE. Certainly.

Mr. MONDELL. What the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. McLAUGHLIN] just stated is entirely true, and yet the fact remains that this is probably the only way in which these errors, discrepancies, and conflicts can be settled. This is one of the faulty surveys of years past with which people living in public-land States are familiar. Nobody knows just how those errors arose. They probably grew out of the fact that the surveyor who made the survey, knowing that the survey would never be checked in his time, did not run all of the lines. That has been true with regard to surveys in many parts of the West, and it may have been true in this survey in Florida. Some of the lines probably were never run except on paper. Those that were run may have been run so carelessly that they are probably valueless. Until we established the system of marking corners with metal monuments they were marked with monuments which were easily destroyed, quickly decayed, and after a few years could not be identified. Now, it is true that the Federal Government can not now make anything more than a retracement. The Federal Government can go in there and can declare what were the original corners. Upon the best evidence obtainable the retracement can be made which is binding unless it can be proven that the retracement is not accurate. But the Federal authorities have the right to retrace and to say where the old corners were, and to a certain extent that would settle the controversy, because ordinarily the private owner does not contest a retracement by the Federal Government, but in that event he must prove that the retracement is not accurate. But the retracement does not fully settle the situation because of the fact that the original survey was faulty, but people have so high a regard for Federal surveys they are much more inclined to accept the judgment of a Federal surveyor than that of the local surveyor.

The SPEAKER. The 10 minutes of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Florida be extended for five minutes.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I ask that his time be extended for 10 minutes.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, give the gentleman the five minutes, and if necessary he can be given more time.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. While these local readjustments are frequently impossible by surveys run by local surveyors and through suits in local courts to settle and readjust these matters, it has proven that it is frequently possible for the Federal Government by making a retracement to make a readjustment of lines that will be accepted by the people locally. That is particularly true where, in this particular case, it seems that a faulty survey left some areas, probably small, that do not seem to have

been included in any of the tracts surveyed. So there is a little leeway, there is an opportunity to adjust by giving the man a small tract that may be in a hiatus between two lines, thus saving him from the loss that he would suffer by readjustment with his neighbor on the other side under suggestion of a Government surveyor. The plan proposed by this bill is a wise one, in my opinion. It is the only plan that I know of whereby a readjustment, an equitable readjustment, can be had without a long series of lawsuits.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Recognized unless it is disputed, proved unless disproved.

Mr. MONDELL. I understand, but the question is simply this: Here is a condition under which these people for years have been trying to settle their differences and have been unable to do it, and for reasons that are well known to men who have lived under similar conditions elsewhere. Here is a proposition of an equitable adjustment under Federal auspices that in all probability will settle all of these questions by agreement of the parties. It will cost Uncle Sam a few dollars, but the cost will be comparatively small.

Mr. DRANE. It is by petition, too.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman says this is to be an adjustment under Federal auspices of a matter with which the Government has nothing to do and concerning which the Government has no authority. All over the public-land States differences have arisen, doubts have arisen as to where the lines are, and in no case does the Government go in and try to settle differences, because they arise between private owners, nor should it do so. The Government having parted with its title has quit entirely its supervision of and control over and makes no attempt to control these lands; and now to authorize the Federal Government to go in and mix in a private controversy I think is wrong in principle. It will invite such interference by the Federal Government in private quarrels all over this country. It seems to me to be wrong. The Government has no interest in the matter; the Government has no authority over it. Its finding and recommendation can be accepted or set aside by either interested party and at any time. The dispute continues, and the parties to it find themselves at last in a State court, where they belong. Why the Government should be asked to have anything to do with it I can not see.

Mr. MONDELL. Now, Mr. Speaker, what the gentleman from Michigan says would be of great force if it accurately stated the facts. We are doing this very thing in every public-land State in the Union, and we have been doing it for years. Twenty per cent of all the money appropriated for public-land purposes can be used for this sort of retracement, but in this particular case it so happened that the original survey left some lands in hiatus between surveyed lines, and there is a situation that can not be met——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wyoming asks unanimous consent for five minutes more. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MONDELL. There is a situation that can not be met by the ordinary methods of retracement and resurvey that are being carried on every day in the year. In Nebraska township after township has been retraced practically as proposed here. In my State many townships have been retraced. In Colorado vast areas have been retraced.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield for a suggestion?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Congress made an appropriation of $50,000 to resurvey two entire townships in my State where there was not a soul left in them. Yet they were officially surveyed.

Mr. MONDELL. That sort of retracement and survey would apply in the case of these Florida lands, except that a condition rather unusual exists there, apparently, under which the old surveys did not seem to embrace all the area of water and land. And therefore legislation somewhat supplementing the legislation under which we make ordinary retracements and surveys is necessary. But the principle involved, the policy proposed, the work to be done, the ends sought, are what is being accomplished all over the Northwest every day of the year under retracement surveys.

Mr. DRANE. Now, Mr. Speaker——

Mr. OSBORNE. Will the gentleman permit an inquiry?

Mr. DRANE. I will.

Mr. OSBORNE. Is it not a fact that the original fault in this matter is the fault of the Government?

Mr. DRANE. That is right.

Mr. OSBORNE. And that the people are thrown into this confusion by reason of the fault of the Government employees, the surveyors, and is it not a fact that these mistakes do occur, as the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has said, in every public-land State? Is it not a fact that it results in bloodshed and in all kinds of trouble, and that the cost to the Government in making these retracings is so insignificant in comparison with the good to be accomplished it is hardly worth while to be taken into account?

Mr. DRANE. That is true, and here is something else that should not be lost sight of, and that is that all the people interested have petitioned the Land Department agreeing to abide by the decision of that department. The Land Department feels that it has not the authority under the law to adjust these differences, though it is in sympathy with it.

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DRANE. Certainly.

Mr. SINNOTT. With reference to the interest of the Government, that is referred to in the first paragraph of the Secretary's letter on page 2. That was his opinion before the resurvey was made, the first preliminary resurvey; but in the third paragraph from the bottom of the Secretary's letter he states that a condition developed by the resurvey which showed that additional areas of unsurveyed public lands might be disclosed by the resurvey or the retracement referred to in this letter.

Mr. DRANE. It is believed the Government will find land that it did not know it owned.

Mr. SINNOTT. As to retracement, the Government does concern itself with land after it has parted title with it at the present time, but not after the first grantee from the Government has sold the land. So if there are any transfers from the original entrymen they would be shut out from the benefits of the retracement act referred to by the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. DRANE. Mr. Speaker, the matter has been very thoroughly covered by what these gentlemen have said, and I am going to submit three amendments——

The SPEAKER. To this paragraph?

Mr. DRANE. Yes, sir; to the first and subsequent paragraphs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Has the right to consideration of the bill been given?

The SPEAKER. It is being read for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. DRANE: Page 1, line 7, after the word "in," insert "township 29 south, range 28 east; also in."

Mr. DRANE. That simply adds township 29 to it; and I will simply say before doing this that I submitted it to the Secretary of the Interior and asked him, in view of his having indorsed the original bill, if he objected to this amendment; and I have a letter from him in which he states:

I am advised that lands in this township have recently been surveyed, and that the same condition of affairs exists with respect to lands there as regards those originally described in the bill. Such being the case, I have no objection to the amendment proposed by you, and believe it might be advisable to include them in the measure.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DRANE. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH. Have the people residing in the township also joined in the petition?

Mr. DRANE. I can not say as to that. I do not know.

Mr. WALSH. You do not know whether they will agree to abide by it or not?

Mr. DRANE. As to township 29, I can not say.

Mr. WALSH. Well, it seems to me that unless we are sure of that——

Mr. DRANE. I may say that this bill is not mandatory on the department. It simply leaves it discretionary.

Mr. CANNON. I want to ask the gentleman one question.

Mr. DRANE. Certainly.

Mr. CANNON. A has an improvement here on an entry that he claims to have made on lands that were surveyed, and on which he has put $50,000 of improvement or $5,000 of improvement. To-day they are litigating about it. B says, "No; you are on my land." Now, the Government retraces, we will say. That does not amount to anything provided that in litigation this $50,000 of improvements that A is in possession of is claimed by B. And then, I think the report shows that there is enough in that region or corner that has been established, where they could run from one township and range to another township and range and reestablish. Now, what would be the equities between A and B?

Mr. DRANE. You understand, sir, that that survey was made probably more than 50 years ago.

Mr. CANNON. Yes.

Mr. DRANE. A few of the old settlers went in there and raised their families and developed orange groves there. Now, a new generation has come on, and they are seeking to get in. They find another survey, and there is inexplicable confusion between Mr. A and Mr. B. There seems to be no other way in which to settle it. They appeal to the constituted authorities here in Washington. The authorities say, "We are willing to settle it, provided we have legislative authority." There is all there is in it.

Mr. CANNON. Precisely. But all of us who have grown up on the border understand that corners disappear. I know some litigation that lasted for years, and was fairly expensive, in the State of Illinois and also in the State of Indiana, about corners and ranges, but finally it was fought out and the title was settled. Would the Government be responsible if it makes this resurvey?

Mr. DRANE. No, sir. The bill provides that no man shall receive any more land than the Government originally intended to give him.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Florida has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, in the Washington Post of yesterday reference was made to the election just held in the seventh Alabama district. The article that I refer to states that the election is still in doubt, and that the normal Democratic majority is about 4,000. Both of these statements are incorrect.

Mr. Speaker, death is no respecter of persons. He knows no difference between Democrats and Republicans, and whether they be in the private walks of life or Members of this august and honored body, sooner or later he visits them all. He invaded the ranks of our Alabama delegation a few weeks ago and took away an honored Member, Hon. John Lawson Burnett, one of the ablest and best Representatives that have sat in this body since I have been a Member. [Applause.] On the 30th day of September the district he represented so faithfully and well for 20 years was called upon to elect his successor. The Democrats in a primary nominated L. B. Rainey, an able and splendid young Democrat from Gadsden, the home city of Mr. Burnett. The Republicans nominated C. B. Kennamer. They did not do so, however, until two more prominent Republicans had been offered but declined the nomination. One of them stated that he was in favor of the league of nations. Both of these Republicans knew that the district that had just elected Mr. Burnett to represent that district in the Sixty-sixth Congress would be sure to elect a Democrat to fill out his unexpired term. While the Democratic majority in the district is not always as large as we would like for it to be, the district is safely Democratic, and can always be carried by a Democrat when we make a thorough canvass, as we did this time. Representative Burnett had been elected from that district by some rather small majorities. At one time his majority was 523 and at another time 133 and at one election his majority in the district was only 15 votes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. At the time his majority was small is it not a fact that there was a county in his district that was 550 Republican, which was taken out after those elections?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not know what the Republican majority was in that county, but it was small.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Is it not a further fact that another county was added to the district which was normally 150 Democratic?

Mr. HEFLIN. I do not know the exact majority; about 100, I should say.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Is it not a fact that Mr. Burnett's majority at the last election was over 1,300?

Mr. HEFLIN. Sometimes his majority was large and sometimes it was small. There are more Republicans in that district than there are in any other district in the State, but there are not enough of them to carry the district. The district is safely Democratic. I made 21 speeches in the district in the campaign just closed, and I enlightened the Republicans as best I could all over the district. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. If the district was safely Democratic, why was it necessary for the gentleman to make 21 speeches? [Laughter.]

Mr. HEFLIN. In order to arouse the Democrats to the importance of voting the Democratic ticket—to get out the Democratic vote. As I said at the outset, the Democratic majority is not very large in that district. The unrest produced by the World War and the misunderstanding of the league of nations produced by the speeches of Senator LODGE, Senator REED, and other Republicans [laughter], circulated over the district, confusing and misleading the people, had to be met, explained, and combated by us. Mr. Rainey, the Democratic nominee, declared for the league of nations and the Democratic administration, while Mr. Kennamer, the Republican candidate, declared against the league of nations and the administration. The official count gives Mr. Rainey a clear majority of 406 votes, and this is a clear victory for the league of nations and the Democratic administration. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to have three minutes more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to proceed for three minutes more. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. HEFLIN. Just for a question.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. I will ask if it is not a fact that the Democratic speakers, and also the Democratic press in that district, because of the fact that the sentiment was so largely against the league of nations, proclaimed throughout the district that the league of nations was not an issue; that it mattered not who was elected, because the House had nothing to do with the question of determining the league of nations; and did not the gentleman himself say that in his speech at Center on Saturday before the election?

Mr. HEFLIN. I did say that the House had no vote on the league of nations, and I also said that there was a good deal that the Representatives in the House would have to do if we kept our wholesome Democratic laws upon the statute books. [Applause.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Did not the Gadsden papers, for several days immediately before the election, warn the people not to be fooled about the league of nations, and did they not say that the league of nations was not the issue at all?

Mr. HEFLIN. Your candidate insisted that the league of nations was the issue, and that if he were elected it would go out to the world that the district was against it.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Please answer the question.

Mr. HEFLIN. And Rainey, our candidate, said, "I am for the league of nations and for the Democratic administration," and he was elected by 406 majority. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Did not the Gadsden papers, as I have stated repeatedly, say that the league of nations was not the question, and that that was a false issue, and not to be fooled by it?

Mr. HEFLIN. These papers stated, and correctly, that the Member elected would not have a vote on the ratification of the treaty. But the Republican candidate and his helpers all insisted that the league of nations was the issue. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] was down there and contributed to our success, as did Mr. FESS, of Ohio. [Laughter and applause.] A speech made in this House by Mr. FESS April 24, 1916, helped us with all right-thinking people in the seventh district. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

I will print in the RECORD a telegram from Judge Herzberg, of Gadsden, giving the Democratic majority as disclosed by the official count of all the votes cast in the district:

GADSDEN, ALA., *October 3, 1919—4.34 p. m.*

Hon. J. THOS. HEFLIN,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.:

Official count, entire district, gives Rainey, Democrat, 406 majority.

L. L. HERZBERG.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the pro forma amendment.

Gentlemen of the House, the reference made by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] to the late Congressman Burnett is one that we all appreciate and indorse. [Applause.] I looked upon him as one of the bravest of our Members, one of the clearest in his views, and one of the most amiable Members that it has been my pleasure to know since I have been in Congress.

Now, as to the election on the 30th. Prior to 1915 the seventh district of Alabama started on the extreme east of the State with Cherokee County, and ran across to the extreme west side

of the State, including Franklin County, with eight counties altogether. The elections were uncomfortably close, as the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] has just mentioned. In 1915 the State was redistricted, and two counties, Franklin and Winston, strongly Republican, were lopped off, and the Democratic county of Blount was added to it, and with these changes the normal majority of the Democrats was between 3,000 and 3,600.

When this vacancy occurred in the House there was some concern as to whether there was any chance of a high-grade, clear-cut, aggressive campaign on the part of the Republicans. It was thought that there was some chance for breaking into the very heart of the solid Southland. I have reasons for believing that that situation is present and has been for some time. If you could eliminate certain prejudices the South would not remain solidly Democratic. There is not an intelligent Member on either side of the aisle who will not admit that, privately at least, if not publicly.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman allow me an interruption?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. BANKHEAD. What character of prejudices does the gentleman refer to?

Mr. FESS. Prejudices that grow largely out of the race question.

Mr. OLIVER. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. OLIVER. Does the gentleman know that the candidate of the Republicans in that contest condemned the appointment of negro lieutenants for negro troops by the President, and likewise condemned the appointment of a negro to act as special agent of the War Department in looking after the welfare of negro soldiers?

Mr. FESS. I am not aware of that. I am aware, however——

Mr. OLIVER. I will state that that is a fact. Is the gentleman further aware, when he speaks of a high-grade campaign, that the Republican candidate was strong in his opposition to tick eradication?

Mr. FESS. Republicans are not running campaigns on the issue of tick eradication.

Mr. OLIVER. That was one of the issues made by the Republican candidate, and my understanding is that the gentleman who now has the floor wrote letters to the seventh Alabama district indorsing the policies that the Republican candidate stood for.

Mr. FESS. I will state to my friend from Alabama who has just interrupted me that the Republicans do not conduct campaigns on the issue of tick eradication or any other issue that looks to the Federal Government to see how much money can be taken out of the Treasury. That is a thing that we object to—your pork-barrel methods. [Applause.]

In the second place, if our Democratic friends can take any encouragement from the result of this election, in which the official report says there is a majority of 406 for the Democratic candidate in a district which was redistricted in order to make it safely and solidly Democratic with a normal majority of from 3,000 to 3,600 cut down to 406, they are welcome to all the encouragement they can get from that. [Applause.] Let the Republicans, as well as the Democrats, note that five counties out of the seven were carried by the Republican candidate, including the Democratic county added in 1915, and but two counties out of the seven were carried by the Democratic candidate, and this upon an issue in which my name was used, as the gentleman from Alabama, our genial friend, Mr. HEFLIN, suggested, on a cheap basis of racial prejudice. If that sort of thing can go, it is only a question of the Democratic constituency and not a matter of intelligence, which has no permanent importance, and I will say to my Democratic friends, you may claim the Congressman, but we shall claim the victory; for if our Democratic friends in solidly Democratic communities can be made so impatient and uncertain that you have got to import the force of your committee and your Congressman into the district to hold it in order to hold your own seats on your own ash heap, the victory is ours and not yours. [Applause.] It is only a suggestion of what our friends may look for in the very near future.

Mr. HEFLIN. We will carry it by 2,000 majority next time.

Mr. CARAWAY. I ask unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes on this subject.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TOWNER). The gentleman from Arkansas asks unanimous consent to address the House for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARAWAY. I am always amused when our friend from Ohio, Dr. FESS, talks politics. He said a minute ago that if they could eliminate certain conditions they could break the solid South. I should like to tell him what those conditions are. Whenever they can banish intelligence down there, he may expect the solid South to go Republican. [Laughter.]

But until that happens the doctor is going to have to content himself, as he said he would, by letting us have the offices and he claim the victory. [Laughter on the Democratic side.] There is not any more use, seriously speaking, of talking about the South going Republican than there is to talk about the Republican Party growing patriotic on the question of the league of nations—not a bit. [Laughter.] If the gentleman can get any real consolation by claiming an empty victory, why, God bless his soul, he will be happy all his life. [Laughter on the Democratic side.]

The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] suggests that the Republican candidate in Alabama ran on his opposition to tick eradication, and the gentleman from Ohio says he wants it understood that the Republican Party is not a tick eradicator. [Laughter.] Well, you know there is considerable resemblance between the Republican Party and a cow that has not been dipped. [Laughter.] And, I take it, the same thing is the matter with both of them, and until they get rid of the tick we may have the kind of politics that the gentleman from Ohio says fills him with glory. [Laughter and applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD] a few moments ago asked Dr. FESS in regard to the character of the prejudice resorted to in this special campaign in Alabama. I desire to give him an example. When I arrived at Brimingham on my way to the district I was handed a paper, the Birmingham Ledger, or Herald, announcing my coming and giving the places where I was to speak. Among other things it stated that I was a carpetbagger [laughter]; that I was afflicted with what was known as Wilsonphobia; that I had come down there to drop poison; that I was there for the purpose of deluding the people; that they would resent any man from the North coming down there to tell them how to vote. That was a sample of the prejudice to which they resorted. When I arrived at the place of my first speaking, Cullman, I was met by a committee. I did not know but that it was a committee to carry out the spirit of the article to which I have just referred, but they turned out to be friends.

I was instructed as to the manner of procedure. I was informed that the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] had spoken there the day before, and I was told something about his speech. It was suggested to me that there were three things that they would like to have me do: First, to give HEFLIN hell; second, to give Wilson hell, and especially to give the league of nations hell. [Laughter.] I declined the first proposition. I informed the audience the next day that they did not appreciate the gentleman from Alabama; that it was a demonstration of the old adage that a prophet is not without honor save in his own country; that he was easily the biggest man in the Alabama delegation, and you did not have to prove it, for he would admit it. [Laughter.] I also informed them that they did not appreciate his influence; that the gentleman was desirous of entering the war; that he was chafing like a war horse to get into the fray, and would have gone if it had not been for the urgent request of the President of the United States to remain here; that for him to go would deprive him, the President, of his mouthpiece in the House. [Laughter.]

I informed them that he was appreciated fully, however, by the President from the fact that when it came to selection of an Assistant Secretary of War during this trying period he went to Alabama to get him; that this Assistant Secretary came from the district of Mr. HEFLIN, and notwithstanding he was black as a coal he was nevertheless appointed Assistant Secretary of War. I told them that as another evidence of his influence that when the ship *George Washington* sailed across to the other side they were looking for some one to represent that section, and the gentleman from Alabama was again called upon to name that representative. The man he selected was as black as the ace of spades; but this did not matter to this great champion of the colored race. Therefore I declined to do what they wanted me to do in regard to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

That the league of nations was an issue down there there can be no manner of doubt. Although the speakers and the press in every issue were disclaiming the fact that the league of nations was the issue, the Gadsden Democratic paper came out every day and said it was a false issue and was done for the purpose of fooling the people; that no matter who was

elected he would have no voice and nothing to say, and appealing to the fact that the letter sent by Dr. FESS, chairman of the congressional committee, for the people down in that section to vote for Kenneman was based on the fact that Kenneman had promised to vote for certain issues inimical to the South. The main appeal made by the gentleman from Alabama was that in the event that the treaty was ratified cotton automatically would go to 60 cents a pound. [Laughter.] I told the people that I expected he knew what he was talking about, and by that same token the boll weevil would be exterminated. Also, the cattle tick about which the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. OLIVER] had spoken, was an issue down there, and I assured them upon the same authority the cattle tick would be eradicated immediately upon the adoption of the league of nations, cotton would go to 60 cents a pound, and the cattle tick would turn up its toes, the roup in the chickens would disappear, and all other diseases of animals and men would be no more. [Laughter.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Yes.

Mr. HEFLIN. I stated that when Mr. LODGE started his fight on the league of nations cotton was 36 cents, and that at the time I was speaking it was 29 cents, and that if it was ratified it would go to 60. [Laughter.]

Here is what I said about the gentleman coming down there: I said that Mr. WOOD had made more bitter attacks on the South being in the saddle and attacking the President than any Republican I knew of, and that if Mr. SANDERS of Indiana or Mr. PURNELL or Mr. BLAND should be sent down there they would not be open to that kind of an attack, but that the man they had sent was open to that kind of an attack, and that was why we were attacking the gentleman—on the question of the solid South and the South being in the saddle, and the gentleman helped us very much.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Well, you ought to have given me a vote of thanks, and you did not do it anywhere. But, Mr. Speaker, in all seriousness, I wish to bear witness to the fact that in all my experience, in all the campaigns that I have ever had to do with, I never received at the hands of any people a warmer reception or more cordial welcome than I did from the Republicans in that community. I want to say as to the proposition, which comes in large measure from the other side, that the Republicans of the South are the scalawag Republicans, Republicans merely to get the plunder when we are in power, is a base slander, that it is not true in any sense of the word, and that the Republicans in the seventh district of Alabama are composed of the best citizens of Alabama, and if they have the courage to stand up and be knocked down year after year, as they have been doing, ever ready to fight for the principles of the Republican Party, gaining strength with each encounter, so that in this campaign it became necessary for the entire Alabama delegation, with one or two exceptions, to go to the rescue of one of their Democratic candidates, it augurs well, and demonstrates that there is still hope and that the light is breaking for a better day. [Applause.]

Mr. DRANE. Mr. Speaker, I think all this shows that I am a very good-natured man. I now move the adoption of my amendment.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Florida.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the said Secretary of the Interior be, and is hereby, authorized to cause to be made such surveys or resurveys in said townships as may in his judgment be necessary in order to carry out the provisions of this act.

Mr. DRANE. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I have sent to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 3, line 21, after the word "in," insert "township 29 south, range 28 east, also in."

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I do not see the necessity for putting in "township 29" in section 2 when it has already been put in by the gentleman's amendment in section 1.

Mr. DRANE. It does not belong in section 2, I would state. It should be in section 3.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman offered the amendment, in line 21 of section 2 on page 3. Mr. Speaker, may we have the amendment again reported?

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment of the gentleman from Florida.

There was no objection, and the Clerk again reported Mr. DRANE'S amendment.

Mr. DRANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that amendment for the purpose of offering a perfecting amendment.

The SPEAKER. We are in the House now, and the gentleman has the right to withdraw it without unanimous consent.

Mr. DRANE. Mr. Speaker, the Secretary in his letter suggested the striking out of section 3 of the bill, stating it is not necessary, and I now move that section 3 be stricken out.

The SPEAKER. That can be done only after it has been read. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 3. That from and after the date of the introduction of this bill the lands in townships 36, 37, and 38 south, ranges 29 and 30 east, Tallahassee meridian, shall be withdrawn from all settlement and entry and shall remain so withdrawn until the adjustments hereinbefore alluded to shall have been completed.

Mr. DRANE. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the section.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida moves to strike out the section. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question now is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

On motion of Mr. DRANE, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. DRANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the title be amended to conform to the text of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the title will be amended to conform to the text of the bill.

There was no objection.

By unanimous consent, Mr. DRANE was granted leave to extend and revise his remarks in the RECORD.

SCHOOL LANDS IN GOVERNMENT TOWN SITES ON RECLAMATION PROJECTS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 794) granting lands for school purposes in Government town sites on reclamation projects.

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

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. HERNANDEZ] to state how many different districts there are in which it is necessary that some such withdrawal as this should be made.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. I do not know; there are several. There are 39 reclamation projects in which relief is sought by this bill.

Mr. WALSH. We ought to know how many before we passed a general law just to cover a few districts, particularly when you are asking to pass it by unanimous consent. This report does not give very much information.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. The Committee on the Public Lands makes but one amendment to the bill as it came from the Senate, on page 1, line 3, after the word "be," to insert the words "and he is."

Mr. WALSH. Well, unless——

Mr. MONDELL. Whose bill is this?

Mr. HERNANDEZ. This is Senator SMOOT'S bill.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts yield?

Mr. WALSH. I will yield.

Mr. MONDELL. I know of town sites on one reclamation project to which this legislation would apply, and while I have not had my attention called to the legislation I can readily understand how important it is. I can not see any possible objection to a general provision of this sort. There are not a great many Government-owned town sites on reclamation projects. There are a few, but on every one of them the question would necessarily arise as to the disposition of land for school purposes.

Mr. WALSH. Does not the gentleman think there should be some limit to the amount of undisposed land that can be used for that purpose rather than leave it to the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior?

Mr. MONDELL. I should imagine that it would be perfectly safe to leave the discretion with the Secretary and his officers for the reason that the gentleman knows that they are not going to be overliberal in a matter of this sort. It might be limited to a block to a school district, and that would not be excessive in a town which was growing. I should say, however, that it is pretty difficult for the Congress to determine whether this should be a block or a quarter of a block. I can not imagine any condition under which the grant to a school district would be excessive, and I think the tendency would be to be conservative and possibly not grant as much as ought to be granted.

Mr. WALSH. Well, does not the gentleman think that Congress would be warranted in placing a maximum? Now, if you do not, in some districts the Secretary in the exercise of his discretion might convey 40 acres of property and in another district it might be three.

Mr. MONDELL. I imagine that the most that would be granted in any case would be a block, or there might be a town site large enough to necessitate and warrant the passing of title to two tracts in the town site for school purposes, but that certainly would be the maximum for anyone to suggest or propose. But what I fear is that if we fix a maximum it will be rather in the direction of a larger area than would ordinarily be granted than otherwise. I imagine there can be no objection to a maximum of not to exceed a block, say, for any one school. There might be a town site in which several school sites were desired.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. In many town sites on reclamation projects, I wish to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts, the people are very poor, and it is very difficult for them to secure money enough to buy school sites. This legislation will have the tendency to build up the community. The Government donates land which is unappropriated and not desired for building purposes. The fact that it is undisposed of would indicate that nobody wants it, and it seems to me to be unfair to impose a tax upon those people, most of whom are poor, in these new towns, and require them to buy land for school purposes. It is all for the general welfare. Everyone in the town is benefited and the Government is not assuming any burden or responsibility.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, that is a stock argument of these people in these States, who are depending upon the Federal Treasury for everything they get.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It does not cost the Government anything.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman from Massachusetts allow me?

Mr. WALSH. I will.

Mr. MONDELL. As a matter of fact, it is not a grant of something that belongs to the Government to some one who has no interest. Now, let us see what happens. If these lands in the town site are sold they go to the credit of the project.

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. The people on the projects, all of them, get the benefit of the sums paid, whereas if they are granted to a school district the people of the school district—that is, of the town and of the adjacent country—have the benefit. It is simply a question of whether the people of an entire project, which might be 50 miles long, secure the benefits of the selling price of a block of land or the people of the school district, that is somewhat a smaller area, have the benefit of the tract for school purposes.

Mr. WALSH. What are those people doing on those tracts for school facilities now? There are some of them who have school facilities and school buildings?

Mr. MONDELL. I think in some cases the school district has purchased land. I should not be surprised if they purchased it at a rather nominal price.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I suggest to the gentleman from Massachusetts that it is sufficiently explicit when it says such lands as "are necessary for said district for school buildings and grounds."

Mr. WALSH. In the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. "*Provided*, That if any land so conveyed cease entirely to be used for school purposes the title thereto shall revert to and revest in the United States."

Mr. WALSH. But the Secretary of the Interior never passes any opinion upon it; it will be passed upon by some clerk down here or somebody in the office down here.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Suppose a canyon is to serve as a playground adjacent to where the building is located——

Mr. WALSH. A canyon?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. A canyon.

Mr. WALSH. We have got bills here where we are asked to give some land because they are afraid of falling into a canyon or canal.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. The gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], the State of culture, would not want to deprive the children on one of these projects of a little bit of land, which would amount to $5 or $10 or $15, possibly?

Mr. LONGWORTH. Can the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. HERNANDEZ] tell me how many reclamation projects there are now in his State?

Mr. HERNANDEZ. There are 39 in the United States.

Mr. LONGWORTH. How many in the gentleman's State?

Mr. HERNANDEZ. In my State there are two.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is Government work being prosecuted on them now?

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Is it continuously going on?

Mr. HERNANDEZ. One of the projects—the Carlsbad project—is finished now. That is being operated to great advantage and is very successful. The Rio Grande project is still unfinished so far as the canals are concerned.

Mr. WALSH. Would the gentleman from New Mexico have any objection to inserting in line 8, after the word "lands," the words "not exceeding five acres in area"?

Mr. HERNANDEZ. I would accept that amendment.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If the gentleman will permit, in these days the tendency in the country is to make larger and more commodious grounds for school children to play in. Five acres is not large enough to play baseball on.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman will come to Massachusetts we will show him where they are teaching people to play baseball, and who will become famous in the game, upon sand lots of less than 1 acre in area.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Of course, your land is very valuable.

Mr. WALSH. The more valuable the land, the more valuable the player.

Mr. HICKS. Do I understand from the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] that you can not play a ball game on a 5-acre lot?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. That is not big enough. They can throw over that.

Mr. HICKS. You must have big ball players out in Colorado.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Well, the schools have to have accommodations, and they need buildings and outbuildings.

Mr. HICKS. These ball players that the gentleman refers to must be members of the Rocky Mountain League?

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman from Colorado in all seriousness believe it would be necessary in any of these reclamation projects to utilize more than 5 acres for school purposes?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Why, yes; and I will tell you why. Very often they have the children plan little gardens, and that is a part of the curriculum of the school. They ought to have them, and ought to be encouraged to have them.

Mr. WALSH. That is something that has not been offered here. I think I shall object to the consideration of this bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts object?

Mr. WALSH. I withdraw it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is, Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object——

Mr. MONDELL. With the understanding that the committee accepts the amendment limiting the area to 5 acres.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there or is there not objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. MONDELL. It is proper for the House to understand what the attitude of the committee is in the matter.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. HERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New Mexico asks unanimous consent that the bill 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:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be hereby authorized, upon application by the proper officers of a school district located wholly or in part within the boundaries of a project of the United States Reclamation Service, to issue patent conveying to such district such unappropriated undisposed of lands within any Government reclamation town site situated within such school district as, in the opinion of the Secretary of the Interior, are necessary for use by said district for school buildings and grounds: *Provided*, That if any land so conveyed cease entirely to be used for school purposes title thereto shall revert to and revest in the United States.

Also the following committee amendment was read:

Page 1, line 3, after the word "be," insert the words "and he is."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the committee amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I move to amend, on line 8, after the word "lands," by inserting the words "not exceeding 5 acres in area."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. WALSH: Page 1, line 8, after the word "lands," insert the words "not exceeding 5 acres in area."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I think I shall support the amendment, but I want to say a word in reference to the tendency of enlarging the space about school buildings. It used to be that about all there was to a school was the building, with a small inclosed space that was regarded a necessity for a playground, but within the last 10 years there has been a very pronounced change of sentiment, to the effect that all that there is in school work is not confined within a building, that much of it is outside of the building, and especially is that true since the drift has been toward vocational education. There has been a movement to increase the agricultural possibilities of scientific methods, and to-day in Ohio, as well as in most other States of the Union, there has been a very pronounced tendency to make agriculture a part of the educational work of the schools, and while land in this particular part of the country is not limited, and while there would be a tendency to not limit it in the bill, I shall vote to limit it to 5 acres. But I wanted to take the time to say that the larger land area is preferred to the smaller, as used to be the rule. I think the whole country realizes that intensive agriculture, as started through the school gardens, is one of the most pronounced advancements in education in the last decade.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to my friend.

Mr. WALSH. Of course, this tendency to increase the area for play and agricultural pursuits is followed and can be seen in even crowded cities.

Mr. FESS. Very distinctively so. It has gotten to be so to-day that to leave a vacant lot in a city uncultivated is looked upon not only as a lack of interest but actual waste in making the most out of the educational facilities that go with the educational system. I know that in the cities, as much so as in the country, the school gardens requiring an enlarged space for school grounds have come to be distinctive demands.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment. I want to supplement what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] has said. I think possibly I am responsible for enlarging this acreage for school purposes. As I recall it, at first only 1 acre was provided for for schoolhouse and grounds. I wanted it increased to 10 acres. We are building for the future and this bill applies to all the Government reclamation projects.

I do feel that we ought to encourage them and provide for large school sites. That land is now vacant and barren land, comparatively worthless, and we want to encourage the children to do gardening and field cropping, to carry on practical plant industry, and give them room to make it a practical subject of study; and it seems to me if they had 10 acres for every one of these country schools it would be splendidly well applied. I regret to see gentlemen suggest cutting it down. I feel that that really is a great mistake. If the gentleman will stop to think of the utilization which can be made of that extra land he will feel that he is really doing an injustice to the youth and welfare of all those communities in asking to limit it to just enough for a schoolhouse and the immediate necessary surroundings. Give the children enough ground for a playground and cropping grounds and gardens and a baseball field besides.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Washington moves to strike out the last word.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Mr. Speaker, I want also to call attention to what the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] and the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] have said, and to emphasize that same thing. The tendency at this time is decidedly in favor of obtaining land to be used for agricultural and demonstrational purposes in connection with schools, and this is especially important on irrigation projects. There are many people who move from localities that know nothing of irrigation, where the children know nothing of irrigation, and know nothing of intensive cultivation and development of the land, and it is the belief of the county agricultural agents and county superintendents in the irrigation States that there will be no better opportunity offered in those communities for teaching children the things they have to learn in order to bring about the highest development of these lands. When you have children in school they are assembled in mass, so that it should be left discretionary, and if it should seem advisable in any case to have a few more than 5 acres of land in order to teach this very thing that must be taught in order to bring the best development to that tract, it seems to me it would be highly advisable. I really believe it ought to be left discretionary, not as a matter of land granting for any community, but to bring the highest development to that community.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Would not the gentleman admit that it would be good policy, however, to limit the amount rather than to leave it unlimited?

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. It is left optional with the Secretary.

Mr. FESS. I am rather of opinion that it is an unwise policy to proceed without any limitation at all.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. I know that often we have to acquire as much as 5 or 10 acres. How do we know whether it should be 5 or 6 or 8 acres, or, in this particular instance, 3?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Years from now, when they want an additional playground, they will have to pay an enormous price for it, whereas the land now is not worth 15 cents.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. It is for the upbuilding of the farming community that I plead.

Mr. FESS. If the tendency is to run toward agricultural development, I should not object to the enlargement.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. It most certainly is in that direction.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I can not see any reason for any opposition on the part of any of these gentlemen to this measure, and particularly from both of these gentlemen who are members of the Committee on the Public Lands. This land is now undisposed of. Why is it undisposed of? Is it because it lacks value? And if it lacks value, how is it possible to establish a school there and cultivate valuable gardens upon it?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The chances are that the schoolhouse will be one of the very first buildings erected in a town site. When there are buildings constructed there and water is put on those projects that will be found useful.

Mr. WALSH. The danger of this bill is to pass it without any limit and to permit the Secretary of the Interior or some of his subordinates, upon representation made, to grant away 15 or 20 acres for school purposes on the pretext that the children are coming in there, and that they are going to get water on it, and they are going to have valuable school gardens. Well, the children out there will not make any more effort to cultivate valuable school gardens than they do in the States where the citizens from taxation raise money and buy land and build schoolhouses and do not have the opportunity to have the Federal Government turn over tracts, and it seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that Congress ought to put a limit in all this legislation, as it has heretofore put a limit in other directions. The plea is that you should not limit the children. You would think that they were going to put up five or six story school buildings and have thousands of children upon these reclamation projects. The fact is, you will have very few of them.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Does not the gentleman know that in the West, as far east as Illinois, the children have to go 5 or 6 or 8 miles to school?

Mr. WALSH. Oh, you do not have to go as far West as that to find such a condition. In New England, too, the children sometimes have to go as far as 10 or 12 miles.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Or, I should say, sometimes children have to go 15 miles.

Mr. WALSH. Well, say they go 15 miles.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. There should be farms for horses and gardens, so that the children can be taught agriculture. There is need for more than 5 or 6 acres where the land is cheap.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. It is not as a school garden, as such, to which I refer, but as an agricultural training station for the children who will go out here for miles and miles around, who have not had training for this sort of cultivation.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I should like to add, as to the concern expressed by some gentlemen of the enormous prices to be paid in the future for these lands in case 5 acres is not enough, that it is not very tenable, because I have been hearing lately from gentlemen interested to the effect that unless we appropriate now $50,000,000 immediately for reclamation, none of these reclaimed lands will be worth anything. There is now pending before the Committee on Ways and Means a bill to

draw from the Treasury and transfer to the reclamation fund $50,000,000, on the ground that, as things are going now, none of these projects can be completed otherwise.

Mr. WALSH. I will direct the attention of the gentleman from Ohio to the fact that this land is for school buildings and grounds. Now, that does not mean for prairie gardens, to grow wheat and other enormous crops. It means for school grounds, the same as in any city.

Mr. LONGWORTH. But the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR] said that this land was worth now only 15 cents, and that if we provided a limit of 5 acres, enormous sums would be required to buy the land in the near future.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WALSH. Yes.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. The figures regarding values are altogether speculative. It seems a wise provision to limit the number of acres. I think the limit of 5 acres is a little small, but nevertheless the gentleman from New Mexico [Mr. HERNANDEZ] is not objecting to it. It is always wise to make such a provision, of course.

Mr. WALSH. I am very glad to hear the gentleman's views on that point.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH].

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Why not make it 6 acres? That will make a rectangle, and 5 acres will make an irregular piece of ground.

Mr. WALSH. I ask unanimous consent to modify my amendment by striking out "5" and raising the limit to "6."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the modification.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out the word "five" in the amendment and insert in lieu thereof the word "six."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Massachusetts, as modified.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to a third reading, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. HERNANDEZ, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Crockett, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had further insisted upon its amendments to 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, disagreed to by the House of Representatives, had agreed to the further conference asked by the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. GRONNA, Mr. NORRIS, and Mr. SMITH of Georgia as the conferees on the part of the Senate.

ZION NATIONAL PARK, UTAH.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 425) to establish the Zion National Park, in the State of Utah.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Utah [Mr. MAYS] state the necessary annual expenditure for the maintenance of this park?

Mr. MAYS. I think this park will probably require about the same expenditure as the Rocky Mountain National Park to start with, which was $10,000 per year.

Mr. WALSH. Will the expense increase the same as that of the Rocky Mountain National Park?

Mr. MAYS. It probably will increase as the park is more generally used. Sixty thousand people visited the Yellowstone last year. Of course, that park now costs a great deal.

Mr. WALSH. Will it require any extensive expenditures for roads within the reservation?

Mr. MAYS. The Government has already built the road through the main canyon.

Mr. WALSH. And the State has built some roads up to it?

Mr. MAYS. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Will it require any additional outlay in order to make it accessible to tourists?

Mr. MAYS. It is now accessible to tourists, and is being so used; but, of course, as the area visited is extended there may have to be some new roads.

Mr. WALSH. How far is this from the railroad?

Mr. MAYS. I think about 60 miles, is it not?

Mr. WELLING. About 60 miles from the present station of Lund on the Salt Lake route.

Mr. WALSH. I have no further questions.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, this is public land, is it?

Mr. MAYS. All except about 80 acres, which are in private ownership.

Mr. BLANTON. How much public land is there in the park in addition to the 80 acres?

Mr. MAYS. Seventy-six thousand acres.

Mr. BLANTON. How much of that is land that is adapted to cultivation?

Mr. MAYS. I should say none of it.

Mr. BLANTON. Is it adapted to any purpose of commercial value other than park purposes?

Mr. MAYS. It is not.

Mr. BLANTON. It is fit for nothing but park purposes?

Mr. MAYS. That is all.

Mr. BLANTON. Is there any great necessity for this additional public park?

Mr. MAYS. There is a demand for it.

Mr. BLANTON. I mean outside of the immediate locality in Utah?

Mr. MAYS. Utah has no national park. There are parks established in most of the other States of the West.

Mr. BLANTON. Most of the States have no national parks.

Mr. MAYS. The Western States have. If the gentleman desires it, I will read the list of national parks in the West.

Mr. BLANTON. What I mean is that the great majority of our States have no national parks.

Mr. MAYS. Probably that is true. A great many of them have no scenery well adapted to park purposes. Of course, these great natural curiosities exist mostly in the West.

Mr. BLANTON. At this particular time, when every legislator realizes the urgent necessity for retrenchment in public expenditures, does not the gentleman believe we could hold this matter in abeyance for a few years until we recuperate a bit?

Mr. MAYS. There is no demand for immediate expenditure of money on this park. The Secretary of the Interior recommends that it be set aside as a national park. It was established as a national monument 12 or 14 years ago.

Mr. BLANTON. I understood the gentleman to say that the legislation carried with it an initial appropriation of $10,000.

Mr. MAYS. No; it does not carry a cent.

Mr. BLANTON. But it will require about that amount?

Mr. MAYS. Well, I assume so.

Mr. BLANTON. For the first year?

Mr. MAYS. I assume that ultimately, as the park develops, it would require probably about the same amount as the Rocky Mountain National Park.

Mr. WELLING. If my colleague will yield for a suggestion, I will state to the gentleman from Texas that the area involved in this proposed national park is withdrawn as a national monument already—every acre of it. Please let me say further, this proposed national park is located in southwestern Utah, in Washington County. The State has constructed at great expense an automobile highway from Salt Lake City to the gateway of the park. The Salt Lake route, connecting Salt Lake with Los Angeles, passes within 50 miles of the park opening, and visitors leaving the railroad at Lund can reach the park through regular stages from that point over a perfect State road.

The original act authorizing the withdrawal of this land as a national monument was passed by the Congress on June 8, 1906. Under authority of this act the first withdrawal of land was made by the proclamation of President Taft July 31, 1909. In this withdrawal there were 15,840 acres. At this time the monument was known as the Mukuntuweap National Monument. Mukuntuweap is an Indian name of doubtful origin and was never adopted by the white settlers who had grown to love the majestic beauties which nature had so lavishly revealed at this place. Later on, in March, 1918, the monument was enlarged by proclamation of President Wilson to the extent of 76,800 acres; and responding to the well-known wish of the people living adjacent to the park, the President designated it as Zion National Monument. It is now proposed in the measure which I have introduced to make of this national monument a national park.

The reasons for this change are perfectly obvious. The national parks of the West are becoming the familiar playgrounds of the American people, and rightly so. This year, long before

the close of the tourist season, 60,000 people had visited the Yellowstone National Park through the Salt Lake gateway. The Zion National Park will in every way be worthy of similar approval and patronage by people who love nature in her sublimest moods.

This region obtained its name, Zion Canyon, because of the devout reverence of the Mormon pioneers who settled upon the Virgin River more than 60 years ago. Its perpendicular walls presented an impassable barrier to hostile tribes of Indians, who infested these regions, and these people looked upon Zion Canyon as a convenient and hospitable refuge when threatened by attack from these troublesome Indian tribes.

An enthusiastic admirer of this region once said: "Zion Canyon is an extraordinary gorge cut from brilliantly colored sedimentary rocks by the North Fork of the Virgin River. Its proportions are about equal to those of Yosemite Valley, in Yosemite National Park; the walls are several hundred feet lower and the canyon is considerably narrower. In the cutting of the gorge, however, the torrential stream and wind and rain have carved domes, spires, towers, and other curious forms that strikingly resemble many of the features of Yosemite Valley. More interesting than the carving of Zion's cliffs is their exquisite coloring. Red predominates, as it does in the Grand Canyon in Arizona, but there are amazing combinations of brown, black, and white colors with the red and with each other. White sandstone is superimposed on the red strata, and other layers of the red rock lie in turn upon the white. The action of water upon the exposed surfaces of these rocks has produced a symphony of color that gives the canyon its greatest charm. The finishing touches are given by the forests of the valley floor and the trees on the rim and in the niches of the nearly perpendicular canyon walls. Early scientific explorers of the Southwest, including Maj. J. W. Powell, who made the first trip through the Grand Canyon of the Colorado River, visited Zion Canyon and wrote of the great beauty of the gorge and the brilliance of its coloring, and several artists, including Thomas Moran, have conveyed the wonders of the region to the world by paintings of distinction."

I call particular attention to the fact that the bill does not necessarily involve the expenditure of a dollar of additional money. If the National Park Service, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, feels that work should not be begun on the park at this time, no money at all need be expended. It is thought, however, that this great park should be preserved in its primitive grandeur for the benefit of posterity. Along the perpendicular walls of Zion Canyon are the prehistoric homes of the cliff dwellers of ancient America. It is a favorite field of research for the archaeologist and the scientists who are interested in unfolding the history of this ancient people. On its granite walls are carved the symbols and characters which contain the imperishable record of the life history of these ancient races. I appeal to the House to take such action to-day as is necessary to preserve these records before the despoiling hand of man has forever effaced them.

The people of Utah are naturally intensely interested in this region. Historically it is a sacred spot to them as a refuge from hostile Indian tribes. Scientifically, it contains the record of one of the great unread volumes of past generations. Its scenic beauties can not be surpassed in any region of America to-day, and I trust the time is not far distant when hundreds of thousands of men will find its semitropical climate an inviting field for tourist travel in the winter months.

I may say already an enterprising national-park enthusiast and frontiersman, Mr. W. W. Wylie, has, under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior, established camps and regular stage traffic through the proposed park and many thousands have already enjoyed a visit to this wonderland of nature. I ask the House to permit its present consideration by unanimous consent.

Mr. BLANTON. I will state to my colleague that I am heartily in favor of establishing as many parks over the country as we can and just as fast as we can do so. The suggestion I was making was not in opposition to the general purpose of the measure, but to call attention to the fact that probably within the next few years most of the citizens of the United States will be occupied in trying to help the Government to raise interest to pay on its indebtedness and trying to meet that indebtedness as it matures. It is going to require a lot of effort in that direction. I think we ought to hesitate a little before we go into new ventures.

Mr. MAYS. The gentleman from Texas will realize that for the following year there will be many millions spent on the other side of the seas by American tourists.

Mr. BLANTON. Yes; and they could find much finer scenery in this country.

Mr. MAYS. That was what I was about to say. The parks, such as the Yellowstone Park, are of great benefit to the country. I have lately seen the record that 60,000 visitors, a greatly increased number, were through the Yellowstone Park this year, a great increase as compared with other years. It should be the policy of our Government to keep the tourists in this country till they see America first.

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAYS. Yes.

Mr. HICKS. I think the question of the betterment of national parks is something that every citizen is deeply interested in. I would like to ask the gentleman if this proposed park is contiguous to the Grand Canyon of the Colorado. I can not, from the report, determine it.

Mr. MAYS. It is not in the vicinity, but some distance north.

Mr. HICKS. How far from the rim of the Grand Canyon?

Mr. MAYS. I can not tell the gentleman exactly.

Mr. WELLING. It is 90 miles northwest of Bright Angel Point on the Grand Canyon.

Mr. MAYS. I might say to the gentleman that the Secretary of the Interior is greatly interested in the preservation of this park, particularly because it affords the most interesting illustration of American antiquities. The cliff dwellers had their homes in the sides of these perpendicular walls. These dwellings of prehistoric man are to be preserved. Evidences of a high degree of civilization are found in these villages. The curator of the National Museum has lately returned from an examination of these antiquities and tells me he intends to return soon.

Mr. HICKS. Does the gentleman know how these compare with the Mesa Verde National Park, in southwest Colorado?

Mr. MAYS. They are very similar. I would not want to say better, for I would not seek any issue with the gentleman from Colorado on that point.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman says that this carries no appropriation whatever and will require none for the next fiscal year.

Mr. MAYS. Not at all, except as already required as a national monument.

Mr. BLANTON. It is simply to be set apart as a national park?

Mr. MAYS. That is all.

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask the gentleman whether he or anyone is going to urge, in the case of the passage of this measure, an appropriation in the immediate future?

Mr. MAYS. I have not any such thought in mind at all.

Mr. BLANTON. I am not going to object to a measure which merely sets aside this land as a park. I would object to it if it carried an appropriation.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. May I make the suggestion that at the present time as a monument there is a small amount of money expended upon it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. GARD. Further reserving the right to object for a moment, I notice in the last paragraph of the letter the Secretary says:

> Practically all of the land affected by the pending legislation is unappropriated public land. The alienated lands within the boundaries of the proposed park are properly classified in the lists attached hereto.

How much land is there outside of the public land?

Mr. MAYS. My colleague has the list in detail.

Mr. Speaker, we have established 16 national parks, as follows:

Yosemite National Park, Calif.
Sequoia National Park, Calif.
General Grant National Park, Calif.
Mount Rainier National Park, Wash.
Crater Lake National Park, Oreg.
Rocky Mountain National Park, Colo.
Glacier National Park, Mont.
Mesa Verde National Park, Colo.
Hawaii National Park, Hawaii.
Lassen Volcanic National Park, Calif.
Hot Springs Reservation, Ark.
Platte National Park, Okla.
Wind Cave National Park, S. Dak.
Sullys Hill National Park, N. Dak.
Lafayette National Park, Me.
Mount McKinley National Park, Alaska.
Grand Canyon National Park, Ariz.
Yellowstone National Park, Wyo.

It will be observed that the Congress has reached out to far-away Hawaii and Alaska, establishing national parks in those places. It is well to do so. Our magnificent resources

in scenery should be preserved and made available to the people, thus diverting hundreds of millions of dollars from the eager clutches of the Old World and impressing our people with the unparalleled grandeur of their own country.

Of all the 16 national parks and 23 monuments established, the Zion National Park will be the most remarkable in many particulars. Travelers tell us that these wonderful canyons are as imposing as the walls and depths of the Grand Canyon itself, and afford a much more varied example of remarkable colorings. I will insert a statement from the well-known author and traveler "Jack Lait":

AN APPRECIATION OF ZION NATIONAL MONUMENT.

[By Jack Lait. Written especially for the United States Railroad Administration.]

Zion Canyon is an epic, written by mother nature in her most ecstatic humor, illustrated by creation in its most majestic manifestations, published by God Almighty as an inspiration to all mankind.

Far from the foot-worn ways of conventional journeying, its remote and intimate preserves unfold to the traveler whose eye seeks the extraordinary a masterpiece in magnitude, incredible colorings, vastnesses of those mystic influences which mark the earth's contour, and a haven of distant peace beyond the understanding of him who has never entered the mouth of Zion Canyon, where the hubbub of the affairs of men has not yet penetrated, where nature is so big that one may not think small thoughts, where one is embraced in the spirits of mystery and history and those fascinating elements untouched by the rude fingers of destroying humans.

I spent 10 delicious days and nights between the unscaled walls of Zion; I explored it over fords and fallen giant trees down to where, between great, sheer altitudes of rock, no man has ever gone farther—the stream becomes too deep to wade, too rocky to canoe, too narrow to swim. On every side was crude but marvelous nature in bird and foliage and fish and rock and running water. I stood there and I gasped, though I had become almost familiar with the miracles of Zion. I gasped: I gasped a prayer, for one may not behold what one beholds there without knowing that there is a God; that His ways are inexplicable to man and to be taken in faith alone.

Zion Canyon is the most beautiful spot on this continent. I think I have seen all the famed show places that the evolutions of the earth's formation has made. And of them all Zion to me stands first, stands alone. In this opinion I may stand alone. But I saw Zion at its best, and it captured me. Rich with a phase of American history seldom touched upon in popular literature, pregnant like the page of knowledge with the spoils of time, it gives to one who stands within its magnificent dimensions a sounder affection and admiration for the courage of men and a more profound impression of the wonder-works of God.

Also a paragraph from the letter of the Secretary of the Interior:

I have dwelt particularly upon Zion Canyon because it is now so readily accessible and because it is actually being used as a tourist resort, but there are other canyons in the reservation that are bigger and even more beautifully colored. Still more remain to be entered and explored. In time they will all be open to the public. Furthermore, there are in the reservation mountains, waterfalls, natural bridges, ancient cliff dwellings, and numerous other features interesting to the tourist and exceedingly valuable to the scientist and student. The entire area should be protected for all time as a national park, and I recommend that the bill under consideration receive the approval of your committee and of Congress. I have no criticism to make of the form and substance of this bill.

Mr. WELLING. There are 80 acres of land in private ownership in the entire 76,000 acres.

Mr. GARD. How is that to be acquired?

Mr. WELLING. It unquestionably would be turned over to the park service at a merely nominal sum. It is not worth anything as agricultural land.

Mr. BLANTON. May I ask the gentleman if it would not be a wise policy to make some provision now for such acquirement, because gentlemen know that if we surround that private land with a public park the price of that land will go up to an immense amount of money.

Mr. WELLING. There has never been a public park established with so little privately owned land as this, and I assure the gentleman there will be no trouble about this private property.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. It would be an easy matter to make provision to acquire the land.

Mr. GARD. I regret that the gentleman from Iowa is demanding the regular order when we are simply making inquiries for information.

Mr. MAYS. There is no disposition to withhold any information. My colleague has a description of the land in private ownership.

Mr. DOWELL. I demand the regular order.

Mr. BLANTON. Then, for the present, Mr. Speaker, until we can go into the matter further, I must object.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Speaker, I hope that the gentleman will not object. This matter is perfectly simple and there ought to be no objection to it.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman ought not to rush us, because we are trying to find out something about it, and now is the time to find it out.

Mr. GARD. If the gentleman will withdraw his request for the regular order and let us understand it, I think we will get along.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman from Iowa will withdraw his demand for the regular order, I shall withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Objection is heard.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will withdraw his request for the regular order and give us a few minutes in which to look into the matter, probably there will be no objection.

Mr. DOWELL. But the proper way to get information is when the bill comes before the House. I have no objection to taking a few minutes now, but I shall insist on the regular order if it takes very long. For the present I withdraw the demand.

Mr. BLANTON. And I withdraw my objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] reserves the right to object.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, what I desire to call attention to is that I think we should place some safeguard in the matter requiring this alienated property to be purchased at a certain amount, because I believe, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] has said, that sometimes when the United States steps in and establishes a park, land hitherto thought of little value becomes of immense value, and the Government is called upon to spend a lot of money for a small acreage of land. I think we ought to be protected in this circumstance.

Mr. WELLING. I am so certain of the fact that these 80 acres can be returned to the Government at a merely nominal figure that I am willing to accept any amendment that the gentleman desires to present in respect to it.

Mr. GARD. What does the gentleman suggest?

Mr. WELLING. Say that we provide that it shall be purchased at the price at which public land out there is now ordinarily held—perhaps $5 an acre.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. It is not at all material that the Government have those 80 acres. Let some one own it. It will be all for the better, for then you will have a resident there and it will never interfere with the park.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I call the gentleman's attention to the fact that in the first place there are only 80 acres out of about 70,000, and in all of the other parks which have been set aside there has been a very much greater amount of privately owned land. A good part of it is obtained at a nominal figure and the balance still remains in private ownership. To set a precedent that you could not establish a private park because there would be one part in private ownership I think would be a very bad thing to do.

Mr. GARD. I certainly am in accord with the purpose of the bill, which is to preserve this great national antiquity. I think it should be preserved. There is only a small amount of land, 80 acres, and some say that piece of land is not necessary at all. If it is necessary, I think some additional reservation should be placed in the bill limiting the price at which it shall be purchased. I confess that I am not familiar with the form in which it should be offered, but I suggest that those in charge of the bill place somewhere in the bill the statement that it shall be purchased at a price not to exceed $5 an acre.

Mr. MAYS. That is entirely satisfactory to me.

Mr. RAKER. You can not acquire it now.

Mr. MAYS. But you can limit the price to be paid eventually.

Mr. RAKER. I know, but that is all up to the action of Congress later.

Mr. GARD. No; it is up to it now.

Mr. MAYS. That would limit the Secretary of the Interior to $5 an acre.

Mr. RAKER. But he can not buy the land.

Mr. MAYS. I am willing to accept such an amendment.

Mr. RAKER. There is no authorization for him to buy the land.

Mr. GARD. This does not authorize it. If the gentleman will offer such an amendment, I would have no objection.

Mr. MAYS. I will offer the amendment.

Mr. GARD. Then I have no objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object further, the only reason I raised the question is this: We do know that if a public park is established there and tourists begin to go there every year, the owner of the 80 acres of land could erect big hotels upon it and charge a thousand dollars an acre for it, and reap the benefit of the act of Congress in establishing this as a public park. For that reason an amendment should be adopted to the effect that this is not made a public park until the 80 acres referred to are acquired at a price not to exceed a maximum amount of $5 an acre. That should be a condition precedent. The right of egress and ingress to a per-

son's property is something that the law fixes. This property is entirely surrounded by land owned by the United States, and the minute you put a public park there you can not regulate it so that the owner has not the right of ingress and egress to his property.

Mr. MAYS. We accept the amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. With that understanding, I shall not object.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Zion National Monument, in the county of Washington, State of Utah, established and designated as a national monument under the act of June 8, 1906, entitled "An act for the preservation of American antiquities," by presidential proclamations of July 31, 1909, and March 18, 1918, is hereby declared to be a national park and dedicated as such for the benefit and enjoyment of the people, under the name of the Zion National Park.

SEC. 2. That the administration, protection, and promotion of said Zion National Park shall be exercised under the direction of the Secretary of the Interior by the National Park Service, subject to the provision of the act of August 25, 1916, entitled "An act to establish a National Park Service, and for other purposes," and acts additional thereto or amendatory thereof.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment which I send to the Clerk's desk. Unfortunately I should have offered the amendment at the end of section 1, and I ask unanimous consent to return to the end of section 1 for the purpose of offering this amendment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent to return to the end of section 1 for the purpose of offering an amendment. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 10, strike out the period, insert a comma, and add the following: "under which name the aforesaid national park shall be maintained by allotment of funds heretofore or hereafter appropriated for the national monument until such time as an independent appropriation is made therefor by Congress."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Speaker, in order to answer the objection raised to the bill I offer the following amendment, which I hope will meet the approval of the House. I desire the amendment added after the amendment which has just been adopted.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Add after the amendment just adopted: "provided alienated land shall be acquired in the discretion of the Secretary of the Interior at a cost of not more than $5 per acre.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment. After the word "acre" insert the following: "before said Zion National Park shall be established."

Mr. MAYS. That gives the people a chance if they are so disposed to hold up the situation.

Mr. BLANTON. It requires them to come in before the establishment of the park. After it is once established it puts a value on the property.

Mr. MAYS. It is very common to have privately owned land within the exterior boundaries of these national parks, and if you state that before the park can be established you must buy these 80 acres, these people have a chance to hold up the Government.

Mr. BLANTON. If they know the park is not going to be established until they come in and object to the establishment by not turning over land at a reasonable value, it should not be established.

Mr. MAYS. They may or may not be interested in the establishment of this park.

Mr. BLANTON. I am sure the public-spirited people of Utah could prevail upon the ownership of merely 80 acres of land——

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Speaker, the amendment which I offer gives the Secretary of the Interior the discretion to acquire this land that has been alienated—this is simply 80 acres—at a price not to exceed $5 an acre to the Government, and I think it has been covered fully.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask to be recognized in opposition to the amendment offered by Mr. WELLING.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

The Clerk read as follows:

After the word "acre" insert "before said Zion National Park shall be established."

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, the very minute that this bill becomes a law and this park is thereby established, that very minute this act of Congress gives unusual value to this 80 acres of privately owned land. It has been stated here that more than 70,000 acres of public land will be embraced in this public park, which completely surrounds this 80-acre tract of privately owned land.

Mr. MAYS. The gentleman will remember since 1906 this has been a national monument.

Mr. BLANTON. The point I am trying to make is that if we want to prevent an act of Congress from putting an extraordinary unreasonable value upon this little 80-acre tract of land, now of insignificant value, we should protect the people of the United States right at this time, because whenever you establish this national park——

Mr. CARAWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BLANTON. I regret that I can not now yield to the gentleman from Arkansas. By reason of the money Congress will be called upon to spend thereafter, and by tourists who visit this national park each year on the plan of visitation with respect to the Yellowstone National Park, you will find hotel after hotel placed upon this privately owned property. You will find a corporation soon organized to make profit out of this particular land unless we safeguard the matter right at this time.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. What is to prevent the building of a hotel on any of the other tracts of land?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, well, the United States can control its own property on the inside by regulation, but, as I said before, it can not control the right of reasonable ingress and egress to this private property. The person owning this 80 acres, with Government land surrounding it on all sides, will have the right to come in and go from the property under reasonable regulations.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. Does the gentleman think it could be a very exorbitant price when it is specified at $5 an acre?

Mr. BLANTON. Now, with all due respect to the gentleman from Utah, his amendment does not mean anything as proposed. It merely gives the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, the right to acquire this land at $5 an acre. It does not compel the owner to sell his land at $5 an acre, because we have not the right to compel him in that way. And while we authorize the Secretary of the Interior, in his discretion, to try to acquire this land at $5 an acre, the owner would probably laugh at him if he would go to him with such a proposition after we established the national park completely surrounding the land and thereby making it of great value.

Mr. SUMMERS of Washington. How about the other 78,000 acres privately controlled trying to build hotels?

Mr. BLANTON. Oh, it is on the outside, and not greatly affected, but this owner is on the inside. This 80 acres is privately controlled land that will be on the inside of this proposed national park, and its owner may reap a fortune by reason of this act of Congress, and I take it that we want properly to protect and safeguard this legislation right at this time.

Mr. RAKER. Has the gentleman observed what the experience has been of those who have owned lands within——

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. BLANTON. I ask unanimous consent for one minute more in order to answer the question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BLANTON. The experience has been that the very minute a private citizen gets a chance to gouge the Public Treasury he usually gouges it to the maximum limit. To take this chance and opportunity away from the owner of this 80 acres of land, whoever he may be, I am seeking now to get an amendment to this bill.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I am disappointed that the committee even consented, although, of course, they had to consent, that the Secretary should purchase the land. But the gentleman from Texas evidently is not familiar with the history of owners within the boundaries of parks. Their use of the land is practically of no value. They can not travel over the public land, in and out, as they would; they can not do as they please. They have got to come to the Government to get the right to go over the land. If the gentleman will read the last case in the Supreme Court in regard to the interest a man has from the Government in the Yosemite National Park, he will see that this man will be only too glad to sell and sell at a reasonable

price. He has no monopoly there. He can not establish a hotel or run over the public land without getting their consent.

Mr. WELLING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I yield.

Mr. WELLING. Is it not true that in all the national parks that have been created there has been a great deal larger proportion of deeded land than there is in this?

Mr. RAKER. This is the only one in which it is practically infinitesimal. They have run from a thousand to fifteen thousand acres and more in the national parks. And you establish a policy that every bit of the land must be in public ownership before you can establish a park, and that is unfortunate. The national parks are an asset to this Government, they are of inestimable value, and will continue to grow each day as this Government continues, and we ought to encourage the appropriation for and the proper establishment of national parks instead of trying to curtail them. And by every dollar we spend in the maintenance and upkeep of them, we add that much value to this country. Not only the Government land but surrounding land, whole counties, have an interest, and it is for the interest of humanity in general that the people should get the benefit and use of these parks, and that they have hotels and other accommodations so that they can go there and enjoy the benefits of that park. It is unfortunate that anyone should say that a park can not be established until they have acquired all the private land. Now, that will defeat this bill entirely, because there is no provision in the bill or any authorization to condemn, because there is no park. If you establish a park, then under the law authorizing the national parks you can proceed to acquire the land. Why not establish the park and then proceed to acquire the privately owned land?

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RAKER. I yield.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman states in one breath that the land would be of no value to the owner; that he would be glad to turn it over to the United States, and in the next breath the gentleman says that if you may not acquire the land at $5 an acre you never would acquire it.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, no. I said there was no authority to give the Secretary of the Interior to commence action of condemnation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. RAKER. Just two minutes more.

There is no park established until the land is acquired. You make no provision for the acquiring of the land, and therefore you have a dead act, of no effect and no avail, and which no one can use. And clearly if you give the Secretary discretion, if he desires later to exchange it for some public land on the outside, for this particular park, an equal exchange, we will get the land for the benefit of the park. Nobody is going to be injured. They never have been injured. There have been fair deals and fair transfers, and as to this policy of saying in advance that you can not establish a national park until you have acquired the privately owned land, and the next policy, that you can not establish a national park unless you will agree in advance to expend no money upon it. I wish to ask, Why should the Government own a valuable property worth a great deal to it and its citizens and then not improve it? Ordinary business men do not do those things. If they have a property that is of value they expend a reasonable amount of money on it in order to make it more valuable, so that they can get some return for it. And it is the same way with this as in every other park.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Division, Mr. Speaker.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 6, noes 32.

So the amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Utah [Mr. WELLING].

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read the third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. WELLING, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Utah makes the same request. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio objects. On what subject does the gentleman want to extend his remarks?

Mr. BROOKS of Illinois. I wish to extend my remarks on the war with Silesia.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the war with Silesia. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks that I made a little while ago.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to revise and extend the remarks which he made a little while ago. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a short extract from a report of the Department of Agriculture as to crop conditions in Georgia and my remarks in connection therewith.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting a letter in regard to crop conditions in Georgia and his own remarks in connection therewith. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, may I ask the gentleman in what way the Members of Congress or the people of this Nation would be particularly interested just now in the crop conditions of Georgia, aside from general interest?

Mr. LANKFORD. This is an extract from a report from the Department of Agriculture to the effect that the cotton yield in Georgia will be about 33⅓ per cent of the normal yield.

Mr. BLANTON. Then it will tend to help the farmer, and I shall not object.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Following are the statement and extract referred to:

Mr. LANKFORD. Mr. Speaker, I was simply crushed and horrified this morning when I read from the Georgia October 1 cotton report from the Department of Agriculture, as follows:

> That the State's yield will be the lowest since 1896, that the total production will be the smallest since 1903, that loss of more than 150,000 bales representing $30,000,000, has been incurred since last report date are three astounding statements of the cooperative crop reporting service established by Union of State Department of Agriculture, J. J. Brown, commissioner, and United States Bureau of Crop Estimates, Leon M. Estabrook, chief. Not only that, these are true and conservative figures, as can easily be verified by reading reports of thousands of trustworthy and trained observers maintained by this service in every cotton county in Georgia.
>
> These figures simply mean that the weevil has swept Georgia, doing a maximum damage. Only some 17 cotton counties remain which are not infested, and at the rate of present progress most of these will be invaded before the season closes. As is history in all territory injured for the first time, north central Georgia did not appreciate and would not believe the damage actually taking place, and even the keenest observer hesitated to indicate the full extent of the loss.
>
> Auxiliary to the loss through the weevil, and scarcely second to him in destructiveness, has been the adverse weather. Long periods of flooding rains early in the season were followed in August and September by severe drought and heat. The first wrought destruction on low lands; promoted soft, tender growth where cotton had escaped; and was ideal for weevil propagation. The dry weather caught the plants and stripped them of upper fruit and even their leaves.
>
> Ordinary cotton troubles like rust, blackroot, worms and red spiders, though as bad as usual, in presence of the greater pests have been almost forgotten.
>
> All of these factors, together with labor shortage, have resulted in the greatest abandonment in years. Most of this occurred before the acreage estimate was made and hence included in it, but that since June 25 is still double the average since weevil infestation.

Mr. Speaker, my district is the greatest sufferer in the State, according to the report, and will make less than a third of a normal crop of cotton.

I was raised on a small farm in Clinch County in my district, and actually know what privation and suffering this shortage of a cotton crop means to the people of my section and State.

This great calamity of crop shortage is a most powerful unanswerable argument against the imposition of a potash tariff or any other unnecessary burden on the farmers at this time.

Let us pray to God for a chance to help them instead of a chance to hurt them.

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the proposed bonus to be given soldiers by inserting a letter from Capt. C. C. Helmer, of Carroll, Iowa.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting a letter as indicated. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, is the letter from some one in authority or from one of the gentleman's constituents?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. It is from one of my constituents. He is a captain in the Regular Army.

Mr. GARD. And does his letter throw any light on the subject?

Mr. DICKINSON of Iowa. I think it does. He is one of the soldier boys.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, some days ago objection was made to a request to insert a communication from a certain organization of soldiers taking the stand that they did not want a bonus. Now, in view of the fact that an objection was made to a general statement by a whole organization in the way of resolutions passed by that organization concerning a particular bill, it occurs to me that until the whole organization is permitted to be heard from, surely no particular soldier should be heard from, and therefore for the time being I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects. The Clerk will report the next bill.

RIGHT OF WAY THROUGH PUBLIC LAND.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 2946) to amend acts to permit the use of right of way through public lands for tram roads, canals, and reservoirs, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I understand the gentleman from Idaho has an amendment to submit to this bill excluding the forest reserves from the provisions of the act.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes. After the report was made on the bill a communication was received from the Secretary of Agriculture, asking that the amendment be inserted.

Mr. GARD. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio objects.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman from Ohio let me make an explanation in regard to this bill? It passed both branches of Congress last year. The Senate made a slight amendment to the bill, but it came here just two days before the adjournment.

Mr. GARD. I have objected, and I shall object. I will reserve my objection for a moment; but there seem to be so many objections to the bill from gentlemen on the Committee on Public Lands that I do not think it should be taken up at the present time.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I hope the gentleman from Ohio will not resort to that sort of tactics.

Mr. GARD. The Secretary of the Interior says the bill is objectionable to him.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I do not think he makes any such statement.

Mr. GARD. In his letter he says, "The bill in its present form is objectionable to this department."

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Oh, that letter was written on the 12th of January during the last Congress, and he suggests now that if the amendment recommended by him is adopted he has no objection. He approved the bill in a letter the 18th of last June.

Mr. GARD. If the gentleman wants his bill to come in with proper amendments, all right.

Mr. SINNOTT. I will say to the gentleman from Ohio that that objection has been obviated.

Mr. WELLING. The objection has been eliminated by the acceptance of the amendment proposed.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes. The bill has been amended by the adoption of the amendment suggested by the Secretary of the Interior in January last.

Mr. GARD. The gentleman from Oregon suggested that the gentleman from Idaho has another amendment. Now, I object to having bills come up and after authority is given to consider them have gentlemen come in with amendments changing their character.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. After the bill was reported the Secretary of Agriculture volunteered a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Public Lands suggesting an amendment that this proposed legislation should not apply to forest reserves. We have accepted that amendment because the Secretary of Agriculture has requested it. That is what the gentleman from Oregon had reference to.

Mr. RAKER. I know, but that is an important matter, and this is the first I have heard of it. I would not want to let legislation of this kind go through, proposing to say to men whose property is there that they can not have the same rights over forest reserves that others have.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. But there is a general law applying to rights of way over forest reserves.

Mr. WALSH. Has the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] withdrawn his objection?

The SPEAKER. He reserved his objection.

Mr. GARD. I withdrew the absolute objection, so as to allow the gentleman from Idaho [Mr. SMITH] and the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] and the gentleman from Oregon [Mr. SINNOTT] to explain the bill.

Mr. WALSH. I think they ought to do a little explaining for the benefit of the rest of the House. They have been doing it over on that side, where nobody except the gentleman from Ohio can hear it.

Mr. GARD. I would be very glad if they would explain it to the House.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. It is a very important bill, and it passed both Houses of Congress last year. There is no new matter in the bill except that suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture, and it seems to me we ought to consider the bill in the House.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of the bill?

Mr. GARD. Further reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would ask the gentleman from Idaho if he intends to offer an amendment to this bill carrying out, in effect, the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Oregon?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Yes.

Mr. GARD. What is that amendment?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Simply the amendment suggested by the Secretary of Agriculture, that this act shall not apply to lands within national forests, because we already have general legislation controlling rights of way in national forests and the uses to which the national forests shall be put.

Mr. GARD. What is the reason for the granting of the rights granted by this bill?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. As indicated in the report, it is necessary to have ditch riders stationed along these great canals which cross the public domain, and in many instances go up into the canyons. In order that these employees may have some place to build their homes and their corrals to take care of their horses, it has been deemed advisable to secure legislation giving them the title to 5 acres of land for this purpose. Otherwise they would be trespassers on the public domain.

Mr. GARD. Are there no tracts of land where under present authority these men may have 5 acres for a house?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. No; the rights of way are only 200 feet in width, and there is no place for them to erect their houses and build their barns. The only place they could build them would be on the public domain, and then they would be trespassers and liable to prosecution. The land is useless. It is not now utilized for any purpose, because it is away out on the plains or up in the canyons, where it could not be used for any other purpose, and is not desired for any other purpose.

Mr. RAKER. If the gentleman will yield, this brings a new feature onto the forest reserves. I remember when the bill was considered I was very much interested, but this proposed amendment eliminates practically three-fourths of the value of the bill, if not nine-tenths of it. Most of these ditches, canals, and rights of way are over forest reserves.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Oh, no.

Mr. RAKER. Oh, but they are in my country and in Nevada, Oregon, and other places. Now, I am going to ask the gentleman a fair question. This never was considered by the committee. Why should we eliminate this right as to forest reserves when that question was not considered or raised in the committee?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. For the reason, as I explained, that the suggestion from the Secretary of Agriculture was not received until three weeks after the bill was reported.

Mr. RAKER. I know; but that is an entire change of the bill.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. We are bringing it up here for consideration now. That is what we are trying to secure—con-

sideration of the amendment offered by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. RAKER. If this legislation is advisable as to the public domain, does not the same reason exist for its application to forest reserves?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. No; for the reason that——

Mr. SINNOTT. If the gentleman will yield, the Agricultural Department reports that there is existing legislation under which the department has no difficulty in meeting the demands of persons who desire to use national forest lands for the purposes contemplated by this proposed legislation, so that there is no trouble upon the forest reserves at the present time. There is legislation that enables these privileges to be granted.

Mr. RAKER. That legislation is simply the right to occupy the land for not more than 20 years, but this gives them a permanent title to the land in connection with their reservoirs, ditches, and so forth, so that they may have it for actual use. I will ask the gentleman if that is not correct?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. That is true; but the gentleman knows that the jurisdiction over forests is in the Department of Agriculture and the jurisdiction over the public domain is in the Secretary of the Interior, and there is a law which applies to the national forests which authorizes their use for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

Mr. RAKER. I want to be fair with the gentleman. The law in regard to the forest reserves provides that the Department of Agriculture may authorize the occupancy and use of certain lands for a period of not exceeding 20 years.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. But that right can be renewed at any time.

Mr. RAKER. It can be renewed, but if a man puts a large amount of money into a reservoir and ditch and other waterworks, why should he not have the same right of permanent occupancy if the land is forest reserve as though it were a part of the public domain?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. We have no objection to it, and we want to meet the wishes of the Secretary of Agriculture in this regard and avoid a controversy which might result in objection to the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. There seems to be such confusion among the membership as to what the bill should be that I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made. The Clerk will report the next bill.

RECLAMATION PROJECTS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 796) for furnishing water supply for miscellaneous purposes in connection with reclamation projects.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

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

Mr. WALSH. I object.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Will the gentleman withhold his objection so as to give us an opportunity to explain the bill?

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman desires to make a statement, I will reserve the right to object in order that he may do so.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Let me say that this little bill is one that has been passed before by the Senate and been favorably considered by this committee at the last session of Congress. Throughout nearly all of the thirty-odd Government reclamation projects in the West there are at times every season occasions when the officials want to furnish some water for something else than irrigation purposes—for instance, as the Secretary of the Interior says, for sugar-beet factories and alfalfa mills and for domestic purposes to the people. Sometimes they have to furnish water for railroad engines on trains running through the projects. It is some little temporary use, the amount of water being usually insignificant, but at the same time it is very important to the community. We have put in an amendment that such water shall only be furnished on the approval of the water users' association of that project. So if it is with their approval and the approval of the Secretary of the Interior and is for a general public benefit, and at a time and under conditions where it does not take any water away from the irrigators, I do not see what objection there can be to it. It is in the interest of development, accommodates everybody, and is objected to by nobody. It applies to all the reclamation projects. I trust that the gentleman from Massachusetts will not object to this provision, because it certainly harms nobody. I can not see what objection can be made to it, and I ask the gentleman from Massachusetts to withdraw his objection to this bill, which is for the benefit and development of the country. I do not know whether I have had any effect upon the gentleman's views.

Mr. FESS. You have.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I wanted to make an appeal that would melt the heart of a wooden Indian tobacco sign to allow this bill to pass and let those deserving people have some water.

Mr. KINKAID. Will the two gentlemen allow me an interruption? This is to relieve very necessitous conditions which occur in a great many places in the arid West when water is extremely scarce. Water is no more important for farming purposes than it is for domestic purposes, but where there is adequate water and some left over from irrigation and domestic purposes, then this is to relieve those necessitous conditions such as the gentleman from Colorado has named. It is a very conservative measure. We have restricted it by four provisos, that the water users must consent, and that it must not be a damage to the project, and furthermore the Government is protected.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. WALSH. I object.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may not be stricken off, but retain its place, and go to the foot of the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado asks unanimous consent that the bill may go to the foot of the calendar. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill H. R. 2941 retain its place on the calendar.

Mr. WALSH. No; it ought to go to the foot of the calendar.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman from Massachusetts will withdraw his objection for a moment.

Mr. WALSH. I will withhold it.

Mr. MONDELL. I did not hear what the gentleman from Massachusetts said was the ground of his objection.

Mr. WALSH. I did not say anything, but I objected.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. It is pretty hard to argue against a blank objection, without there being any reason whatever given for the objection.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I take it that the gentleman knows what the situation is. The difficulty as the matter now stands is that it is exceedingly difficult for town sites to get a water supply on reclamation projects. Under the law as it now stands, or is interpreted, the only water rights are those that become appurtenant to the land, and therefore are irrigation water rights. The towns on reclamation projects must have a water supply. The only source of water supply for these towns in many instances is the water on the project. The amount of water needed for this purpose is infinitesimal as compared with the amount used for irrigation. But it is the most essential of all the water supplies.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Let me illustrate the situation on a reclamation project with which I am familiar. The only way the town on the reclamation project secures water at all is by a fiction that a municipal water supply is an irrigation water supply. That is a fiction that can be questioned at any time. It is true that the people on the town site have invested a considerable amount of money in providing for a reservoir and a pressure pipe, but the water supply is still, so far as its legal status is concerned, an irrigation water supply. As a matter of fact, it is a municipal water supply. I imagine the amount of water needed for that town site is probably not more than the amount of water that would be needed for the irrigation of, say, 40 acres of land. But there is no need higher than that of the need of water for municipal purposes. This is a simple little bill for the purpose of enabling the Secretary to recognize that situation and make provision for these municipal water supplies.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Why can not the town get the water now?

Mr. MONDELL. In this particular case I am speaking of the town can get no other water except that which comes from the project, because there is no water within many miles of the project except the water that comes through the canal to the project. The town is many miles from water except that which comes through the canal. It is the only water in the locality and is brought down for the purpose of irrigating the land. It reaches the little town site built on the project for the purpose of affording the necessary business houses, the railway station, and so forth.

There is no way under heaven of securing water for that town except securing it from this project, water that irrigates the land.

Mr. WALSH. That is not the only section connected with those projects. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. They have no authority to purchase this water from the users now.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not know that the House wants to give me the time to explain the process of appropriation of water for irrigation, but this water supply was appropriated by the Secretary of the Interior for the benefit of the people on the project. The Secretary of the Interior is simply a trustee, and eventually, after all of the lands are sold, that water supply is the property of the people owning the land on the project, a part of whom are those who happen to live in this little town. The water supply is sold to the landowners. That is, the water is not sold; it can not be under the laws of the State; we use that term because there is no other to express what is really done. What is done is to make a charge for the distribution and delivery of water that belongs to the people and land of a project, and that is the charge that is referred to here under the term "sale." He simply makes a charge to the town, as he would to a settler, for a certain amount of water to be used, in this case for municipal purposes, and the sum paid goes into the reclamation fund to help pay for that project. Under the present law there is no way in which that charge for distribution and delivery to a community on the project can be made except under the fiction that the water is being used to irrigate land when, as a matter of fact, it is being used to irrigate the inhabitants thereof, and it is much needed, of course, in these dry times, when there is nothing else to drink.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, in view of the very interesting statement of the gentleman from Wyoming, supplementing the statement of the gentleman from Colorado [Mr. TAYLOR], I object.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will not object to letting it retain a place on the calendar.

Mr. WALSH. At the foot of the calendar. We can not have bills objected to remain in the same place on the calendar.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I am not asking to have it remain in the same place, but to go to the foot of the calendar.

The SPEAKER. The House has already consented to that.

SALE OF CERTAIN LANDS AT MINIDOKA, IDAHO.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 2945) to authorize the sale of certain lands at or near Minidoka, Idaho, for railroad purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman from Idaho state what the bill is?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. This is a bill to authorize the sale of about 67 acres of land on a reclamation project to the railroad company, upon which it desires to build a roundhouse and also extend its switches. It is favorably recommended by the Secretary of the Interior, and a provision has been inserted that the land shall not be sold for less than $50 an acre, the proceeds of which will go into the reclamation fund for that particular project. The land has never been applied for, and is really now worth nothing excepting for such purposes as those indicated in the bill. The railroad company is willing to pay $50 or whatever sum above that the Secretary of the Interior estimates the land to be worth.

Mr. GARD. Does the bill carry an amount at which it is to be sold?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. The bill provides that it shall not be sold for less than $50 an acre. The land is really quite a distance from the land that is irrigated, and it has never been applied for, although the project has been open for nearly 10 years.

Mr. GARD. What is the amount of the land?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Sixty-seven and eighty-seven one-hundredths acres.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman from Idaho whether or not the mineral rights are reserved in this transaction?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. The bill does not provide for that, but I have no objection to it. It is in the Great Snake River plain where there are no minerals but lava rock.

Mr. BLANTON. I would state to the gentleman that in two counties in my district to-day there are 200,000 barrels of oil flowing out of the ground every day——

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. But that is a different country from this.

Mr. BLANTON. And they are in a country which until a short time ago people never dreamed had any mineral rights at all. I think that where property is sold at a nominal value—and this is a nominal value, is it not?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. No; it is not.

Mr. BLANTON. When you consider it is within a reclamation project.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Oh, there is no water there to irrigate it. It is 6 or 8 miles from the high-line canal.

Mr. BLANTON. If the gentleman will offer an amendment reserving the mineral rights to the Government, I shall not object.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I have no objection to the gentleman's offering such an amendment.

Mr. BLANTON. Would the gentleman offer it at the proper place in the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I am not interested in offering such an amendment, but if the gentleman wishes me to draw it up I will be very glad to do it.

Mr. BLANTON. The gentleman can draw it up and offer it. I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the State of the Union.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Idaho asks unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized to sell and convey to Oregon Short Line Railroad Co., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of Utah and authorized to do business in the State of Idaho, its successors and assigns, for railroad purposes, and at a price to be fixed by appraisement at not less than $50 per acre, and under such terms, conditions, and regulations as the Secretary of the Interior may prescribe, the following-described land, situated in Minidoka County, Idaho:

All that part of the west half of the southeast quarter and the southeast quarter of the southwest quarter of section 2, and the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter and the north half of the northwest quarter of section 11, all in township 8 south, range 25 east of the Boise meridian, within the following-described area:

Beginning at the intersection of the present southeasterly right of way boundary of the Twin Falls Branch of the Oregon Short Line Railroad Co. with the section line common to said sections 2 and 11, 100 feet southeasterly from and at right angles to the center line of main track of said railroad, said intersection also bearing north 89° 5′ west, 460.1 feet from the quarter section corner common to said sections 2 and 11; thence north 40° 25′ east along said southeasterly right of way boundary, being 100 feet southeasterly from and parallel to said center line of main track, for a distance of 1,726.8 feet; thence south 0° 1′ east, and parallel to the north and south center line of said section 2, for a distance of 1,332.6 feet, to a point in the section line common to said sections 2 and 11; thence continuing south 0° 1′ east, and parallel to the north and south center line of said section 11, for a distance of 1,320 feet, to the south line of the northwest quarter of the northeast quarter and the north half of the northwest quarter of said section 11; thence north 89° 5′ west, along said south line, for a distance 2,229.5 feet, to a point in the present southeasterly right of way boundary of said railroad; thence north 40° 25′ east, along said right of way boundary, and being 100 feet southeasterly from and parallel to said center line of main track, for a distance of 1,710.4 feet, to the point beginning, and containing in all 67.87 acres, more or less, within the proposed pumping unit of the Minidoka project of the United States Reclamation Service.

The committee amendment was read, as follows:

Page 1, line 8, strike out the word "appraisement" and insert "the Secretary of the Interior in order to return the expenditure heretofore made or proposed to be made for the irrigation of the land."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "company," insert a comma and add the following: "reserving all mineral rights to the Government."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

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

On motion of Mr. SMITH of Idaho, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

TRANSFER OF EMPLOYEES IN THE CLASSIFIED CIVIL SERVICE.

The next business in order on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 7404) to repeal section 7 of the act of October 7, 1917, entitled "An act making appropriation to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and for other purposes."

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like to ask the gentleman from Idaho some particulars in regard to this bill. From a reading of the report, is it a proper conclusion to reach that there are two purposes in view, one to raise salaries and the other to facilitate the exchange of employees from one department to another?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, in drawing this report I hoped to make it full enough so that all Members who took the time to read the report might understand the merits of the legislation. At the beginning of the war, when we had quite a number of war bureaus created, it was necessary to have a great

many additional clerks, and those new war bureaus commenced to draw from the old established bureaus in the various departments, and there were so many requests for transfers that it was necessary, for the good of the service and to avoid disorganization of established bureaus, to have the act referred to prohibiting such transfers. Now that the war is over and conditions are resuming normal, it is desired by the Civil Service Commission, also by two Cabinet officers, that this law prohibiting transfers from one department to another be repealed. The law works a great injustice to a great many competent people. From my own district two men came here to Washington and were given positions in a permanent branch of the department. When their skill and experience were discovered transfers were asked for them to other bureaus, but they could not be transferred because of the fact that they had not been in the department for one year.

Mr. HICKS. Let me interrupt the gentleman, if I may, for a moment. On page 2 of the report in the second paragraph at the bottom it states:

It also prevented one department bidding against another, in cases where one of them happened to be more advantageously situated than another with respect to the use of lump-sum appropriations.

Now, if the old law prevented and this does away with the prohibition, then we are going to establish a custom of departments bidding against each other, I would presume.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. In establishing new bureaus the clerks have to be compensated from a lump sum and the gentleman's objection would apply, but there are only three or four bureaus now where clerks are paid from a lump-sum appropriation—the Shipping Board, the Revenue Department, and perhaps in the Census Office. This legislation is intended to make it possible for those bureaus when some one especially qualified who is now in a permanent department for particular work in another department may be transferred without having to serve one year in the department in which he was originally appointed.

Mr. HICKS. There is one other question I would like to ask the gentleman, and that is on page 4 of the gentleman's report in the letter received by Mr. LEHLBACH from Secretary Baker he states that there should be a provision or an amendment put in "prohibiting one department from tendering, either directly or indirectly, a position to an employee of another department at an increased salary without the prior consent of the head of the department desiring the transfer." Was that proviso put in the bill?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. No; it was not put in the bill, because we considered it unnecessary. Under the civil-service law permitting transfers, transfers can not be made from one classified position to another without the consent of the head of the department from which the clerk is transferred and the consent of the head of the department to which the clerk is transferred.

Mr. HICKS. Then why did Mr. Baker refer to it in his letter of July 29?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Perhaps he was not advised on what the law is, as you can not now make a transfer without securing the consent of the heads of the departments interested in the transfer. The Civil Service Commission has written a letter to the committee, which, it seems to me, should appeal to the judgment of Members and is incorporated in the report.

Mr. HICKS. From whom?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. From Mr. Morrison, the chairman. This legislation is simply in the interest of the public service and the proper transaction of the public business. These gentlemen charged with the administration of the law seem to think it is very important. The House Committee on Reform in the Civil Service considered it and reported it out favorably.

Mr. HICKS. Mr. Speaker, I always dislike to make objections to bills which have been considered by a committee, but it does seem to me that this bill may throw the gates open to increases in salaries, and also to the enlargement of our bureaus and the increase of our civilian employees, and for that reason I am constrained to object to the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York objects.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. I ask unanimous consent that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

CARIBOU NATIONAL FOREST.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (H. R. 4311) to authorize the addition of certain lands to the Caribou National Forest.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the immediate consideration of this bill?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, I desire to have the gentleman explain the necessity for the bill with the amendments which are inserted by the committee.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. The amendment in italics, inserted on the first page of the bill, conforms to the recommendation of the Secretary of the Interior, who desired to have the land examined in order to determine whether or not, in his judgment, it should be included in the national forest, and the amendment on the last page is simply to protect pending entries.

Mr. GARD. I note that the Secretary of the Interior says in the report, on page 3:

I am without information as to the necessity for the proposed legislation. While generally opposed to placing lands more valuable for agricultural uses in forest reserves, it is not very clear that these lands are more valuable for such uses, and I would interpose no objection to the legislation proposed if additions to the forest be restricted to lands of the character contemplated by the bill in its present form.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. That was the reason we put in the provision that he should first examine the land, when he would be in a position to determine whether he wished to approve of the transfer or not.

Mr. GARD. Why is it that the Secretary of the Interior, who is in charge of these matters, is without information as to the necessity for public land in the Caribou National Forest, and what is the necessity for it?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. The reason the Secretary is not advised is because the land is up on the top of the mountains, and none of his special agents has ever been in there to make examination of the land. The necessity for the legislation is to further protect the stream flow in that country, and simply connects up the forest reserve lying on the west side of Wyoming with the forest reserve lying on the east side of Idaho. It is just a strip of townships which should be placed under the jurisdiction of the national forest administration.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill go to the foot of the calendar.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, may I ask the gentleman if it is not better policy for the Secretary of the Interior to have this proposition investigated first, before the legislation is taken up and passed, as to the necessity for increasing the size of the reserve?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. The safeguard was put in the bill so that he could examine the land before he determined the matter.

Mr. BLANTON. Has there ever been such a piece of legislation passed until the Secretary of the Interior has had the matter investigated and made a favorable report?

Mr. SMITH of Idaho. We have passed a number of bills of that character, both in this Congress and in the last Congress. In this instance, because his recommendation was not absolute, we inserted the provision as he suggested.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the bill going to the foot of the calendar? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

HOMESTEAD ENTRIES IN FORT PECK INDIAN RESERVATION.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 183) providing additional time for the payment of purchase money under homestead entries of land within the former Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the consideration of the bill?

Mr. SINNOTT. Mr. Speaker, I ask that this bill be passed for the present without prejudice.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oregon asks unanimous consent that the bill be passed without prejudice. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The Clerk will report the next bill.

RAILROAD RIGHT OF WAY FOR PUBLIC-ROAD PURPOSES.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 2100) authorizing the Union Pacific Railroad Co., or its successors, to convey for public-road purposes certain parts of its right of way.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this bill? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Union Pacific Railroad Co., or any of its successors or assigns, is hereby authorized to convey to any State, county, or municipality any portion of its right of way to be used as a

public highway or street: *Provided*, That no such conveyance shall have the effect to diminish the right of way of said railroad company to a less width than 50 feet on each side of the center of the main track of the railroad as now established and maintained.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I wondered whether or not there should be an amendment on line 4.

Mr. WALSH. Has consent been granted for the consideration of the bill?

Mr. RAKER. Yes. It is before the House as in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. Consent was granted.

Mr. RAKER. I want to call the committee's attention to the fact and ask if they do not believe the words "or assigns" ought to be stricken out of line 4?

Mr. KINKAID. To remove obstacles to the construction of the Lincoln Highway is the immediate purpose, yet streets in villages and cities are also equally involved. While the suggestion of the gentleman from California seems to be plausible, I think, on the whole, the word "assigns" had better not be stricken out.

Mr. RAKER. Originally there was some little doubt in my mind in regard to this, authorizing the transfer, but I simply want to call the gentleman's attention to this fact, that there could be no valid assignee of the Union Pacific Railroad Co. to this land. That is right, is it not?

Mr. SINNOTT. Will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. SINNOTT. This bill is for the purpose of curing that. The Union Pacific Co. had no right under the original grant to assign or deed away any of this land. Some of the land has been deeded for wagon-road purposes, and this would cure that.

Mr. RAKER. That has already been done? In other words, the Union Pacific Railroad Co. has already transferred some of this land within the right of way for public-road purposes?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes. And that grant was invalid, except as it was cured by the former act.

Mr. RAKER. Now, the purpose of this is not only to authorize them to assign further land for road purposes but to confirm that which has already been transferred?

Mr. SINNOTT. For road purposes.

Mr. RAKER. For road purposes only?

Mr. SINNOTT. Yes.

The SPEAKER. The question is on ordering the Senate bill to be read a third time.

The Senate bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. SINNOTT, a motion to reconsider the vote whereby the bill was passed was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the next one.

ENTRIES UNDER THE HOMESTEAD LAWS.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the resolution (H. J. Res. 167) making the provisions of section 2296 of the United States Revised Statutes applicable to all entries made under the homestead laws and laws supplemental and amendatory thereof.

The title of the resolution was read.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the resolution?

Mr. WALSH. I object.

The SPEAKER. Objection is made, and the Clerk will report the next bill.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution remain on the calendar and go to the foot thereof.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that the resolution remain on the calendar and go to the foot thereof. Is there objection?

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, what is the parliamentary effect under the rule of bills and resolutions going to the foot of the calendar? Does that mean that they are to be put on next week, next time, and, if that process is continued in the case of this resolution, kept up from time to time indefinitely?

The SPEAKER. It can not.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Whereas under the rule a bill or resolution can be put on only twice, as I understand it, there are some of these bills and resolutions that I have objected to with the idea of disposing of them, not with a view of permitting them to be brought up another time, and I think the Members of the House should have that in mind when they are making objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can cure that by objecting.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. The gentleman understands they could not be brought up to-day. They would have to go over two weeks.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I object to the request of the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. RAKER. The Speaker holds that when objection is made bills go off the calendar? That is the usual practice with all the bills?

The SPEAKER. Yes. The Clerk will report the next one.

RECLAMATION OF ARID LANDS IN NEVADA.

The next business on the Calendar for Unanimous Consent was the bill (S. 9) to encourage the reclamation of certain arid lands in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes.

The title of the bill was read.

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

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I would like to ask the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. EVANS] a question, whether this measure in its present form conforms in all respects to the bill that was up in the last Congress? Does the gentleman know?

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. I am a new Member. It has passed the Senate. It has the unanimous approval of the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

Mr. WALSH. Will some one on the committee advise me? Was this passed in the last Congress?

Mr. KINKAID. It was passed in the Senate in the last Congress. It has been pending for some time, and it has had several favorable reports from the Senate committee, and it has passed the Senate at least once before.

Mr. WALSH. This is too important a measure to be passed by unanimous consent.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a moment?

Mr. WALSH. I will withhold my objection for a moment, but I shall object.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, if I may make a short statement, I think something should be done to change the status in Nevada, where population in the entire State in 1910 was less than 82,000. This serious situation was not because of natural resources but for failure of the Federal Government to enact laws suitable to our peculiar conditions, which are unique, being the only State of its kind in all our Union. The rainfall there is less than in any other State. The waters of Nevada occur in a most peculiar way. Of all our several flowing streams none extend beyond our State boundaries, but sink into the ground and entirely disappear beneath the surface.

Therefore we plan by this measure which applies solely to Nevada Government lands now unreserved, unappropriated, nonmineral, nontimbered, public lands, to invite private capital to sink deeply, tapping the underground flow known to exist beneath arable and productive soil, with the hope of establishing an artesian flow, or raising water by pumping to irrigate and reclaim this section of idle soil to production and progress.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, is the gentleman reading a letter from the department?

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. No, sir. I am reading my own thought, to make it a little more cohesive.

The Carey Act and land law now in force have failed to induce settlement and development of these vast areas of level and fertile sections, because after 50 years Nevada is owned 5½ per cent of area by individuals, 5½ per cent further by railroads, and 89 per cent by our Government. It has always been the purpose of the Government to pursue a liberal policy toward western development of public lands, granting all that was needed to encourage genuine settlers to develop western sections from Territories into States of most prosperous communities and cities.

I wish to say that the proposed legislation is to some extent experimental, and will be watched with intense interest by all adjoining States where the governmental policy is to place the title to those areas into private ownership, and encourage bona fide settlers. That vast productive section awaits the coming of the prospector and the farmer, the only men qualified to subdue and restore the West, who, in spite of failure, are ever hopeful that the future will bring its sure reward. They need, and should have, your confidence and encouragement. They are the men who have brought cultivation to the arable and the arid lands of the West. They pioneer into sections unsafe for the newcomer.

The western man has a certain respect and admiration for the eastern man, because in him he recognizes the builder, the doer of big worth-while things; therefore the ambition rises strong within the western mind to reclaim, restore, and build the West. Be advised by the western man as to western needs. Repeal

laws obstructive to true progress. Invite and encourage the pioneers and prospectors, who in their own western way are the real constructive spirits that will cause the West to prosper as does the East, joining hands to make all problems easy and the future beyond compare.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Speaker, I wish to say for the benefit of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], as well as of the House generally, that the membership of the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands was of the opinion that this is a very meritorious measure. The Committee on Irrigation in the last Congress was of the same opinion, and made a favorable report on a similar bill.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KINKAID. Yes.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Is it not true that the objections that were made in former Congresses to the measure as it originally came from the Senate have been eliminated from this? At least that is my understanding and judgment, and as chairman of the former Committee on Irrigation I am glad to corroborate what the present chairman says. We all feel that there should be no objection to this bill, and we feel that the State of Nevada is peculiarly entitled to this legislation.

Mr. KINKAID. Yes. The State of Nevada is situated very peculiarly in this respect——

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my objection.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, will the gentleman permit and agree to an amendment to reserve the mineral rights of the Government?

Mr. KINKAID. They are reserved.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. They are already reserved.

Mr. BLANTON. The way I caught the bill it just spoke of the lands as nonmineral lands. Many lands classified as nonmineral and nonagricultural lands are, as a matter of fact, mineral and agricultural in some instances.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Those reservations are made now by general law. It is not necessary to put that in. You can not get oil land by homesteading nowadays.

Mr. BLANTON. It is all reserved?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. These lands come under the general reservation?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes.

Mr. BLANTON. These homesteads to-day do not contain any oil?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. When you get a homestead, you do not get any oil under it. The oil that may be underneath it is reserved.

Mr. BLANTON. This is not with respect to any homestead rights. It carries with it the right to exploitation with regard to the reclaiming of arid lands.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Yes; by expending a lot of money and digging an artesian well.

Mr. BLANTON. If the mineral rights are properly reserved, I have no objection.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. They are properly reserved. I am glad the gentleman has asked the question.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. This bill is on the Union Calendar.

Mr. KINKAID. I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 5. That on establishing at any time within two years from the date of the permit to the satisfaction of the Secretary of the Interior that underground waters in sufficient quantity to produce at a profit agricultural crops other than native grasses upon not less than 20 acres of land has been discovered and developed and rendered available for such use within the limits of the land embraced in any permit, the said permittee shall be entitled to a patent for one-fourth of the land embraced in the permit, such area to be selected by the permittee in compact form, according to the legal subdivisions of the public land surveys, if the land be surveyed or to be surveyed at his expense, under rules and regulations established by the Secretary of the Interior, if located on unsurveyed land.

Mr. RAKER. I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. RAKER: After the word "land," in line 19, page 4, add:

"*Provided*, That within the limits of a railroad grant land cornering shall be considered as contiguous and in compact form."

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, a point of order. Have we not passed that section?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk informs the Chair that we have not.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Speaker, this applies to California as well as Nevada, and I offer the amendment to see if we can establish a rule. Here is a section of public land containing 640 acres. Back over here is another section of 640 acres, and the two sections corner. There is no other available land, the alternate sections being railroad lands. Because these two sections corner and are not contiguous, a man can not take the two tracts of land for the purpose of developing water. There is a great deal of land in Nevada and considerable in California that is in this situation.

Mr. KINKAID. If the gentleman will allow me to suggest a word in furtherance of his argument, the Interior Department holds that they are not contiguous, because they do not lie alongside each other, but merely corner on each other.

Mr. RAKER. That is correct.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. Does the gentleman know that the courts have held that lands which corner on each other are contiguous?

Mr. RAKER. Just to the contrary. All of the land decisions hold that where lands simply corner they are not contiguous. That is the universal and unvarying rule.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. I beg the gentleman's pardon. The law, with reference to the laying out of congressional districts, requires that the territory included in a congressional district shall be contiguous. Two counties corner on each other have been held to be contiguous.

Mr. RAKER. That does not apply to the public lands.

Mr. McLAUGHLIN of Michigan. The gentleman said it was a uniform rule.

Mr. RAKER. It is uniform and unvarying in the Land Department and everywhere, unless there is special legislation. For illustration, here are two sections cornering. A quarter section in one corner is public land and a quarter section in the other section across the corner is public land. You can take only one of the quarters, because the two are not contiguous but corner on each other. That is the rule. Now, I wish to read this letter written by Mr. Arthur L. Coggins, a very high-class man:

DUNSMUIR, CALIF., *September 25, 1919.*

Hon. JOHN E. RAKER,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. RAKER: Re S. 9, Report No. 286, irrigation arid lands in Nevada:

Section 5 of this act, line 15, provides that the land shall be "in compact form." The interpretation of the Land Office of this term is as "near a square as possible," contiguous, and "lands cornering are not considered as contiguous." Now, within the limits of the railroad grant, where every other section is owned by the railroad, it very often happens, that to the interest of the homesteader, and, in this case, the prospector for water, that he will have to go into two sections for a suitable selection of land. If you go out of one section of Government land into the next adjoining section of Government land, these lands, although cornering, are not considered contiguous, and could not be filed upon within the meaning of these acts.

That is as it has been determined by the Land Department, and it is the law. Mr. Coggins says:

I would suggest an amendment to this act: "*Provided*, That within the limits of the railroad grant, lands cornering should be considered as contiguous and in compact form."

That applies to this particular condition, and it is the amendment which I have offered.

Mr. KINKAID. There is no objection to the amendment.

Mr. RAKER. I want to read this one statement which illustrates the matter before the House:

I ran onto a case like this in Nevada, where there was plenty of water available from underground sources in section 12, but the land was unfit for agricultural purposes, being strongly alkaline. The land, however, in the cornering section 14 was entirely suited to agriculture and could be irrigated from the water developed in section 12, where the poor land was. Under section 14 the water table was at a great depth and in an insufficient quantity for irrigation purposes. It was not possible under any law to so combine the source of the water with that of the good land. It was either to stick in section 14 with plenty of good land and no water or else remain in section 12 with plenty of water and the poorest of the poor land.

In the interest of the true development of these arid lands I would ask that you place before the proper committee the suggestion that I have made in order that it may be incorporated into the bill.

Thanking you for your help in these matters, I am,

Very truly, yours,

ARTHUR L. COGGINS.

This condition applies not only to Nevada but also to California, and I think it ought to be corrected so as to permit a man

in that territory, where the railroad land is in alternate sections, to make use of section 12, for instance, and also section 14, so as to utilize both. That is all this is for; but under the bill as it stands now he can not take it.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I should like to ask a question. The lands in Nevada are used largely for grazing purposes rather than agricultural purposes. Suppose a man takes one of these two-year permits and does not do any work at all but digs a well?

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. The bill provides that he shall do his work expeditiously.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. What does "expeditiously" mean?

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. Within six months.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Does it say within six months?

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. He must make a showing within six months.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. RAKER. Yes.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. In the first part of the bill it provides that the land shall not be fenced or otherwise exclusively used by the permittee, except as provided in the bill.

Mr. RAKER. He can not fence it. He can only use the land.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment of the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

I doubt the advisability of enacting this legislation, though I do not know that I want to advise anybody to vote against it. I do not want to be on record, however, as having indicated that I believe that this is helpful and safe legislation. I hope it may turn out better than I think. My prophecy is that under it many applications will be made and permits will be granted to people who will make little or no effort to develop water, but will seek to withhold the land from entry. I think I can readily see how under it the very condition would arise that arose years ago under an apparently innocent bill, which provided for the construction of storage reservoirs on public domain. Under that law the Department of the Interior was compelled to draw regulations contrary to the provisions of the law in order to prevent the public domain in vast areas being taken and held without any intent to improve. I hope we shall not have the same result under this law.

As to those who do in good faith go on this land with the view of developing water, it may be that the provisions of the bill are not too liberal. There is so much land in Nevada that needs water, and of so little value without water, that perhaps it is right to grant it without the restrictions that we have required elsewhere. Under this law we give a man 640 acres for reclaiming 20 acres; perhaps that is wise. I have some doubts, but under the provisions of the law there is great danger of the practice growing up which I have just suggested of claiming vast areas of land under this law without development and withholding it from any other development, with the expectation of securing some special grazing benefits for the time being.

But, Mr. Speaker, whatever we may think of the bill the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER] has no virtue at all as far as I can see. Within the railroad land grants the railroad owns the alternate sections, checkerboard form. If one should be entitled to take four sections of land, separated from each other by the alternate railroad sections, and if on one of them the permittee should develop water, he ought not to be allowed to select from two sections which simply corner on each other. There would not be one case in a hundred that the applicant would have any purpose in doing that. But permission to secure a permit covering four sections of land so situated would multiply four times the very danger I have suggested, of people going in without any intent or purpose to really develop water, establish a claim to four sections of land cornering on each other and separated by a railroad land grant land which the applicant would probably own. It would be a wonderful opportunity to secure a large range area, or control it, under the pretense that the party was endeavoring to secure water.

Mr. RAKER. What good would it do him except to bore for water? He could not fence it; he could not use it; he could not put it to any other use.

Mr. MONDELL. That was exactly the argument, almost word for word, made at the time we passed the apparently innocuous reservoir bill; but the fact was that locations were made covering whole counties. I recall well one county in one of the Western States, every acre of which was covered by one of these reservoir locations. For the time being it paralyzed all development except such as might come under that particular law, and little or no development did come under that law, so that it did paralyze development. At the end of the filing period another filing was put on the land. Of course, the Secretary of the Interior could not send enough agents out there to keep track of each filing on four sections of land to detemine whether the permittee was proceeding with due diligence to sink a well. That is impossible unless we are to increase greatly the force of public land agents. Therefore, questionable as the bill is as a whole, the amendment is much more questionable than the other provisions of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from California [Mr. RAKER].

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer an amendment to page 4, section 5, line 15.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 4, line 15, after the word "selected," insert the words "with the approval of the Secretary of the Interior."

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, in the policy of this bill it seems we are embarking on a decidedly new field, and it may be that the conditions in the State of Nevada are such as authorize this legislation. It is entirely local. It is made, I suspect, in realization of the limited agricultural and grazing area in the State of Nevada now and the very small population of the State. At the same time, as the gentleman from Wyoming has said, it opens a new field for what may be the desire of some persons to get beyond the law, to do something beyond the mere boring for water, to do something that may not advance the agricultural interests in the State of Nevada. If there be anything concealed in the bill by which the Government might be defrauded out of valuable land, if there be any obscure and ambiguous language by which the Secretary of the Interior may not at all times have the proper jurisdiction or control of the allotment of the land, I think that should be made clear.

Therefore, the amendment that I have offered is intended to have a continuing authority in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior until the final allotment is made by the permittee. The law as it is now written permits an arbitrary selection by the permittee, and surely in the conferring of this great public boon, in conferring private title to public lands on a man who says that he is going to bore for water and who does in fact secure some water, it would seem that continuing jurisdiction of the Secretary of the Interior should apply until the land is actually transferred.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, I would call the gentleman's attention that on page 2 of the bill there is a provision that the land shall not be fenced or otherwise exclusively used by the permittee except as therein provided, and there is a further provision that the land shall theretofore have been designated by the Secretary of the Interior subject to disposal under the provisions of this act.

Mr. GARD. I understand that, but that is not what I mean.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. And also on the first page there is provision that it should be unreserved, unappropriated, nonmineral, nontimber. The idea all the way through is to allay any suspicion. If there is a joker in this bill, I do not know it.

Mr. GARD. And I do not say that there is, but those in charge should admit that the allotment to the permittee should be at all times under the control of the Secretary of the Interior. Does not the gentleman believe that that is true?

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. Yes. The amendment is agreeable to me, but it would have to go back to conference.

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman says that the amendment is agreeable to him, and it would seem to me that we are embarking upon such an unusual procedure in giving up the public domain to private enterprise that this amendment as it has been accepted by the gentleman in charge of the bill should be adopted.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Speaker, the amendment proposed by the able gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] would not change the effect of the bill in the least degree, in my humble opinion, and, therefore, it would do the bill no serious injury to adopt the amendment. But I do not rise to oppose the amendment, but wish to speak briefly with reference to the attitude of our very able floor leader, the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL], to whom I always accord a comprehensive knowledge of the public-land laws and public-land conditions. I think there is no Member of Congress who is any better grounded on this subject matter than is the gentleman from Wyoming. I have always regarded his opinion as highly valuable on all public-land questions. However, I think the objection which the gentleman from Wyoming has made here should not operate against the enactment of this bill upon its merits, because his objection only goes to the possibility that the Secretary of the Interior might not be able with his usual amount of diligence and vigilence to prevent fraud in the operation of the measure. This may occur with regard to any public-lands measure. If

a loophole be open in this bill for the perpetration of fraud, I suggest that the gentleman from Wyoming, who is very capable of preparing a proper amendment, do so and preclude anything of this kind. The great area in the State of Nevada which yet belongs to the Government should not be allowed to remain a desert merely for the want of water to reclaim it to a profitable cultivation or merely for the want of appropriate language to prevent fraud in the operation of the law.

Mr. Speaker, the bill wisely provides that the development shall be commenced within six months, and it also provides that on a showing made to the Secretary of the Interior that if diligence is not being shown in the development the right to the privilege granted under the application and entry may be revoked.

Mr. Speaker, the homestead laws of the United States are a misfit for the State of Nevada; that is, the ordinary homestead laws under which homesteads were taken up in the humid regions of the West—in the States of Illinois, Iowa, Nebraska, Kansas, the Dakotas, and Oklahoma.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has expired.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for two minutes more.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. KINKAID. And the desert-land law which used to permit acquiring title to 640 acres in these desert regions is a misfit in respect to the State of Nevada, because there are no streams there from which water may be taken by gravity and carried on to the lands to be reclaimed. So that the desert-land law is not applicable to the State of Nevada. But here is a proposition which I am sure will appeal very persuasively to this Congress, which wants to restrict appropriations as far as may be. The public treasury is not called upon to expend one cent, and attention has been called to the fact that a bill for $50,000,000 is pending in the Committee on Appropriations, and I will say there is another for $100,000,000, for appropriation for reclamation purposes, which I introduced myself for the reclamation of arid lands. The Government would be out this money for the time being, although eventually it would be reimbursed every dollar; but here the individuals and the corporations who may make applications under this proposed law would be out all of the money and would assume all the risk, and it is a gamble as to whether they will get any water or not. The Government will not be out one dollar, and individuals, enterprising individuals, public spirited individuals in the State of Nevada who want to see their desert areas developed will assume all the cost and risk. Mr. Speaker, we should give the people of Nevada the chance to do for themselves what the Government has been doing for other regions and localities.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Nebraska has again expired.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio. Here is a State of 81,000 population, just one-third the number of people in the usual congressional district in my State. Here is a bill permitting the drilling for water in an unsettled country in order to develop it. The only purpose that the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio could have would be to send this bill back to conference. The very provision that he attempts to place in this bill is well guarded in the section read and referred to by the gentleman from Nevada [Mr. EVANS]. This is the history, gentlemen, of the Western States, that you have to pass liberal laws permitting development before you will get them settled up by substantial people. The western part of Texas for many years lay there dormant until liberal laws were passed by the Legislature of Texas that enabled men to go there and drill 400 to 800 feet and develop that section of the country. Ten years ago there were 80,000,000 acres of school lands in western Texas undeveloped. Liberal laws were passed permitting men to go there and settle and develop and get homes, and to-day they are settled by small farms, which never would have been done if it had not been for those liberal laws. This bill permits men to develop the State of Nevada, that has about one-third the area of my State and one-third the population of my congressional district. I say the bill ought to pass in its present form, and the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio ought to be voted down, because the only purpose it can have is to send this bill back to conference. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 8. That all entries made and patents issued under the provisions of this act shall be subject to and contain a reservation to the United States of all the coal and other valuable minerals in the lands so entered and patented, together with the right to prospect for, mine, and remove the same. The coal and other valuable mineral deposits in such lands shall be subject to disposal by the United States in accordance with the provisions of the coal and mineral land laws in force at the time of such disposal. Any person qualified to locate and enter the coal or other mineral deposits, or having the right to mine and remove the same under the laws of the United States, shall have the right at all times to enter upon the lands entered or patented, as provided by this act, for the purpose of prospecting for coal or other mineral therein, provided he shall not injure, damage, or destroy the permanent improvements of the entryman or patentee, and shall be liable to and shall compensate the entryman or patentee for all damages to the crops on such lands by reason of such prospecting. Any person who has acquired from the United States the coal or other mineral deposits in any such land, or the right to mine or remove the same, may reenter and occupy so much of the surface thereof as may be required for all purposes reasonably incident to the mining or removal of the coal or other minerals, first, upon securing the written consent or waiver of the homestead entryman or patentee; second, upon payment of the damages to crops or other tangible improvements to the owner thereof, where agreement may be had as to the amount thereof; or, third, in lieu of either of the foregoing provisions, upon the execution of a good and sufficient bond or undertaking to the United States for the use and benefit of the entryman or owner of the land, to secure the payment of such damages to the crops or tangible improvements of the entryman or owner, as may be determined and fixed in an action brought upon the bond or undertaking in a court of competent jurisdiction against the principal and sureties thereon, such bond or undertaking to be in form and in accordance with rules and regulations prescribed by the Secretary of the Interior, and to be filed with and approved by the register and receiver of the local land office of the district wherein the land is situate, subject to appeal to the Commissioner of the General Land Office: *Provided*, That all patents issued for the coal or other mineral deposits herein reserved shall contain appropriate notations declaring them to be subject to the provisions of this act with reference to the disposition, occupancy, and use of the surface of the land.

Mr. ELSTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to inquire of the gentleman in charge of the bill whether or not more than one patent can be issued to a single permittee?

Mr. KINKAID. No; that is expressly prohibited.

Mr. ELSTON. No; I can not find it in the bill. There is a provision here that only one permit shall be issued to any person in any 40 square miles. Does the bill authorize a permit to be issued to that same person outside of that area? If so, the process may be multiplied so that a single permittee may acquire an area of land greatly in excess of 640 acres. It might give him many thousands of acres. Now, I do not know whether that is good or bad policy, and I would like to know whether that is protected in the bill?

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. If a man bored a well once every 40 miles, he could not bore a great many before he would get across the State, and I do not see where——

Mr. ELSTON. I understand it is not 40 miles square, but 40 square miles. That is 4 by 10.

Mr. EVANS of Nevada. It is 40 miles square.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. I do not see how anybody could monopolize anything by that.

Mr. ELSTON. I understood it was 40 square miles. The gentleman's explanation minimizes my objection.

Mr. KINKAID. I will suggest to the gentleman that all entries of this kind under public-land legislation is limited to one entry to one individual or corporation. That is the system of public-land legislation throughout. It is all in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. ELSTON. A man could not get many 640-acre tracts with the larger limitation of area?

Mr. KINKAID. No; it is all in the hands of the Secretary of the Interior.

Mr. ELSTON. The gentleman means the number of patents that may be issued after permits have issued. Of course, the permits are not restricted in number, except as to this restriction as to area.

Mr. KINKAID. I understand there will be but one application granted.

Mr. ELSTON. The bill does not say that at all. It says as many applications as——

Mr. KINKAID. I am sure it is implied. That is the system of public-land legislation in general. The homestead law does not say a man shall have but one entry, but he can not have but one entry except where it is provided he can make up for what he lacks in area.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. If anybody can be found who would bore a half dozen wells in 640 acres in Death Valley, it seems to me it ought to be permitted.

Mr. KINKAID. The very object is to encourage that procedure.

Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman permit a question? Do I understand that the "valuable mineral deposits" would include oil and gas?

Mr. KINKAID. Oh, yes; certainly, those are all minerals.

Mr. SINNOTT. And the courts have determined that?

Mr. JONES of Pennsylvania. I know that some courts have not determined that.

Mr. SINNOTT. The Interior Department and the Supreme Court have decided that.

Mr. KINKAID. That is thoroughly covered.

The Clerk resumed and concluded the reading of the bill.

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

On motion of Mr. EVANS of Nevada, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

Mr. KINKAID. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

COMMUTATION OF QUARTERS FOR OFFICERS OF THE NAVY AT SEA.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House joint resolution 213.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan moves to suspend the rules and pass the joint resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 213) continuing temporarily certain allowances to officers of the Navy.

Whereas since it now appears that peace will not have been declared by October 1, 1919, on which date officers of the Navy, by operation of law, will cease to receive the benefits prescribed in the act of April 16, 1918 (Public, No. 129).

Whereas said benefits will accrue to officers of the Army until peace shall have been declared: Therefore be it

Resolved, etc., That the paragraph in the act of July 11, 1919 (Public, No. 8), which reads as follows:

"The act of April 16, 1918 (Public, No. 129), granting under certain conditions to every commissioned officer of the Army the right to quarters in kind for their dependents or the authorized commutation therefor, including the allowances for heat and light, shall hereafter be construed to apply to officers of the Navy and Marine Corps only during the period of the war and in no event beyond October 1, 1919," be, and the same is hereby, repealed.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second may be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. KELLEY] is recognized for 20 minutes and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] for 20 minutes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, under the act of April 16, 1918, commutation of quarters and for heat and light for officers in the Army serving abroad was authorized. Under general law, passed in 1907, that carried with it commutation of quarters and for heat and light for the officers of the Navy and Marine Corps also serving similarly. The whole period of this authorization of April 16, 1918, was for the duration of the emergency. When the Congress passed the last naval appropriation bill we supposed that the emergency would be over by October 1, 1919, and we put a provision in the naval appropriation bill granting commutation of quarters and for heat and light until October 1, 1919, only.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman contend that repealing this section now—October 1 having passed—continues these allowances?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is my understanding.

Mr. WALSH. Then, if that continues them, it certainly does not continue them temporarily?

Mr. PADGETT. The original law simply provided that the commutation should continue during the emergency, and the language of the naval appropriation bill provided that for the Army and Marine Corps it should not be considered to extend beyond October 1. Now, repealing that clause in the naval appropriation bill lets it revert back on the original act and just allows it to them during the emergency, the same as the Army is getting, and puts the Army and Navy and Marine Corps back on the same basis.

Mr. WALSH. Now, let us see if that is so, if the gentleman will yield further. October 1 has passed. The law was in effect which prohibited these allowances being continued beyond October 1. Now, I suppose the assumption is that on the 1st of October these allowances ceased?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. They did.

Mr. WALSH. And you contend that subsequent to October 1, by repealing this statute, you can revive another law to which this was an amendment?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman, no. The act which gives the officers of the Navy and Marine Corps the right to commutation of quarters was passed April 16, 1918, for the Army alone. Now, by a prior act, I think passed in 1907——

Mr. WALSH. March 2.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. March 2, 1907, the commutation of quarters and for heat and light for the Navy and Marine Corps is the same as that for similar grades in the Army. Now, if we repeal this provision put in the last naval appropriation bill it puts it back upon the same basis as though this paragraph we are seeking to repeal had never been passed at all, from this date forward.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield? As I understand the gentleman, if this bill you seek to repeal were not on the statute books there would be no limitation?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. There would be no limitation until the emergency is over.

Mr. FESS. And the existing law would continue it up to the time of the end of the emergency?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is correct.

Mr. FESS. The repeal of this simply repeals the limitation on the original law?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman states it perfectly, I think.

Mr. WALSH. If the gentleman will yield, I would want to be pretty sure that the Comptroller of the Treasury would hold that way before I would make that contention. They were getting these allowances under the law which had been amended——

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No. The gentleman is mistaken about that. They were getting these allowances under the law passed in 1907, which made the commutation of quarters for officers in the Navy and Marine Corps the same as for the officers in the Army. We did not change that law at all. That has not been changed in any respect.

Mr. WALSH. It has been modified.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Not that law. The laws of 1907 and also of 1918 have not been modified in any respect. We amended neither of those acts. What we really did was to approximate the date of the ending of the emergency as October 1, 1919.

Mr. WALSH. Well, October 1 has come and gone. Allowances have been discontinued. Now, you can not, after a date has passed and beyond which the law shall not be effective after that date has passed, then come in and repeal that paragraph and revive and put into force the original law again.

Mr. PADGETT. It would meet your objection, then, if you would say, where the words are "is hereby repealed," to strike out the period and insert "effective September 30." And that would make the repeal——

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is not the gentleman's contention.

Mr. PADGETT. That is not necessary under this law. That is the idea he has.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The gentleman is wrong about it. Let me state this question so as to have it clear.

The law of 1907 provides that commutation of quarters for the Navy and Marine Corps shall be the same as for corresponding officers in the Army. Now, in 1918 a law was passed giving commutation of quarters to the officers of the Army serving abroad. That carried with it automatically, without any legislation at all, commutation of quarters for the officers of the Navy and Marine Corps serving similarly. When we passed the last appropriation bill we put in a proviso that it should not go further than October 1, 1919. Now, by removing that proviso it leaves the legislation just as it stood before the passage of the last naval appropriation bill.

Mr. BRIGGS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RICKETTS. That law is dead, as I understand it?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; the law is not dead.

Mr. RICKETTS. The provision you made in the appropriation bill is ended?

Mr. PADGETT. It simply said it would not be construed as applying to the Navy.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. We simply said that this commutation of quarters should not go forward longer than October 1, because we supposed the emergency would be over at that time.

Mr. RICKETTS. Is it not out of the way?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. RICKETTS. I take it that you limited the effect of that law up to October 1, 1919.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No. We sought to fix the time of the emergency.

Mr. RICKETTS. In other words, you said the emergency would end on October 1?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; but it has not ended.

Mr. RICKETTS. It has not ended?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No. If we repeal the paragraph placed in the last naval bill, the commutation of quarters will continue as long as the emergency lasts. I think the situation is prefectly clear.

Mr. HICKS. Are we not doing this—we are just killing a provision that we put on the existing law; and, therefore, by removing that it really puts the old law into continuous operation?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. But you are killing that provision which expires by its own limitation.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No.

Mr. WALSH. That date has gone, and if the Army and the Navy have been receiving these allowances since October 1 they have been doing it in violation of the law.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The provision we put on did not affect the Army.

Mr. WALSH. One further question. Does the gentleman know whether or not the Navy and the Marine Corps have been receiving these allowances from the 1st of October to date?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. They have not.

Mr. WALSH. Have they been receiving any allowances?

Mr. PADGETT. They have been receiving allowances under the general law, but this was a special act passed at the beginning of the war that extended commutation to the Army, and which was to continue during the emergency.

Mr. WALSH. You want these allowances continued?

Mr. PADGETT. We repealed that law.

Mr. WALSH. Then, if you want these allowances continued, what difference is it whether you repeal this or not?

Mr. PADGETT. They stopped on October 1, and by repealing that limitation they go right on under the general law that was passed in 1907. I believe that was the date.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. I want to know if I understand the situation correctly. My understanding is that after we got into the war a law was passed under which, for the period of the emergency, and limited to the period of the emergency, certain allowances were made to the officers of the Navy.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Officers of the Army.

Mr. MONDELL. This applies to the Navy.

Mr. PADGETT. Another general law makes it apply to the Navy.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Another law, passed in 1907, provides that allowances for the Navy shall be the same as for the corresponding officers in the Army. That took in the Navy and the Marine Corps, although they were not mentioned specifically in the act of 1918. It has been so ruled, and they have been so paid. When we passed the naval appropriation bill we assumed that the emergency would end by October 1, and so we provided that these allowances for the Navy should not go beyond October 1. Now the emergency has not ended. The Army officers similarly situated go on drawing the commutation of quarters if serving abroad, but the Marine Corps and naval officers serving abroad or at sea can not draw commutation for quarters since October 1 on account of this limitation.

Mr. MONDELL. Then the effect of your legislation will be to reestablish, from the time this law passes until the end of the emergency, the right to these allowances?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is it exactly.

Mr. MONDELL. It probably will not warrant the payment of these allowances from October 1 up to the present time?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Possibly not.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I differ with the gentleman there. It is perfectly easy for us to make a law retroactive so far as allowances are concerned. Up to the time of the date mentioned in this act—that is, up to April 16, 1918—you had a general law that makes these allowances?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes; and that is still in force.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. At that time you put a limitation on it?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No. We passed a new act providing for certain allowances during the emergency for officers of the Army serving abroad. Before that they could not get commutation of quarters and of heat and light if serving outside of the jurisdiction of the United States. So that law was passed. The old law of 1907 made that automatically apply to both the Army and Navy, and if we had not put any provision in the naval appropriation bill to change it, everything would have gone on smoothly until the emergency was over. We supposed it would be over on October 1, and so we put in that date.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. These allowances were going on, and would have continued until some other arrangement was made if you had not put this provision in the last naval appropriation bill?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. And by this present provision you simply take off the limitation?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Could not the process sought to be accomplished be carried out by simply striking out the words "and in no event beyond October 1, 1919"?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That could be done, but the entire paragraph may as well come out. No part of it is needed.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then you do not have to repeal the whole provision. It certainly, according to——

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. We did not need to affirmatively provide in the naval appropriation bill for payment to October 1. That would have been done had we simply let the matter stand as it was.

Mr. LONGWORTH. According to the gentleman's statement, as I understand to-day, these allowances will be continued in the case of the Army, but not in the case of the Navy and Marine Corps after October 1.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. After October 1; yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Why not strike out the words "and in no event beyond October 1"?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Well, we may as well strike it all out, leaving it as if no provision had been in the naval appropriation bill at all.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I confess I do not get that clearly.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I am like the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH]. I confess I am in a fog.

Mr. LONGWORTH. It is as clear as mud to me.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. This act of April 16, 1918, provided that the provisions for special allowances should hereafter be considered to apply to officers of the Navy and Marine Corps only during the period of the war, and in no event beyond October 1, 1919.

Mr. LONGWORTH. That is the point the gentleman is trying to avoid, because the period of the war is still on.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. I will say to the gentleman that it did not apply by its terms to the officers of the Navy or Marine Corps at all.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Why not? It says it shall be construed to apply to the officers of the Navy and Marine Corps only during the period of the war, and in no event beyond October 1, 1919.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If the gentleman will listen to me carefully, I will state it once more. I think anybody ought to be able to understand it: In 1918 Congress passed an act giving certain allowances to officers in the Army, who were serving abroad, for commutation of quarters and for heat and light. Nothing was said in that act about the Navy or the Marine Corps at all, but by a previous act passed in 1907 automatically those same commutations and allowances applied to officers of the Navy and the Marine Corps of similar rank. Now, last summer when we passed the naval appropriation bill we put on a provision saying that these allowances should end on October 1. If we repeal that provision, the acts of March, 1907, and April, 1918, will control the payment of commutation of quarters for officers in the Army and the Navy and the Marine Corps alike, and that is all we have got to do.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. What was the effect of that law? Did it take anything away from the officers in the Army or Navy?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It did not take anything away from the officers of the Army.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Did it add something to them?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. No; it did not touch the legislation respecting the Army in any way.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. But with respect to the Navy? Why did the naval act of 1919 say that the act of April, 1918, should apply to officers of the Navy and Marine Corps in no event beyond October 1, 1919?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. We thought that the emergency would be over by that time, and fixed that date, and based our appropriation accordingly.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Conceding that you thought the emergency would be over by that time, what was the object of the law?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. To stop these commutations on that date.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Why did you want to stop these commutations on that date?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Because we thought the necessity would be over, and that the officers would be back in their usual status.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. In other words, before that time they were getting something which, as of October 1, 1919, you wanted to take away from them?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Why do you want to restore it to them now after October 1 has arrived and passed?

Mr. PADGETT. Because the emergency still exists.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. You passed that provision while the emergency existed, with the purpose of taking away these allowances from them on October 1, 1919. You declared that in no event, that is to say, whether the war was over, or not, should they receive the allowances after October 1, 1919. Now when October has arrived you say you want to give the allowances back to them.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Officers in the Army who are serving abroad are now drawing these allowances for their families, but Marine Corps officers serving in the Army also, in the same field abroad, are not permitted, if this law stands after October 1, to draw their allowances, and it would be a discrimination against the Navy and Marine Corps such as Congress never intended should be made. That is why.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. We ought to pay these officers, not according to what somebody else is getting, but according to what is just and proper in their respective cases. If in the summer of 1919 you thought that these allowances ought to be taken from these officers as of October 1, 1919, why do you now think that they ought to be restored? The fighting is long since over.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Would there be any necessity for the repeal of this section if the words "and in no event beyond October 1, 1919," were not in it?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Not at all.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Why, then, do you not simply eliminate those words?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That could be done in that way, but we do not need any part of the paragraph, so we eliminated all of it.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then why was the paragraph ever passed? Why did you adopt it at all if there was no necessity for it?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. It was unnecessary, very likely, except in so far as it describes the situation we intended to limit.

Mr. LONGWORTH. And the committee guessed wrong about it, but why not simply eliminate their wrong guess?

Mr. PADGETT. We are doing that.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am afraid you are not.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. We made the appropriation for the commutation of quarters for officers, being an appropriating committee, and we had to have some particular date in mind in fixing the amount of money. We felt quite sure that peace would be officially declared by October 1, and so we put that date in the bill as marking the end of the emergency.

Mr. PADGETT. It was in a spirit of overeconomy.

Mr. LONGWORTH. The gentleman wants to accomplish the same thing I do, but in a different way.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] has 20 minutes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I am opposed to this proposition, and I imagine the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] favors it.

The SPEAKER. The Chair thinks some one who is opposed to the joint resolution should be recognized.

Mr. PADGETT. I will yield to the gentleman from Virginia such time as he desires.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Let me make my statement first.

Mr. BRIGGS. Certainly.

Mr. PADGETT. Let us bear in mind that nothing has been repealed. The act of 1907 provided that the commutation of quarters for the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps should be the same; in other words, that the Navy and the Marine Corps should have the same commutation as is provided by law for the Army. That is the general law. That law is in force now, unamended and unrepealed.

After we got into the war the act of April 16, 1918, provided for an extension of commutation of quarters, light, and heat for the Army. The Navy was not mentioned in the act; the Marine Corps was not mentioned. It just provided for the Army. That was to continue during the emergency.

As soon as that was enacted the Comptroller of the Treasury held that the Navy and the Marine Corps were entitled to the same additional commutations as provided by this act for the Army under the provisions of the general law of 1907, and they have been receiving it, and were receiving it, up to October 1. In this past summer, when we were making up the naval appropriation bill, there was a provision inserted which read as follows:

> The act of April 16, 1918, granting under certain conditions to every commissioned officer of the Army the right to quarters in kind for their dependents or the authorized commutation therefor, including the allowances for heat and light, shall hereafter be construed to apply to officers of the Navy and Marine Corps only during the period of the war, and in no event beyond October 1, 1919.

Now, the effect of that was that it did not repeal anything, did not change the law except that it should not be construed to apply to the Navy and Marine Corps, but left it in force as to the Army.

When you come down to brass tacks, the Naval Committee in the spirit of extreme economy that was prevailing, trying to bring the bill down to bedrock, put on that limitation, guessing that the war would be over by October 1. Now, that guess has not materialized. The result is that now the Army is receiving it, and by this provision which we are repealing we are providing that it shall not be construed to apply to the Navy and Marine Corps after October 1.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. LONGWORTH. By repealing it you provide that it shall not apply to the Navy at all, even during the emergency.

Mr. PADGETT. No; we simply repeal the provision of July 11, 1919, which leaves the act of April, 1918, in full force, and applying to the Navy as well as to the Army.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Let me ask the gentleman if the words "and in no event beyond October 1, 1919," had not been put in as a result of a bad guess, would you need this legislation?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then, why not just strike it out?

Mr. PADGETT. If we strike it out, we strike out the whole provision in the act of July 11, 1919, which provided that the act of April 18 should not be construed as applying to the Navy beyond October 1. The phraseology is entirely correct.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. BRIGGS. What serious objection could there be to an amendment to this effect, that "the benefits of the act of April 16, 1918, shall continue to apply to officers of the Navy and Marine Corps"?

Mr. PADGETT. That would be all right; that would be doing just what this does, taking the obstruction out of the way. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Virginia, Mr. SAUNDERS.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I have been trying in vain to secure light on one point that has been developed in this argument. The gentleman from Tennessee speaks of seeking to remove an obstruction which appears to have been the creation of the Naval Committee. Why did this committee create this obstruction? I have asked that question of all of the gentlemen who have spoken for this resolution and up to the present time have received no satisfactory reply. Why was obstruction created, I ask again?

Mr. PADGETT. I have stated that it was in a spirit of overeconomy, trying to reduce the naval appropriation bill to the uttermost limit. We put it in, assuming that the emergency would be over by October 1.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. And to convey the impression that these officers would not receive these allowances after October 1?

Mr. PADGETT. And they would not have gotten it, and they will only get it if this is enacted, up to the expiration of the emergency.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Not at all. As I understand this, if you adopt this resolution, these payments will continue for all time.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, the gentleman is entirely wrong.

Mr. PADGETT. The act of April 11, 1918, authorizes only up to the termination of the emergency.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Where is that?

Mr. PADGETT. The act of April 11, 1918.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. On page 2 of the report the gentleman will find it—

> *Be it enacted, etc.*, That during the present emergency—

And everything following that is qualified by that statement, "During the present emergency." It will stop for the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps altogether then.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Then this "obstruction" that the gentleman speaks of was created during the war, and took

away from the naval officers as of October 1 the benefits that they would receive up to that time.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is right.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. And you want to wipe the "obstruction" so that they will continue to receive these benefits so long as the war goes on?

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. That is correct.

Mr. PADGETT. And no longer.

Mr. MONTAGUE. To put them upon the same footing as the Army.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Oh, that does not appeal to me at all. We have passed more vicious legislation since I have been in the Congress upon the suggestion that the Army or the Navy was not getting something that the other was getting than I think is to our credit. We ought to deal with these matters on their merits, and when a bill is presented dealing with a situation in the Navy, it should not be sufficient to say that because the Army is getting something, therefore the Navy ought to get it, or if it is an Army bill that because the Navy is getting something, the Army ought to get the same thing. I am concerned more with the merits of the pending proposition.

Mr. PADGETT. The merit of the proposition is simply this, that the law provides that the commutations of the three services, the Army, the Navy, and the Marine Corps, shall be the same. That is fundamental.

Mr. MONTAGUE. And have been for many years.

Mr. PADGETT. Since 1907.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If that is so, you do not need this legislation.

Mr. PADGETT. Oh, yes; we do. On April 11, 1918, we provided some additional commutations on account of war conditions, to continue during the emergency, and under that first provision the Navy and the Marine Corps were getting the benefit of it. Now, we come along on July 11, 1919, and say that the act which says that they shall be the same shall not be construed to give these additional commutations to the Navy and the Marine Corps beyond October 1. Now, we are just taking out that obstruction.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. In other words, the show of economy that you were seeking to make to the House and to the country at that time, you are now seeking to make of no effect as soon as the law begins to operate.

Mr. PADGETT. To continue during the emergency.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. You provided that the allowances should not continue beyond the 1st of October in any event.

Mr. PADGETT. Yes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Creating thereby the idea that the Naval Committee was effecting an economy, but as soon as the economy begins to be effective, the Naval Committee hastens forward with a resolution to wipe out the law that is operating in this unexpected fashion. The economy that you were arranging for could not operate before October 1, and as soon as it begins to operate, why the committee comes forward, and says that it ought not to operate. I do not think that puts either the House or the committee in a very desirable light.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Oh, the gentleman is entirely under a misapprehension as to the attitude of the committee.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Virginia has expired.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. PADGETT] has used at least two minutes of my time, and I ask him to yield me that much time.

Mr. PADGETT. I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. The Naval Appropriation Committee was endeavoring to appropriate all the money that the Navy would require, but no more.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Certainly.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. If this pay went on for an entire year, the sum to be fixed in the naval appropriation bill would be one thing and we would have to spread it out on the country.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. And so we thought we made a reasonably good guess that the whole matter would be settled by October 1, and we made the appropriation accordingly and that is all there is to the history of the transaction.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Oh, that is not all.

Mr. PADGETT. And there is another thing that was before the committee, and that is this, that if the declaration of peace is proclaimed there might be some little controversy holding on definitely, running along after the declaration of peace, and we said the pay should not go beyond October 1.

Mr. LONGWORTH. May I ask the gentleman from Tennessee a question?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will yield.

Mr. LONGWORTH. If this law is repealed, what law is in effect?

Mr. PADGETT. The act of April 11, 1918, stands in full force, and the act of 1907, which provides commutation for the Navy and the Marine Corps shall be the same as the Army; and the act of April, 1918, simply provided for the Army, and by interpretation of the other acts the Navy got the benefit of that legislation. I will yield the gentleman from Virginia two more minutes.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I think I will certainly get through in two minutes unless the gentleman from Tennessee wants more time. Mr. Speaker, I think that at last I understand the legal effect of what the committee is proposing to do and the legal effect is undoubtedly to leave the situation as I have stated that it would be. The committee has given to the country the impression that they were going to save money through the provision in the last naval bill, that they would certainly reduce expenses of this Government by cutting off certain allowances as of October 1, 1919. The gentleman can not controvert that proposition. I again call attention to the fact that the very moment that this reduction becomes effective, the committee comes forward to say that this would be all wrong, that they wish to take back what they have done, that they made a bad guess, and that these allowances which were proposed to be cut off, and which we have cut off for a few days as a result of the legislation of July, 1919, ought to continue, in other words that this reduction which we hoped to secure by this legislation of July, 1919, shall not become really effective. It will not become effective if we pass this resolution. As soon as the hope of reduction held out in the act of July becomes a reality we are asked to efface the reality. The promise of reduction appears to have created vain hopes.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I will yield.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman state what the emergency is that makes it desirable to repeal this limitation which has already expired?

Mr. PADGETT. The emergency is the high cost of living and the general law which provides that the Navy shall have the same that the Army has, and this simply puts the Navy and Marine Corps in the same condition of the Army, and the law says they shall be under this condition and is temporary.

Mr. WALSH. Was the guess about the high cost of living or the termination of the war when it was fixed in October 1? Nobody expected the high cost of living was going to cease by October 1.

Mr. PADGETT. That is one thing the Navy is up against as well as all the people.

Mr. WALSH. Every branch of the service.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I do.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Is the meaning of the word "emergency" as given by the gentleman the high cost of living, and not the duration of the war?

Mr. PADGETT. No.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. How long will this emergency last?

Mr. PADGETT. Which one?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Only one has been mentioned.

Mr. PADGETT. The emergency referred to is the termination of the war.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Is that perfectly clear?

Mr. PADGETT. That is the act of April 16, 1918, and that stands in full force.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. New and troublesome conditions might arise after peace is declared, would you speak of them as an emergency?

Mr. PADGETT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PADGETT. I will.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am still a seeker after the light. If this paragraph which we now propose to repeal had never been enacted would the Navy to-day draw exactly the same commutation?

Mr. PADGETT. Exactly, and when this is enacted they will draw just exactly what they have been drawing up to October 1.

Mr. LONGWORTH. Then this paragraph was purely a restrictive measure?

Mr. PADGETT. Exactly so.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I think I follow now, and I am prepared to vote.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I think we ought to have a record vote on a proposition like this.

The SPEAKER. The question is, Shall the bill pass under suspension of the rules?

The question was taken.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia makes the point of order of no quorum present. It is clear there is no quorum present.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

Mr. KELLEY of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Will this vote——

The SPEAKER. It is too late now for a parliamentary inquiry.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

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.

ADJOURNMENT.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned to meet to-morrow, Tuesday, October 7, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

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. 9223) granting a pension to Ezra Shanks; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 7425) granting a pension to Martha J. Comstock; 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. RAMSEY: A bill (H. R. 9752) for the purchase of a site and erection of a public building at Englewood, N. J.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 9753) to prevent deception in the sale of baled cotton in transactions in interstate and foreign commerce; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HUSTED: A bill (H. R. 9754) to create a national monetary commission; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. VESTAL: A bill (H. R. 9755) to establish the standard of weights and measures for the following wheat-mill and corn-mill products, namely, flours, hominy, grits, and meals, and all commercial feeding stuffs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Coinage, Weights, and Measures.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 9756) to amend the Judicial Code to permit terms of the district court for the northern district of New York to be held in Rensselaer County; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: Resolution (H. Res. 323) providing for the appointment of a select committee to consider all legislation relating to honorably discharged officers, soldiers, sailors, and marines of the present war; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ASHBROOK: A bill (H. R. 9757) granting an increase of pension to George W. Willard; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9758) granting an increase of pension to Johanna Dowling; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DUNBAR: A bill (H. R. 9759) granting a pension to John Pennington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9760) granting an increase of pension to James M. Foss; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 9761) for the relief of David C. Bays; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HAWLEY: A bill (H. R. 9762) for the relief of certain settlers in Oregon for losses sustained during the Rogue River Indian outbreak in southern Oregon in 1855; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9763) granting a pension to John J. Moll; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KIESS: A bill (H. R. 9764) granting a pension to Charles C. Chilson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 9765) granting an increase of pension to Rebecca Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PARKER: A bill (H. R. 9766) for the relief of the estate of George W. Lee, deceased; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: A bill (H. R. 9767) granting an increase of pension to William W. Blachly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. REED of West Virginia: A bill (H. R. 9768) granting an increase of pension to Jacob P. Marling; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9769) granting a pension to Worthy Poling; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 9770) granting an increase of pension to Joseph W. Santee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. RUBEY: A bill (H. R. 9771) granting a pension to William C. Jacobs; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9772) granting a pension to Lucy A. Dodson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9773) granting an increase of pension to Harman B. Benton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9774) granting an increase of pension to Josephus McMurtrey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. THOMPSON: A bill (H. R. 9775) granting an increase of pension to Margaret I. Reider; 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. ESCH: Petition of the Anti-Saloon League of America, protesting against legislation granting liquor permits to pharmacists; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers to accompany House bill 9549, granting a pension to Mrs. Sadie Doan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HERSEY: Petition of sundry citizens of Brownville, Me., urging repeal of tax on soda, ice cream, etc.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KIESS: Papers to accompany House bill 9076, for the relief of James A. Roche, alias James Brady; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Petition of Angel City Court, No. 579, Catholic Order of Foresters, Los Angeles, Calif., protesting against the enactment of the Smith-Towner bill, to provide for a department of education, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. WASON: Petition of Maxwell Grey and 21 other residents of Whitefield, N. H., urging the repeal of motion-picture taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: Petition of American Legion of Maine, praying for an investigation of alleged unjust punishments and other wrongs to members of the American Expeditionary Forces and for the punishment of officers responsible therefor; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

SENATE.

TUESDAY, *October 7, 1919.*

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

Almighty God, we seek Thy favor and guidance for the tremendous duty that is upon us this day, with far-reaching influence, that we may have the divine sanction upon that which we say and do, and that out of all our planning and purposing there may come a sweeter comradeship in a common service and a unity of faith and purpose and ideals among all the people of this land, that we may live and serve and sacrifice for the advancement of Thy kingdom of righteousness and truth in the world. We ask it for Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. SMOOT and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Beckham	Chamberlain	Cummins
Ball	Borah	Colt	Dial
Bankhead	Brandegee	Culberson	Dillingham