By Mr. STEELE: A bill (H. R. 9803) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Audenried, Pa., two German cannons or fieldpieces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY of California: A bill (H. R. 9804) to create a department of aeronautics, defining the powers and duties of the director thereof, providing for the organization, disposition, and administration of a United States air reserve force, and providing for the development of civil and commercial aviation; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas: A bill (H. R. 9805) donating a captured German 77 and carriage to the city of Fredonia, Kans., for decorative and patriotic purposes; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ROMJUE: A bill (H. R. 9806) to enable the Capital Traction Co. to acquire the stock, franchises, and property of certain street railway corporations in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: A bill (H. R. 9807) to amend the revenue act of 1918; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SEARS: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 225) authorizing the establishment of a free port at Jacksonville, Fla.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HILL: Resolution (H. Res. 325) to increase the salary of one special employee of the House; to the Committee on Accounts.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Resolution (H. Res. 326) directing the Secretary of the Navy to report on conditions in the United States Naval Academy at Annapolis; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FESS: Resolution (H. Res. 327) for the consideration of H. R. 4438; 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. DARROW: A bill (H. R. 9808) granting a pension to Mildred S. Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HERSMAN: A bill (H. R. 9809) granting a pension to James D. Brown, alias James D. Kester; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JACOWAY: A bill (H. R. 9810) granting a pension to Sam Ragsdale; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MARTIN: A bill (H. R. 9811) for the relief of Thomas R. Clark; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. OVERSTREET: A bill (H. R. 9812) for the relief of Janie Beasley; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PARRISH: A bill (H. R. 9813) granting a pension to F. Lewis; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9814) granting a pension to James M. Waide, jr.; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: A bill (H. R. 9815) granting a pension to Hulda Flatt; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ZIHLMAN: A bill (H. R. 9816) granting an increase of pension to John Sullivan; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9817) granting a pension to John E. Root; to the Committee on Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Indiana Yearly Meeting of Friends, protesting against the military intervention of the United States in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BARBOUR: Petition of Thomas Enright Post, No. 97, Veterans of Foreign Wars, on the subject of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of California Peach Growers (Inc.), urging the placing of an effective tariff on foreign-grown beans; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BEE: Petition of sundry citizens of Guadaloupe County (Seguin), in opposition to the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. CROWTHER: Petition of sundry citizens of Schenectady, N. Y., protesting against the Smith-Towner educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of Lithuanians of Amsterdam, N. Y., asking the United States Government to recognize their independence; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of numerous citizens of Montgomery County, N. Y., protesting against certain provisions contained in Senate bill 2906, known as the Cummins bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. DARROW: Petition of Elizabeth Powell Bond and 46 other residents of Germantown, Philadelphia, Pa., urging congressional investigation of lynching and mob murder; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOWELL: Petition of sundry citizens of the State of Iowa, praying for the return of the American soldiers from Russia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ELLIOTT: Petition of S. Edgar Nicholson, protesting against military intervention in Mexico; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of S. Edgar Nicholson, protesting against universal compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of Women's Post War Council, favoring the return of the bodies of the dead soldiers of our forces when possible; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of S. Edgar Nicholson, favoring a league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of members of the clerical forces of the naval establishments, favoring an immediate increase in salaries; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Petition of the American Legion, indorsing and approving the action and purpose of the congressional investigating committee to place responsibility for the alleged unnecessary wrongs inflicted against officers and soldiers of the American Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. NEELY: Petition of Capitol Petroleum Co., against propaganda interfering with independent oil companies in Mexico; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Memorial of Highland Park Presbyterian Church, Los Angeles, Calif., indorsing the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. SCHALL: Resolution of the Minnesota Joint Engineering Board, urging Congress to provide for the utilization of the water power at the Government dam at Minneapolis, without longer deferring action in anticipation of general water-power legislation; to the Committee on Water Power.

SENATE.

THURSDAY, *October 9, 1919.*

Rev. J. J. Muir, D. D., of the city of Washington, offered the following prayer:

O God, our help in ages past, our present help in every hour of need, we turn to Thee this morning, thanking Thee for opportunity and for all the privileges of life, and ask Thy guidance in meeting the confusions and unrest of these times. Help these Thy servants in every circumstance of responsibility. Grant Thy grace, we beseech of Thee, in the sick room at the White House, and to Thy servant the President reveal Thyself as a helper and healer. Accept of us and glorify Thyself in and through the Nation. Through Christ our God. 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	Gerry	McCumber	Simmons
Ball	Gore	McKellar	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Gronna	McNary	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Hale	Moses	Smoot
Borah	Harding	Myers	Spencer
Brandegee	Harris	Nelson	Sterling
Calder	Harrison	New	Sutherland
Capper	Hitchcock	Newberry	Thomas
Chamberlain	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Townsend
Colt	Kellogg	Nugent	Trammell
Culberson	Kendrick	Overman	Underwood
Cummins	Kenyon	Owen	Wadsworth
Dial	Keyes	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Dillingham	King	Penrose	Walsh, Mont.
Edge	Kirby	Phelan	Watson
Elkins	Knox	Poindexter	Williams
Fernald	La Follette	Pomerene	Wolcott
Fletcher	Lenroot	Robinson	
France	Lodge	Sheppard	
Frelinghuysen	McCormick	Sherman	

Mr. NEWBERRY. I desire to announce the absence of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN], the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CURTIS], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], who are engaged in a committee hearing.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] are absent on account of illness in their families. The senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. PITTMAN], the junior Senator from Louisiana [Mr. GAY], and the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES] are detained from the Senate on official business. The junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON], the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. STANLEY], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] are absent on public business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Seventy-seven Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

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. 633) extending the provisions for the regulation of steam vessels to vessels owned or operated by the United States Shipping Board, and for other purposes.

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

H. R. 3620. An act to authorize the Commissioner of Navigation to change the names of vessels;

H. R. 8986. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Paris-Hugo Bridge Co. to construct a bridge and approaches thereto across Red River, near Arthur City, Lamar County, Tex.; and

H. R. 9692. An act to amend section 13 of an act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion; and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereof; and to promote safety at sea," approved March 4, 1915.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

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

S. 9. An act to encourage the reclamation of certain arid lands in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes;

S. 253. An act 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;

S. 2100. An act authorizing the Union Pacific Railway Co. or its successors to convey for public-road purposes certain parts of its right of way; and

H. R. 7478. An act to amend sections 5200 and 5202 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by acts of June 22, 1906, and September 24, 1918.

HOUSE BILLS REFERRED.

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

H. R. 3620. An act to authorize the Commissioner of Navigation to change the names of vessels;

H. R. 8986. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Paris-Hugo Bridge Co. to construct a bridge and approaches thereto across Red River, near Arthur City, Lamar County, Tex.; and

H. R. 9692. An act to amend section 13 of an act entitled "An act to promote the welfare of American seamen in the merchant marine of the United States; to abolish arrest and imprisonment as a penalty for desertion; and to secure the abrogation of treaty provisions in relation thereof; and to promote safety at sea," approved March 4, 1915.

PROMOTION OF FOREIGN COMMERCE.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a response on the part of the governor of the Federal Reserve Board to Senate resolution 203. It will be inserted in the RECORD. It is brief.

The communication is as follows:

FEDERAL RESERVE BOARD,
OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,
Washington, October 7, 1919.

SIR: Referring to your letter of the 6th instant inclosing a copy of Senate resolution 203, you are advised that neither the Federal Reserve Board nor the Federal reserve banks receive any appropriations from Congress. All the Federal reserve banks at the present time are earning large profits far in excess of operating expenses and dividend requirements (dividends being limited by law to 6 per cent, cumulative), and the expenses of the Federal Reserve Board and its staff are defrayed out of the proceeds of assessments levied semiannually upon the Federal reserve banks in proportion to their capital stock and surplus, as authorized by a paragraph in section 10 of the Federal reserve act.

The Federal Reserve Board is not charged with any duty relating to the promotion and development of foreign commerce, although the Federal reserve banks are authorized under section 14, with the consent or upon the order and direction of the Federal Reserve Board and under regulations to be prescribed by the board, to open and maintain accounts in foreign countries, appoint correspondents, and establish agencies in such countries. Under this authority the board has authorized the Federal Reserve Bank of New York, acting for itself and other Federal reserve banks, to establish agency relations with the Bank of England and the Bank of France.

Under the provisions of section 25 of the Federal reserve act the board has also authorized a large national bank to establish branches in several foreign countries, and has authorized national banks having a capital of not less than $1,000,000 to purchase stock in corporations or banks principally engaged in foreign banking after these corporations have made an agreement with the board as to the character of the business to be transacted, the manner in which the business is to be conducted, and as to reports and examinations. A number of these foreign banking corporations have been organized with national banks as stockholders, and they have branches or offices in nearly all parts of the world.

The Federal Reserve Board itself, however, has incurred no expense in matters connected with the promotion and development of foreign commerce, nor has it any employees engaged in such work.

Respectfully, yours,

W. P. G. HARDING,
Governor.

Hon. GEORGE A. SANDERSON,
Secretary United States Senate.

SHIPMENT OF WHEAT.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, on yesterday the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] had printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. J. H. Young, an officer of the United States Railroad Administration, with reference to the exportation of wheat. Mr. Young gives the excuse that for the want of ships wheat is not being exported. I take it that the Senate is anxious to have the facts, and I wish to say that I am in a position to give them the facts because I have taken the matter up with the Secretary of Agriculture. For the information of the Senator from Oklahoma, as well as other Senators, I ask to have read a letter which I have just received from the Secretary of Agriculture.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read.

The Secretary read as follows:

THE SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, October 2, 1919.

Hon. A. J. GRONNA,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GRONNA: I have your letter of September 27, in which you make inquiry regarding embargoes upon cereals and their products, live stock and the products of live stock, and other necessary food products. Matters of this sort are now handled by the War Trade Section of the State Department, which took over the functions of the War Trade Board at the close of the past fiscal year. The bureau of exports of that section informs me that, with the exception of wheat and wheat flour, any and all food products may be exported freely, without individual export license, to any country in the world except European Russia. Questions relating to the exportation or importation of wheat and wheat flour are dealt with by the United States Wheat Director, whose offices are located at 42 Broadway, New York City. I am inclosing herewith for your information a copy of a letter from the Bureau of Exports, together with two bulletins which have a bearing on your inquiry.

Very truly, yours,

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary.*

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I simply want to add that Mr. Julius Barnes, Director of the Grain Corporation, is responsible for the embargo. There has been and there is now an embargo on wheat and wheat flour, and that is the reason why wheat is not being exported. The letter which was printed in the RECORD on yesterday does not give the correct information. As a further proof of that, Mr. President, I offer——

Mr. POMERENE. May I ask the Senator a question in that connection?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes, sir.

Mr. POMERENE. What is the reason for this embargo?

Mr. GRONNA. I have telegraphed Mr. Barnes and asked him why it is necessary to have this embargo at the present time, but up to this moment I have not received a reply.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator from North Dakota permit an inquiry?

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly.

Mr. KING. I have been advised by a number of gentlemen who have given attention to this matter that one of the reasons why the shipments of foodstuffs during the past month or so have been as small as they have been—although they have been very great—was because of the lack of credit in Europe, the lack of means upon the part of European Governments with which to pay for the foodstuffs. From all that I can learn, including statements made by Mr. Hoover and others who are familiar with European conditions, the fact is that the European nations do not have sufficient funds with which to make the purchases in this country which their necessities require.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say to the Senator from Utah that that is not the reason with reference to wheat and wheat flour. If the Senator will read the letters which I have asked to have printed in the RECORD in connection with my remarks, he will find that to be the fact.

Mr. President, if I may be permitted to add another word, I wish to say that under our tariff law there is a duty of 10 cents per bushel on wheat between the United States and Canada. It seems, however, that these people are a law unto themselves and make their own laws. I am advised by the Secretary of Agriculture—I have his letter here, but it is rather a lengthy one, and I shall not ask to have it printed in the RECORD—that there is no duty on wheat. The law has never been repealed, so far as I know; it is on the statute books of the United States; Canada refused to accept the reciprocity treaty by an overwhelming vote, as Senators know; and why this law has been set aside I do not know. At any rate, it has been held, and is held to-day, that there is no duty on wheat between the United States and Canada.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from North Dakota to say that it is held to-day that there is no duty on wheat?

Mr. GRONNA. Yes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. May I ask him by whom it is so held?

Mr. GRONNA. It must be by Mr. Barnes, the wheat director, for wheat is being shipped into this country free of duty.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, the Senator from North Dakota knows that Mr. Barnes can not give a judicial opinion which would bind anybody.

Mr. GRONNA. The holding must be by the Treasury Department.

Mr. WILLIAMS. If there is any doubt about the legality of the action, why has the matter not been carried into court? The courts have the final say about whether there is or is not a duty upon a product coming into the United States. Has the matter ever been determined by the customs court or has it ever been appealed from that court to the Court of Appeals? What is the status of it?

Mr. GRONNA. The status of it is this: It has been held—I suppose by the Treasury Department—that there is no duty on wheat. Of course, no one has had the time to take the matter to the courts, I will say to the Senator from Mississippi. It is a matter with which the people of the United States have not been familiar; it is a new matter.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Of course, there is no authority in any part of the Executive to set aside a law; the Senator from North Dakota knows that as well as I. If the law be that there is no duty upon wheat from Canada at this moment, of course, there is none. By the way, that is the law. If the law be that there is a duty upon wheat, of course, there is one. Now, what I am trying to get at is for the Senator to be more specific and to tell the country just who has held that there is no duty on wheat, and what is his ground of objection to the legality of that decision if it be a decision.

Mr. GRONNA. I have the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture, and I will ask that it may be read. That will give the Senator from Mississippi the information.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I wish the Senator would have that letter read, because the Senator is making a very grave charge. He is making a charge that the Executive of this country is suspending and setting aside laws. It was for that crime that James the Second had to abdicate the throne of England and that Charles the First lost his throne and his head.

Mr. GRONNA. The Senator from North Dakota is making the statement that there is no duty on wheat, upon information furnished him by the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Very well; let the letter of the Secretary of Agriculture be read.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will read, as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, September 27, 1919.

Hon. A. J. GRONNA,
United States Senate.

DEAR SENATOR GRONNA: Your letter of September 22, inclosing correspondence with Senator WALSH relative to changes in tariff regulations on seed oats and wheat has been received. I find that there is no tariff at this time on wheat imported from Canada, and that the tariff on oats is 6 cents per bushel of 32 pounds. As the usual rate of seeding for oats in Montana and western North Dakota is around 2 to 2½ bushels per acre, the additional cost per acre due to the tariff would not be more than from 12 cents to 15 cents.

The estimated average area sown to oats in Montana during the past three years is 680,000 acres. Of this, probably 400,000 to 450,000 acres is on dry farms in the area seriously affected by drought this year, and the seed for probably all of this will have to come from sources outside of that area next spring. Of the 400,000 to 450,000 acres of dry-land oats, perhaps 300,000 are in Great Northern territory, which would be most likely to draw on the prairie Provinces of Canada for its seed supply.

The Bureau of Crop Estimates' report for 1918 shows that 650,000 acres of oats were sown in the territory north of the Missouri River and east to and including Rolette and Benson Counties. Some seed oats will have to be shipped into this section next spring, though the crop is much better than in any part of Montana. The poorest crops, not only of oats but of other grains, are in Bottineau, Rolette, Pierce, and McHenry Counties. In Burke, Divide, Williams, Mountrail, and Ward Counties considerable quantities of fair to good oats have been harvested, so that demand for seed from outside sources is unlikely. The counties farther east have direct connection with Canada by both the Great Northern and Soo lines, and could readily obtain a part of their seed supply from that section if desired.

The oat crop, as well as all other crops, is much poorer in southwestern North Dakota than in the northwestern part of the State. In the counties west of the Missouri River and in the adjoining counties of McLean, Burleigh, and Emmons, 420,000 acres were sown in 1918. A large part of the seed oats for this section will have to come from outside sources next spring, but only Emmons, Burleigh, and McLean Counties can be supplied on direct shipment from Canada. Presumably the Northern Pacific and Chicago, Milwaukee & St. Paul territory in both North Dakota and Montana is much more likely to draw on eastern than on Canadian sources for its seed grain.

The growing season in Minnesota was very wet with a resulting rank growth and considerable lodging and disease, so that it is doubtful if seed oats of good quality could be obtained there. Probably the best sources are the northeastern counties of North Dakota and southeastern South Dakota, where sufficient corn is grown to keep down wild oats.

In response to a telegram sent to Mr. George H. Clark, Canadian seed commissioner, the Bureau of Plant Industry has received the following message:

Oat crop, Alberta, Saskatchewan, this year harvested early; excellent condition. Believe could spare up to 2,000,000 bushels Canadian standard No. 1 and No. 2 seed Alberta white oats, consisting of Banner and Abundance varieties, which mature together. This quality oats commands premium, uncleaned condition about 15 cents for No. 1 and 10 cents for No. 2 over Canadian No. 2 Canada Western. Cost of cleaning and wastage in cleaning amounts additional to 8 cents per bushel. Canadian Government elevators. Suggest you communicate directly with United Grain Growers, Cooperative, Winnipeg.

Judging from Mr. Clark's telegram and our own knowledge of the supply of seed oats in Montana and North Dakota, there seems to be no doubt that there will be enough seed oats in Alberta and Saskatchewan for all possible demands, and it is likely that the people of northern Montana and northwestern North Dakota will desire to fill a large part of their needs from these Provinces.

Very truly, yours,

D. F. HOUSTON, *Secretary.*

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, as I understand that letter, the Secretary of Agriculture says that he "finds there is no duty upon wheat and that there is a duty of 6 cents upon oats."

Of course, he must find that from the law, and so I do not quite understand the charge being made now by the Senator from North Dakota against the executive department. A moment ago I understood from the Senator that he contended that there was a duty on Canadian wheat and that it was being suspended by the executive department. If the Secretary of Agriculture be correct in saying that "he finds no such law," then the Senator from North Dakota must be incorrect in some way.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, the Senator from North Dakota made no charge whatever against the executive department. The Senator from North Dakota stated that the Director of the Grain Corporation, Mr. Julius Barnes, was, in his judgment, responsible for the condition referred to; that he had placed an embargo—which he has a legal right to do—not only upon wheat but upon wheat flour. I do not charge that is any violation of law, but I do not believe that it is fair to set aside the law; and the Senator from Mississippi knows as well as I do, because he helped to make the law, that to-day there is a duty of 10 cents a bushel on wheat, unless the Canadian Government has seen fit to approve the reciprocity treaty or to approve our tariff act of 1913 and agree that there shall be no duty on wheat or on wheat flour.

Mr. WILLIAMS. The embargo question is a separate and independent question, and is subject to a different course of analysis in determining as to whether or not it ought to have been laid. Frankly I do not see why any embargo should be laid upon the exportation of wheat, and had I the authority I

certainly would not have laid any; but that is a different question.

I understood the Senator in his opening remarks to say he did not understand who had "suspended the law." Now, the Senator tells me that he made no charge that anybody had suspended it.

Mr. GRONNA. If the Senator will yield to me, I seem to be very unfortunate in making myself understood. I offered a letter from the Secretary of Agriculture to show that there was an embargo on wheat.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I heard that letter read.

Mr. GRONNA. I did that because the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN] on yesterday had printed in the RECORD a letter from Mr. Young giving the reasons why wheat was not being exported and stating that it was due to the lack of ships.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understand that.

Mr. GRONNA. I am glad the Senator understands that.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But the point I am arriving at is this: I understand the Senator now either to have withdrawn the charge or to have informed me that I misheard him—I do not know which; but I understood that in his first remarks he was making inquiry as to some executive officer who had "suspended a law" which *he* says is in existence and valid to-day and which is being violated. The Senator is mistaken, then, when he withdraws the charge in his last remark and says that he made no charge against anybody of suspending the law, or else he was mistaken in his charge.

Mr. GRONNA. The only difference is that I did not say, "I do not make any charge against anybody"; I said I made no charge against the executive department. I do make the charge against Julius Barnes, the Director of the Wheat Corporation, that he is acting contrary to the spirit of the law.

Mr. WILLIAMS. But, Mr. President, if an article bearing by law a duty is admitted into the United States duty free it must be through the operation of the Treasury Department, which is a part of the executive, so that, of course, the Senator is making a charge against the customs service, which is a part of the Treasury Department.

Mr. GRONNA. I ask leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter of Mr. Vance C. McCormick, chairman of the War Trade Board, one from Mr. F. S. Dickson, of the Bureau of Exports, and export license No. RAC-77.

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

WAR TRADE BOARD,
Washington, June 30, 1919.

REGULATIONS GOVERNING THE EXPORTATION AND IMPORTATION OF WHEAT AND WHEAT FLOUR.

The War Trade Board announce, effective July 1, 1919, that all control over the exportation and importation of wheat and wheat flour heretofore vested in the War Trade Board under Title VII of the espionage act and section 11 of the trading-with-the-enemy act, respectively, will, in accordance with the proclamation issued by the President on June 24, 1919, under section 6 of the so-called "wheat guaranty act," approved March 4, 1919, be transferred to and vested in the United States Wheat Director. All outstanding unused export or import licenses issued by the War Trade Board for wheat or wheat flour will be revoked effective July 1, 1919, and collectors of customs have been advised that said licenses are of no further force or effect.

The War Trade Board announce further that wheat and wheat flour will be removed, effective July 1, 1919, from the export conservation list and from the list of restricted imports of the War Trade Board.

All inquiries regarding the exportation or importation of wheat and wheat flour should be addressed to the United States Wheat Director, 42 Broadway, New York City.

VANCE C. MCCORMICK, *Chairman.*

SEPTEMBER 30, 1919.

The honorable the SECRETARY OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: Referring to your telephone request for information regarding any embargoes which may be in force in the export of food products, I wish to advise you that, with the exception of wheat and wheat flour, any and all food products may be exported freely, without individual export license, to any country in the world save European Russia. I inclose a copy of War Trade Board ruling 833, issued to-day, covering shipments under special export license RAC-77.

I also inclose a copy of War Trade Board ruling 797, dated June 30, 1919, which announces that on and after July 1, 1919, all control over the exportation and importation of wheat and wheat flour heretofore vested in the War Trade Board will, in accordance with the proclamation issued by the President, of June 24, 1919, under section VI of the so-called "wheat guaranty act," approved March 4, 1919, be transferred to and vested in the United States Wheat Director.

Very truly, yours,

BUREAU OF EXPORTS,
By F. S. DICKSON.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
WAR TRADE BOARD SECTION,
September 30, 1919.

Special Export License No. RAC-77, extended to cover the shipment to the Republic of Austria, Bulgaria, Turkey, and Hungary of all commodities except war materials.

The War Trade Board Section of the Department of State announces that Special Export License RAC-77, W. T. B. R. 831, has been extended and reissued, effective October 1, 1919. Special Export License RAC-77 as amended will authorize the exportation by freight or express, without individual licenses to the countries hereinbelow mentioned, of all commodities whatsoever, except (1) certain commodities as listed below when destined to Hungary, the Republic of Austria, Bulgaria, or Turkey; (2) arms, ammunition, and explosives consigned to China; (3) wheat and wheat flour, the control over the exportation of which has been vested in the Wheat Director (see W. T. B. R. 797, issued June 30, 1919):

(a) Any country in the Western Hemisphere.
(b) Any country in Africa.
(c) Any country in Asia or Oceania.
(d) Any country in Europe except Russia.

An individual export license must be obtained before any of the commodities hereinafter mentioned may be exported to Hungary, the Republic of Austria, Bulgaria, or Turkey. The importation into the above-named countries of the following commodities will be restricted, and individual export licenses will be granted only in exceptional cases:

Aircraft of all kinds, including aeroplanes, airships, balloons and their component parts, together with accessories and articles suitable for use in connection with aircraft.

Apparatus which can be used for the storage or projection of compressed or liquefied gases, flame acids, or other destructive agents capable of use in warlike operations, and their component parts.

Armor plates.

Armored motor cars.

Arms of all kinds, including arms for sporting purposes, and their component parts.

Barbed wire and implements for fixing and cutting same.

Camp equipment.

Camp equipment, articles of, and their component parts.

Clothing and equipment of a distinctively military character.

Electrical appliances adapted for use in the war and their component parts.

Explosives especially prepared for use in war.

Field glasses.

Gases for war purposes.

Guns and machine guns.

Gun mountings, limbers, and military wagons of all descriptions.

Harness or horse equipment of a military character.

Implements and apparatus designed exclusively for the manufacture of munitions of war, or for the manufacture or repair of arms or of war materials, for use on land or sea.

Mines, submarines, and their component parts.

Projectiles, charges, cartridges, and grenades of all kinds and their component parts.

Range finders and their component parts.

Searchlights and their component parts.

Submarine sound-signaling apparatus and materials for wireless telegraphs.

Torpedoes.

Warships, including boats and their component parts of such a nature that they can only be used on a vessel of war.

The exportation to the Republic of Austria, Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey of the following articles, viz, barbed wire and implements for fixing and cutting the same, articles of camp equipment and their component parts, clothing and equipment of a distinctly military character, electrical appliances for use in war and their component parts, military wagons of all descriptions, and harness or horse equipment of a military character, is forbidden only on account of the military use to which such articles can be put. If exporters have information showing that the articles are destined for civil purposes, the same should be submitted with their applications for export licenses.

Exporters who desire to make shipments under Special Export License RAC-77 need only present their shipper's export declarations (Customs Cat. 7525), in duplicate (see W. T. B. R. 828, issued Aug. 21, 1919), to the collectors of customs at the ports of exit for indorsement to permit the shipments to proceed.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I think there is some little confusion with reference to the 10 per cent duty upon wheat. Let me read the section of the act of October 3, 1913, with reference to wheat. It is as follows:

Wheat, wheat flour, semolina, and other wheat products, not specially provided for in this section—

The section is the free list—

Provided, That wheat shall be subject to a duty of 10 cents per bushel, that wheat flour shall be subject to a duty of 45 cents per barrel of 196 pounds, and semolina and other products of wheat, not specially provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem, when imported directly or indirectly from a country, dependency, or other subdivision of government which imposes a duty on wheat or wheat flour or semolina imported from the United States.

I presume that the decision referred to by the Senator from North Dakota was a construction of that section of the tariff act of 1913.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, my object in interrupting the Senator was to get this thing in specific and definite shape. As the Senator from North Carolina has just shown, no law has been suspended, no law has been violated, and no part of the executive branch of the Government has rendered itself subject to the enormous impeachment that was laid against the Stuarts for doing what was charged by the Senator from North Dakota.

LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I ask to have inserted in the RECORD a list of 104 organizations in California which have indorsed the ratification of the treaty and the league of nations since July 1. It will be remembered that I have already introduced a number of reports of that sort from various States, particularly from California.

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

"FURTHER LIST OF CALIFORNIA ORGANIZATIONS THAT HAVE ADOPTED SINCE JULY 1 RESOLUTIONS FAVORING THE LEAGUE OF NATIONS.

"Organization, place, and date.

"ALAMEDA COUNTY.

"Washington School Parent-Teachers' Association, Oakland, July 2, 1919.

"Berkeley Mothers' Club, Berkeley, July 7, 1919.

"BUTTE COUNTY.

"Federation of Women's Clubs, Chico.

"Community Council and Social Center, Oroville.

"Chico Lodge, No. 113, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Chico, June 3, 1919.

"CONTRA COSTA COUNTY.

"Olive Homestead, No. 1106, B. A. Y., Richmond.

"Alameda District of California Federation of Women's Clubs, Richmond.

"COLUSA COUNTY.

"Citizens of Colusa, mass meeting, Colusa, August 6, 1919.

"Citizens of Williams, mass meeting, Williams, August 7, 1919.

"FRESNO COUNTY.

"Hawthorne Parent-Teachers' Association, Fresno, May 8, 1919.

"The Reorganized Church of Jesus Christ of the Latter Day Saints, Fresno, June 2, 1919.

"HUMBOLDT COUNTY.

"Local Union No. 12, International Union of Timberworkers, George Galloway, secretary, Eureka, July 13, 1919.

"KERN COUNTY.

"United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Local No. 743, Bakersfield, July 1, 1919.

"KINGS COUNTY.

"Public meeting, Corcoran, June 30, 1919.

"Plumbers' Local Union No. 262.

"Carpenters' Union No. 1043, A. Gustafson, secretary, Hanford, June 19, 1919.

"Painters' Union No. 594, E. W. Beckman, secretary, Hanford, June 14, 1919.

"Kings County Building Trades, A. Gustafson, Hanford, June 13, 1919.

"Hanford Review of Maccabees, secretary, C. Mouser, Hanford, June 19, 1919.

"Lady of the Lake Rebekah Lodge, No. 111, Hanford, June 20, 1919.

"LOS ANGELES COUNTY.

"Silver Wave Rebekah Lodge, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Santa Monica.

"Torrance Chamber of Commerce, Torrance, Calif.

"Norwalk Parent-Teachers' Association, Norwalk, July 5, 1919.

"Monrovia Lodge, No. 308, Free and Accepted Masons, Monrovia, June 12, 1919.

"South Park Parent-Teacher Association, Los Angeles, July 3, 1919.

"Printing Pressmen and Assistants' Union No. 155, Pasadena, July 10, 1919.

"Santa Monica Lodge, No. 307, Free and Accepted Masons, Santa Monica, June 6, 1919.

"Knights of Pythias, Covina, July 10, 1919.

"New England Society, Los Angeles, July 7, 1919.

"San Fernando Chamber of Commerce, San Fernando, July 22, 1919.

"College Women's Club, Long Beach, July 20, 1919.

"John A. Marin Post, No. 153, Grand Army of the Republic, Soldiers' Home, July 22, 1919.

"Redondo Aerie, No. 935, Fraternal Order of Eagles, Redondo Beach, July 21, 1919.

"Pasadena Lodge, No. 324, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Pasadena, July 24, 1919.

"Loyal Order of Moose, Los Angeles, July 24, 1919.

"Pasadena Tent, No. 1, the Maccabees, Pasadena, July 21, 1919.

"America Lodge, No. 65, Knights of Pythias, Redondo Beach, July 23, 1919.

"Harbor City Post, No. 185, Department of California and Nevada, San Pedro, July 23, 1919.

"Sequoia Tribe, No. 140, Sailors' Union Hall, San Pedro, July 24, 1919.

"Glendora Chamber of Commerce, Glendora, July 21, 1919.

"Board of directors chamber of commerce, Venice, July, 1919.

"Ocean Park Chapter, No. 245, Order of Eastern Star, Venice, June 19, 1919.

"Royal Oak Lodge, No. 220, Sons of St. George, Los Angeles, July 25, 1919.

"Mayflower Rebekah Lodge, No. 300, South Pasadena, July 21, 1919.

"Lawndale Improvement Association, Lawndale, July 14, 1919.

"Venice Chamber of Commerce, Venice, July 22, 1919.

"Covina Chapter, Daughters of American Revolution, Covina, July 31, 1919.

"Anna Ella Carrol Tent, No. 9, Daughters of Veterans, Sawtelle, July 28, 1919.

"Lancaster Lodge, No. 347, Free and Accepted Masons, Lancaster, August 1, 1919.

"Norwalk Chapter, No. 143, Order of Eastern Star, Norwalk, Calif., August 12, 1919.

"Brotherhood of American Yeomen, Pasadena, Calif., July 24, 1919.

"Heliotrope Rebekah Lodge, No. 183, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Pomona, July 22, 1919.

"Pasadena Rebekah Lodge, No. 121, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Pasadena, August 5, 1919.

"LAKE COUNTY.

"Upper Lake Women's Protective Club, Upper Lake, July 2, 1919.

"MADERA COUNTY.

"Madera Lodge, No. 327, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Madera, July 10, 1919.

"Madera farm bureau picnic, Madera.

"Farm bureaus of Madera County, board of directors, Madera.

"Union meeting of the churches, Madera.

"Dixie Land Improvement Club, Madera.

"Teneya Tribe of Red Men, Madera.

"MARIN COUNTY.

"Carpenters' Union No. 35, L. Johansen, secretary, San Rafael, July 15, 1919.

"NAPA COUNTY.

"Mass meeting of citizens, Calistoga, August 1, 1919.

"ORANGE COUNTY.

"Gazelle Grange, No. 380, Gazelle, July 9, 1919.

"RIVERSIDE COUNTY.

"Hiawatha Tribe, No. 106, Improved Order of Red Men, Riverside, June 26, 1919.

"SAN FRANCISCO COUNTY.

"Denman School Mothers' Club, San Francisco.

"Butchers' Union, Local No. 115, San Francisco, July 10, 1919.

"International Alliance of Theatrical Stage Employees and Moving Picture Machine Operators of United States and Canada, Union Local No. 16, San Francisco, July 16, 1919.

"People's Liberal Church, San Francisco, June 29, 1919.

"San Francisco Typographical Union, No. 21, San Francisco, July 22, 1919.

"Varnishers' and Polishers' Local Assembly, No. 134, San Francisco, July 22, 1919.

"SAN JOAQUIN COUNTY.

"Mass meeting of northern part of county, Lodi, July 17, 1919.

"SAN DIEGO COUNTY.

"Moving Picture Operators' Local Union, No. 297, San Diego.

"Lasker Lodge, No. 370, B'nai B'rith, San Diego, July 14, 1919.

"United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, No. 2553, San Diego, July 21, 1918.

"SAN BENITO COUNTY.

"San Benito Labor Council, Hollister.

"SANTA CLARA COUNTY.

"Plasterers' and Cement Finishers', No. 224, San Jose, July 11, 1919.

"Cristofer Colombo Circle, No. 256, C. O. F., San Jose.

"Italian Benevolent Society, Hall No. 129, San Jose, July 7, 1919.

"Cigarmakers' Local Union, No. 291, San Jose, July 19, 1919.

"Millmen's Union, No. 262, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, San Jose, July 14, 1919.

"Union meeting, Baptist, Methodist, and Congregational Churches, Sunnyvale, July 27, 1919.

"First Methodist Episcopal Church, Palo Alto, August 4, 1919.

"Mass meeting in Santa Clara, Santa Clara, August 5, 1919.

"SONOMA COUNTY.

"Woman's Improvement Club, 8, Corona, May 16, 1919.

"Sebastopol Grange, No. 306, Patrons of Husbandry, Sebastopol, June 28, 1919.

"United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners, Petaluma, July 28, 1919.

"SANTA CRUZ COUNTY.

"State Convention of Christian Churches of California, Santa Cruz, August 2, 1919.

"SANTA BARBARA COUNTY.

"Bricklayers' and Masons', No. 5, Santa Barbara, Calif.

"SAN LUIS OBISPO COUNTY.

"San Luis Obispo Rebekah Lodge, No. 218, San Luis Obispo, July 5, 1919.

"Paso Robles High School, Paso Robles, Calif.

"SHASTA COUNTY.

"Welcome Lodge, No. 209, Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Igo, June 26, 1919.

"Eola Rebekah Lodge, No. 256, Igo, June 26, 1919.

"TULARE COUNTY.

"Dinuba Local Union, No. 484, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, Dinuba, July 11, 1919.

"Local Union No. 899, Painters, Visalia, July 10, 1919.

"VENTURA COUNTY.

"Board of supervisors, Ventura, July 21, 1919.

"Board of trustees, Ventura, August 4, 1919.

"YOLO COUNTY.

"Woodland Lodge, No. 1299, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, Woodland, July 1, 1919.

"Women's Home Missionary Society, Methodist Episcopal Church, Woodland, July 7, 1919.

"Women's Foreign Missionary Society, Methodist Episcopal Church, Woodland, July 7, 1919.

"Women's Bible Class, 'Loyalty' Methodist Episcopal Church, Woodland, July 7, 1919.

"Beta Gama Kappa, Woodland, July 3, 1919."

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I also ask to have published in the RECORD a letter from Nelson G. Welburn, vice chairman of the American Legion at Alameda, Calif., also indorsing the league of nations.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, before this request is granted I should like to say that the Senator from Nebraska nearly every day rises and puts into the RECORD telegrams or petitions or letters from people who are in favor of the league of nations. I have a great number of letters and telegrams and petitions and communications from people who are against the league of nations. They have not been put into the RECORD. It never occurred to me that it was a very accurate test of the wishes of the American people to see a rivalry between Senators as to who could introduce the most telegrams or letters or petitions for or against a proposition.

I just wanted to interpolate, before granting the unanimous-consent request of the Senator from Nebraska—and I am not going to object to it—the statement that I do not accept as having any force or weight this effort which the Senator from Nebraska is making to prove by a mass of telegrams that he is introducing that there are more people on that side of the question than there are on the other side. It is no test at all.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I sympathize with what the Senator says. I have received, I suppose, thousands of letters and telegrams that I have not presented to the Senate nor introduced in the RECORD in any way. What I have just presented, except the one letter, is a mere list of 104 organizations which have adopted resolutions. I do not present the resolutions themselves, but merely a list of 104 organizations in California that have adopted resolutions since July 1. That is to supplement others that I have previously introduced.

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

AMERICAN LEGION, CALIFORNIA BRANCH,
ALAMEDA POST, NO. 9,
Alameda, Calif., October 4, 1919.

Hon. GILBERT M. HITCHCOCK,
Senate Office Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: I beg to hand you herewith a copy of the letter as sent the Hon. HIRAM W. JOHNSON this day. In passing, and as a Progressive, I may say to you that the people of California are for the league of nations without amendments or reservations. They emphatically resent the nefarious attempt to convert this important question into a political issue.

Senator JOHNSON's visit to California, sir, has helped and not injured the league of nations. To the nonpartisan element of this State his speeches have not been here an impartial and unprejudiced analysis, but more of an indictment of President Wilson.

Yours, for the success of the league, I have the honor to remain,

Most sincerely, yours, NELSON G. WELBURN,
Vice Chairman.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I also ask to have printed in the RECORD a vote taken by the Los Angeles Times during the last several weeks on the subject of the league of nations, showing 10,941 for the league as against 997 against the league. I want to say that these polls taken by the Los Angeles Times are among very representative organizations and bodies. For instance, in the case of the board of directors of the Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce, 15 Republicans and 2 Democrats, with 3 absent, the vote was 17 for the league and none against it. The Los Angeles Ministerial Union was unanimous, 156 votes for the league. The Los Angeles Board of Education voted 7 for the league and none against it; and so on through a list of some 50 or 60 organizations, the total vote being 10,941 for the league, as I have stated, and less than 1,000 against it. I ask to have the list printed in the RECORD.

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

"HERE IS THE PROOF OF IT.

"Following are straw votes collected by the Times during the past few days on the question, 'Do you favor the league of nations as outlined and defended by President Wilson and opposed by Senator Johnson?' Every available gathering of persons consenting to vote on the subject is included in this list, whether the result favored the position taken by the Times or not. In some cases certain of those voting favored the league with reservations. Where such reservations are of a minor nature, these are counted for the league; where not, against it. In all cases the number of voters making reservation is noted. Most of the church vote was taken at the prayer meetings held Wednesday evening, which accounts for the small vote cast. All are of Los Angeles unless otherwise stated.

	For.	Against.
Board of Directors, Los Angeles Chamber of Commerce (15 Republicans, 2 Democrats), 3 absent	17	0
Los Angeles Ministerial Union	156	0
Presidents' Council, Los Angeles District, California Federation of Women's Clubs, representing 16,000 women	300	0
Los Angeles Board of Education	7	0
Los Angeles City Council (1 undecided)	8	0
First Methodist Church of Hollywood	1,800	6
Ruskin Art Club	100	75
Trinity Methodist Church	2,000	0
Superior Judges (7 with reservations)	15	10
First Presbyterian Church (3 not voting)	50	0
Knox Presbyterian Church	12	0
Union League Club (33 with reservations)	69	45
Kiwanis Club of Long Beach	100	0
Long Beach City Commission	5	0
First Congregational Church	110	0
Broadway Christian Church	30	2
Justices, Department 2, Second District Court of Appeal	3	0
Directors Los Angeles Wholesale Grocery Co	8	3
Current Events Club, Ontario	57	54
Women's Foreign Missionary Society, First Methodist Episcopal Church	25	1
Los Angeles Woman's Christian Temperance Union	30	0
(State Woman's Christian Temperance Union already on record in favor of the league.)		
Michigan Society of Los Angeles	31	28
Bakersfield Labor Council	42	16
Art Theater, Redondo Beach	38	17
Redondo Beach Christian Church	9	2
Lobby Hotel Maryland, Pasadena (5 with reservations)	12	2
Pasadena street crowd (9 with reservations)	31	1
Van Nuys Presbyterian Church	11	5
First Baptist Church, Whittier (12 with reservations)	78	6
Society of Friends, Whittier	1,200	0
City of Porterville	250	25
First Congregational Church, Riverside	800	0
Miscellaneous meetings, Riverside	349	256
Missouri State Society, San Diego	20	4
Suffrage meeting, San Diego	42	17
Miscellaneous meetings, San Diego	175	25
San Diego Sun ballot	2,268	399
First Baptist Church, Ontario	31	10
Calexico (first 10 votes on street; 1 in doubt)	6	3
City of Redlands (90 with reservations)	150	0
City of El Centro	124	24
City of Perris	45	46
Imperial High School	83	21
Los Angeles Greeters' Club	26	11
First Baptist Church	80	27
P. E. O. Sisterhood of Van Nuys	10	4
District attorney's staff	24	8
First Universalist Church	101	0
Total	10,941	997

"The pastors of more than a dozen large churches in this city, who have not yet put the league of nations to a vote before their congregations, express the opinion that the membership of their churches are almost unanimously in favor of it."

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, I desire to ask the Senator from Nebraska if he will not introduce into the RECORD also the vote taken by the Omaha Bee. It will be more easily available for him than for me.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator puts me in a very embarrassing position by such a request. I think possibly it would come with better grace from the Senator from Illinois, and I do not want to violate the advice just given by the Senator who has criticized my introduction. I will content myself with what I have already presented.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, I ask that a statement by Sir Robert Borden, and another by a Canadian correspondent, be printed in the RECORD as evidence that the Canadian view of the position of Canada in the league differs from that of Senators who have held that Canada had a voice, but no vote.

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

"CANADA'S STATUS AS A NATION WITHIN THE BRITISH EMPIRE TOLD BY PREMIER—SIR ROBERT BORDEN EXPLAINS DIPLOMATIC POSITION ACHIEVED BY DOMINION AT THE PEACE CONFERENCE—TELLS OF ITS RELATION AS A SELF-GOVERNING BRITANNIC COUNTRY TO THE TREATY.

"In the Canadian section of the Sun of Tuesday last a special parliamentary correspondent in Ottawa gave some highly interesting particulars regarding certain official correspondence arising out of the Dominion's presence at the peace conference and involving the right of her Parliament to discuss and approve of the peace treaty—the position being taken that in the event of a 'show of hands' by the people of Canada they would undoubtedly be a solid unit for the position taken by Sir Robert Borden, namely, that in matters of peace or war which affect the Dominion the decision must rest not with the King or with the British Cabinet but with the Parliament of Canada.

"The character of the representation secured by Canada at the peace conference, her position as a signatory to the treaties, and her status as a member of the league of nations are matters which—owing to the incomplete development of the relations of the various British dominions to the motherland—Americans, and, indeed, many Canadians, only imperfectly understand. The following statement of the Canadian premier, therefore, just made to the Parliament of Canada, touching upon the entire question, is of the utmost international importance:

[By the Right Hon. Sir Robert Laird Borden, G. C. M. G., P. C.]

"The status of the dominions at the peace conference was the subject of long and earnest discussion. Various methods, which it is not necessary to explain, were suggested. In the end I proposed that there should be a distinctive representation for each dominion similar to that accorded to the smaller allied powers, and, in addition, that the British Empire representation of five delegates should be selected from day to day from a panel made up of representatives of the United Kingdom and the Dominions. The proposal was adopted by the imperial war cabinet.

"Early in December preliminary conversations on the making of peace took place in London between representatives of the British Empire, of France, and of Italy, and the proposal which I had already put forward was accepted in principle. The preliminary peace conference began at Paris on January 12, 1919, and the question of procedure, including that of representation, was immediately taken up by the representatives of the principal allied and associated powers, afterwards commonly known as the council of ten. At first strong objection was made to the proposed representation of the British Dominions. Subsequently there was a full discussion in the British Empire delegation at which a firm protest was made against any recession from the proposal adopted in London. In the end that proposal was accepted.

"CANADA'S REPRESENTATION.

"The adoption of the panel system gave to the Dominions a peculiarly effective position. At plenary sessions there were sometimes three Canadian plenipotentiary delegates, two as representatives of Canada and one as representative of the empire. Moreover, throughout the proceedings of the conference the Dominion delegates, as members of the British Empire delegation, were thoroughly in touch with all the proceedings of the conference and had access to all the papers recording its proceedings.

"This enabled them to watch and check those proceedings effectively in the interest of their respective dominions and placed them in a position of decided advantage. Dominion ministers were nominated to and acted for the British Empire on the principal allied commissions appointed by the conference from time to time to consider and report upon special aspects of the conditions of peace.

"On several occasions I was charged with the duty of attending as one of the British Empire representatives on the council of five. Mr. Lloyd-George called upon me to put forward before the council of four the British Empire case in respect of the clauses on economic questions, on the international control of ports, waterways, and railways, and on submarine cables. During the last month of my stay in Paris I acted regularly as chairman of the British Empire delegations in the absence of the prime minister of the United Kingdom, whose duties as a member of the council of four constantly prevented his attendance.

"A STEP FORWARD.

"It is desirable to note an important development in constitutional practice respecting the signature of the various treaties concluded at the conference. Hitherto it has been the practice to insert an article or reservation providing for the adhesion of the dominions. In view of the new position that had been secured, and of the part played by Dominion representatives at the peace table, we thought this method inappropriate and undesirable in connection with the peace treaty. Accordingly I proposed that the assent of the King as high contracting party to the various treaties should, in respect of the dominions, be signified by the signature of the Dominion plenipotentiaries, and that the preamble and other formal parts of the treaties should be drafted accordingly. This proposal was adopted in the form of a memorandum by all the Dominion prime ministers at a meeting which I summoned and was put forward by me on their behalf to the British Empire delegation, by whom it was accepted. The proposal was subsequently adopted by the conference and the various treaties have been drawn up accordingly, so that the dominions appear therein as signatories and their concurrence in the treaties is thus given in the same manner as that of other nations.

"This important constitutional development involved the issuance by the King, as high contracting party, of full powers to the various Dominion plenipotentiary delegates. In order that such powers issued to the Canadian plenipotentiaries might be based upon formal action of the Canadian Government, an order in council was passed on April 10, 1919, granting the necessary authority. Accordingly I addressed a communication to the prime minister of the United Kingdom requesting that necessary and appropriate steps should be taken to establish the connection between this order in council and the issuance of the full powers by his Majesty, so that it might formally appear of record that they were issued on the responsibility of the Government of Canada.

"CANADA AND THE LEAGUE.

"The new and definite status of the dominions at the peace conference is further manifested in the constitution of the league of nations. Since they had enjoyed the same status at the peace conference as that of minor powers, we took the ground that the dominions should be similarly accepted in the future international relationship contemplated by the league. The league of nations' commission, while inclined to accept this in principle, did not at the outset accept all its implications, as was apparent in the first draft of the covenant. This document, however, was professedly tentative. The dominions' case was pressed, and in the final form as amended and incorporated in the treaty of peace with Germany the status of the dominions as to membership and representation in the assembly and council was fully recognized.

"They are to become members as signatories of the treaty, and the terms of the document make no distinction between them and other signatory members. An official statement as to the true intent and meaning of the provisions of the covenant in that regard was secured by me and is of record in the archives of the peace conference.

"A similar question arose in respect of the constitution of the International Labor Organization. Corresponding to the council of the league, there is a labor governing body consisting of delegates nominated by a limited number of Governments. The original form of the labor convention did not adequately recognize the status of the dominions, and at the plenary session of April 11, 1919, when a resolution was proposed that the peace conference approve of the draft convention, I moved that the resolution be amended by adding a provision which authorized the drafting committee to make such amendments as were necessary to have the convention conform to the league of nations in the character of its membership and in the method of adherence. As a result the labor convention was finally amended so that the dominions were placed on the same footing as other members of the International Labor Organization, becoming eligible like others to nominate their Government delegates to the governing body.

"The recognition and status accorded to the British dominions at the peace conference were not won without constant effort and firm insistence. In all these efforts the dominions had the strong and unwavering support of the British prime minister and his colleagues. The constitutional structure of the British Empire is imperfectly understood by other nations, even by a Nation so closely allied in kinship, in language, and

in the character of its institutions as the United States of America. Such lack of comprehension need excite no surprise, because the association between the mother country and the great self-governing dominions has been for years in a condition of development, and that development is not yet complete.

"FUTURE RELATIONS.

"The future relationship of the nations of the Empire must be determined in accordance with the will of the mother country and of each dominion in a constitutional conference to be summoned in the not distant future. Undoubtedly it will be based upon equality of nationhood. Each nation must preserve unimpaired its absolute autonomy, but it must likewise have its voice as to those external relations which involve the issue of peace or of war. So that the Britanic Commonwealth is in itself a community or league of nations which may serve as an exemplar to that world-wide league of nations which was founded on the 28th of last June.

"On behalf of my country I stood firmly upon this solid ground: That in this, the greatest of all wars, in which the world's liberty, the world's justice—in short, the world's future destiny—were at stake, Canada had led the democracies of both the American Continents. Her resolve had given inspiration, her sacrifices had been conspicuous, her effort was unabated to the end. The same indomitable spirit which made her capable of that effort and sacrifice made her equally incapable of accepting at the peace conference, in the league of nations or elsewhere, a status inferior to that accorded to nations less advanced in their development, less amply endowed in wealth, resources, and population, no more complete in their sovereignty, and far less conspicuous in their sacrifice."

—

"TELLS HOW CANADA WON EQUAL STATUS—OFFICIAL CORRESPONDENCE SHOWS STRONG FIGHT AGAINST OLD COLONIAL IDEA—VICTORY FOR BORDEN—THE CHAMPIONS OF AUTONOMY FOUND OPPOSITION FROM OLD-LINE DIPLOMATS.

"OTTAWA, *September 29.*

"Official correspondence tabled in Parliament this week relative to the status of Canada among the nations has aroused a great deal of interest throughout the country. Arising out of the Dominion's presence at the peace conference and the right of her Parliament to discuss and approve of the peace treaty, the correspondence affords an illuminating insight into the silent struggle between the old Downing Street doctrine of centralization and colonialism and the new claim of the Dominions to the status and responsibilities of nationhood.

"Incidentally the correspondence discloses the tremendous difficulties which Sir Robert Borden fought and overcame in achieving for Canada the status of a nation, as well as in replacing the old diplomacy with the new democracy that demands parliamentary approval before decision by the King.

"From October 27, 1918, when Lloyd-George cabled to Sir Robert Borden urging the importance of his attendance at the prospective London conferences, throughout a series of dispatches down to a few days ago, the Canadian prime minister steadfastly maintained the right of the Dominion to be represented at the peace conference and of its Parliament to discuss and approve the treaty, using language in pressing his claims which must have shocked the susceptibilities of the dilettanti diplomatists of the colonial office. Thus, in October, 1918, replying to a message from Lloyd-George, he said:

"'Certainly a very unfortunate impression would be created, and possibly a dangerous feeling may be aroused, if these difficulties (the obstacles against Canada being represented at the peace conference) are not overcome by some solution which will meet the national spirit of the Canadian people. We discussed the subject to-day in council, and I found among my own colleagues a striking insistence which doubtless is indicative of the general opinion existent in this country. In a word, they feel that the new conditions must be met by new precedents.'

"OLD DIPLOMACY FIGHTS ON.

"This question, with all that it meant to Canada in respect of her progress and development as a nation, as well as in respect to her voice and part in the making or avoiding of future wars, was a constant topic until the days when, following the signing at Versailles by the two Canadian plenipotentiaries, the Empire statesmen began returning to their homes. The old diplomacy and the old doctrine of centralization, defeated in so far as acknowledgment of the Dominion's right to have a voice in and to sign the treaty were concerned, were not prepared to give up the fight.

"And so a series of cables, dated in July and August of this year, and written by Lord Milner, secretary of state for the colonies, took the ground that the overseas ministers, having participated with those of Britain in the peace negotiations and having signed the preliminaries of the peace treaty, the King 'would have the same constitutional justification,' in ratifying the treaty 'in respect of the dominions as he has in respect of the United Kingdom.'

"In other words, one of the most salient figures in the old diplomatic and imperial centralization school argued that a group of overseas and United Kingdom ministers meeting and deliberating in secret might make whatever treaties affecting peace and war they chose, and these needed ratification only by his Majesty the King, and not by the Parliaments of the self-governing peoples of the Empire. The fact that these ministers might be completely out of touch or harmony with public feeling in their countries would not matter, according to this Milner idea.

"SIR ROBERT BORDEN'S STAND.

"Sir Robert Borden, intensely nationalist and an uncompromising champion of Canadian autonomy, vigorously challenged this view, declaring, in a message dated July 29, 1919, that 'there is considerable doubt whether, under modern constitutional practices, the King should ratify without first obtaining the approval of Parliament.' He especially differed from the view that the signature of the dominion's ministers to the peace treaty was equivalent to advice to ratify, asking the pertinent question: 'Do you regard this as holding good in the case of the signature of the United Kingdom plenipotentiaries?'

"There were afterwards messages from Lord Milner showing indirectly that his view was unchanged, one of them saying that 'severe pressure being put upon us from Paris' made it impossible that ratification could be held back after September 17. To this Sir Robert Borden replied, on August 4, that Parliament was called for September 1, adding: 'I can not emphasize too strongly the unfortunate results which would certainly ensue from ratification before the Canadian Parliament has had an opportunity of considering the treaty.'

"Happily there were delays on the part of the other powers, and the British Empire was among the first to ratify the treaty, thus avoiding what might have been an awkward situation. A similar difficulty, however, may arise at any time. In that event there is no question that the people of Canada would undoubtedly be a solid unit for the position taken by Sir Robert Borden, namely, that in matters of peace or war which affect this country the decision must rest, not with the King or with the British cabinet, but with the Parliament of Canada."

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. President, a few days ago I introduced into the RECORD a memorial addressed to my colleague [Mr. EDGE] and myself asking us to oppose the league of nations in its present form. That memorial was signed by the chief justice of the supreme court, the justices of all of the three higher courts, the court of errors and appeals, the supreme court, and the circuit court, and by several thousand prominent citizens of the State of New Jersey, manufacturers, bankers, lawyers, all engaged in active pursuits in New Jersey. I now have, supplementary to that, several hundred names added to that memorial, which I ask may be filed with the memorial presented by me a few days ago.

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

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President, I ask permission to have inserted in the RECORD a resolution to the Chamber of Commerce of the city of Pittsburgh, Pa., relating to labor representation in the pending labor conference.

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

PITTSBURGH, PA., *September 30, 1919.*

To the BOARD OF DIRECTORS,
Chamber of Commerce of Pittsburgh.

GENTLEMEN: To your committee on manufacturing and mining has been submitted a communication received from Dr. Vernon W. Peck, addressed to Mr. William M. Furey, vice president, calling attention to the general situation of the country, the personnel of the conference to be held in Washington in October, and the necessity for some protection of the interests of labor in general and the great mass of American people.

Your committee has given this subject very serious thought, and now begs to submit for your consideration and action the following, namely:

"Whereas the President has called a conference to be held at Washington on October 6 'for the purpose of discussing the labor situation in the country and the possibility of formulating plans for the development of a new relationship between capital and labor,' and as this call states that 'there will be 22 representatives of the general public and an equivalent number of representatives of various bodies of organized employees'; and

"Whereas it is well known that the number of employees in this country who are not organized greatly exceed those who belong to labor organizations, it seems to us unfair and unwise that labor representatives should be confined to those who are connected with such organizations; and

"Whereas we feel that the great body of workmen who are not affiliated with organized labor, who faithfully served the Nation in its time of need, should be recognized in such a gathering as is contemplated in the President's call. Such men are in a position to consider the problems of the employer from the standpoint of the actual worker rather than that of the organizer who is not engaged in actual labor:

"We therefore respectfully and earnestly protest against the constitution of this conference so far as labor is concerned, inasmuch as it does not fairly represent the labor of the United States.

"The importance of this is emphasized by our experience in this district during and since the late World War. No large industrial district in the Nation has such an enviable record of large production, freedom from strikes, and industrial unrest as the Pittsburgh district. This is to a large extent, we believe, due to the fact that perhaps in no similar district approaching it in size is there so small a proportion of workers identified with labor organizations. Notwithstanding this, in no similar district were the workmen better paid, better treated, or more prosperous.

"There is a very large number of intelligent, industrious, conservative, and patriotic workmen all over the country who are capable of considering the questions which will come before such a conference in a broad, unselfish, and statesmanlike spirit, and who by their experience can materially aid in settling the questions that now confront us.

"We suggest that if a definite number of delegates were allotted to certain districts or trades to represent the workmen affiliated with each other in these trades or in the manufacture of special products, but not included in any of the accredited labor unions or federations, an equitable selection could be made by a popular vote taken in each company or plant during working hours, the final representatives being selected by these electors from among their own number."

Respectfully submitted.

THE COMMITTEE ON MANUFACTURING AND MINING.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, a few days ago the League to Enforce Peace, which is merely a branch of the English league which was organized in 1911 or 1912, sent out this telegram:

Crisis at hand will determine whether America joins league of nations or forsakes allies and negotiates separate peace with Germany. Vote for any reservations may require resubmission and endanger treaty. Will you join 99 others in giving $1,000 each to League to Enforce Peace, William H. Taft, President, for immediate use in arousing the country to demand prompt ratification in form that will not send treaty back for further negotiations and delay world pacification? Matter very urgent.

GEORGE W. WICKERSHAM,
CLEVELAND H. DODGE,
OSCAR S. STRAUS,
VANCE MCCORMICK,
HERBERT S. HOUSTON,
Finance Committee, League to Enforce Peace.

Mr. President, at the time that was sent out I stated publicly that this money would be used for the purpose of misleading and misrepresenting and corrupting public opinion; corrupting it by using money to deceive the people as to facts concerning this league. Since that time I have had ample proof of the fact that that is the way in which they have been utilizing this fund.

I have in my hand an editorial from the St. Paul Dispatch of October 1, which is known to be an advocate of the league. It says:

MUST HAVE MONEY TO BURN.

The war chest of the League to Enforce Peace must be full to overflowing when its Washington bureau feels justified in dipping into its funds to the extent of prepaying long-wire messages to the leading newspapers of the country utilizing Senate debates for propaganda purposes. Last night, for example, the bureau forwarded to the Pioneer Press, prepaid, a judiciously selected excerpt from the debate between Senators HITCHCOCK and FALL—a thousand-word narrative skillfully arranged to lay emphasis upon the defense of President Wilson by the administration mouthpiece in the Senate and the arraignment of that body for its delay in disposing of the Versailles treaty.

This rather clever piece of propaganda was not used by the Pioneer Press to replace the story from its own Washington bureau, which carried the Senate debate unemasculated and uncolored by treatment. We have no quarrel with the League to Enforce Peace. On the contrary, we find much with which to sympathize in its campaign to create sentiment for the treaty—with interpretative reservations, of course—and to secure the least possible delay in disposing of it. But that is not inconsistent with declining its propaganda and with wondering what must be the extent and source of its financial resources that permit an expenditure so generous. The league must literally have money to burn.

Mr. President, I have seen the arranged debates, or some of them, which have been sent out by the League to Enforce Peace to the press of the country, uncalled for by the press, and paid for by the league, and no Senator reviewing those debates would contend for a moment that the man who arranged them did so with an honest intention of conveying to the country the true facts in regard to what is taking place here.

I have not the slightest objection, Mr. President, to these men who can command their millions sending out their propaganda if they send it in accordance with any rule of decent observance of an honest intention to convey the real facts to the American people. But I here upon the floor of the Senate take the opportunity of saying that this propaganda is tainted by a premeditated, deliberate dishonesty, and a clear purpose to mislead the American people. The men who are sending out these arranged and manipulated reports of debates intend to deceive the people of this country. I have had many letters, some from other publishers, complaining of the method which the league has employed.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, it would be quite interesting, though insignificant, to determine who is furnishing the money for propaganda upon both sides of this question. It is to be presumed that those who are furnishing the money for propaganda in favor of the league of nations are Americans. I suspect maybe that if a full investigation were made it would be found that those who are furnishing the money for the antagonistic propaganda are a great many of them not Americans.

As to whether or not some newspapers have published reports of debates in the Senate that did not contain the full debate, I am not prepared to say, but very frequently that does happen upon every great public question. A Republican paper in an ordinary tariff debate publishes that part of the debate which suits the Republican Party, and a Democratic paper publishes that part of it that suits the Democratic Party, and I suppose that course is being pursued now on both sides in connection with this new alignment of Senate forces, which is not partisan, but which is at least pro and anti. I suspect that if the Senator were to look with equal microscopic attention at the reports that have gone to the papers which represent his side of this controversy he might find that they were, if not unfair, at least not full, too. I do not doubt that now and then any advocate of any cause is unfair, and that any opponent of any cause is also unfair, but this labored attempt to show that there is an immense amount of money behind the league of nations and that there is no money behind this almost universal propaganda against it is weak and must fall by the board.

Whence the money comes I neither know nor care. I do, however, admit that any American citizen has a right to contribute to the distribution of literature in favor of any cause that he advocates or against any cause that he opposes.

It would be quite interesting to know where the traveling expenses and railroad bills and hotel bills and printing bills of various gentlemen who have been opposing the league of nations have come from. I do not know and do not care. If the argument which is sent through the mails is sound and correct and appeals to the reason of the American people, it does not make much difference to me how it happened to get there; and if the man who is making a speech has his expenses paid by Tom, Dick, or Harry, I do not care much for that either, provided he is expressing his honest opinion and is not bought; and I do not believe that charge could be made against either side.

The Senator must remember that "people in glass houses ought not to throw stones." I expect that some of that part of the American public which is in favor of the league of nations is giving its time, its tongue, its energy, and its money to that cause, and that some of those, whether native or hyphenated, who are opposed to it, are giving their time, their tongue, and their money to oppose it. If there is any charge of corruption of any sort to be made by the Senator, the matter ought to be investigated by Congress, and he ought to introduce a resolution to investigate it.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I did not complain that these men were sending out their literature. I simply stated that upon the statement of the paper, an advocate of the league, and upon other facts, they were manipulating the record here which they were sending out. I have seen some of the material in addition, which has been sent to me, which, I say, has been so arranged as to convey a false view. I have no objection at all to their sending out the full debate of the able Senator from Mississippi or any other Senator who is advocating the league, or any part of it—not in the least.

The Senator says that those who live in glass houses should not throw stones. I presume he had reference to the fact that the Senator from Idaho has been out over the country speaking against the league, and that, perhaps, somebody was paying his expenses.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I did not mean that personally; but there have been a thousand of you out talking.

Mr. BORAH. I beg to say that the Senator from Idaho has, with trivial exceptions—which I will be glad to furnish those interested—borne his own expenses. I wish I had more time and more money to spend in that way. I say again that it is not because men are out speaking for or against the league or because literature is sent out that I object. I object to a studied effort to misrepresent the issue. I know that resolutions have been introduced here purporting to come from an organization which was never adopted in the form in which it was presented here.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That ought to be exposed.

Mr. BORAH. I have exposed it once. I read the resolution here, and I read the statement of those who adopted it, which said that the resolution which they adopted was a condemnation of this league; that the resolution was sent to them by the League to Enforce Peace, and that was rejected; that they adopted another, which was a condemnation of the league, but it was sent here as an indorsement of the league.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I also received communications saying that certain resolutions coming from the Pacific slope, signed as coming from certain societies, and so forth, had never come from the societies and the societies had never held any meetings. I did not know whether the statements made to me were true or not; they came for the most part from people whom I did not know. It may be true that various resolutions against the league have come here signed by a certain society when there was no society meeting held. That merely makes it important that Senators should be careful to see that what they furnish to the Senate as food for thought shall be something which they themselves believe to be thoroughly authentic; that is all.

Mr. OWEN. Mr. President, this discussion brings up a practice which some of the States have established which I think could be advantageously adopted by the Senate of the United States. Some of the States have a publicity pamphlet in which the proponents may set forth the claims which they think justify their attitude and in which the opponents, by properly authorized representation, may set forth what they think justifies the contrary view.

If we had a publicity pamphlet, where those in favor of the league could make their statements, with the opposing views in the same pamphlet, it could be economically distributed throughout the country, and in that way the citizens would have an authoritative view on both sides, instead of these partisan or partial views, each one sending out a view of his own, or permitting individuals who may have an interest, either patriotic or otherwise, to undertake to send out statements which are false on either side.

I take this occasion to call the attention of the Senate to the advantages that would flow upon the establishment of a publicity pamphlet, where questions of this character might be economically sent out to the country, with an authorized statement of the opposing views.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. BECKHAM presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Richmond, Ky., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Jones bill, providing for the marking of cost and retail prices of all articles for sale, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. PHELAN presented petitions of sundry citizens of San Francisco, Oakland, Berkeley, and Piedmont, all in the State of California, praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. KENDRICK. I present a resolution adopted by 63 members of Local Union No. 1807, United Brotherhood of Carpenters and Joiners of America, of Graybull, Wyo., regarding the proposed league of nations, which I ask to have printed in the RECORD.

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

"We, the undersigned citizens of Greybull, Wyo., realizing the responsibilities of our citizenship regarding the great question embodied in the proposed league of nations;

"That peace might be established for all time, and now being considered by the Senate of the United States;

"We feel we would be derelict in our duty if we did not express our disapproval of the report of the Foreign Relations Committee on this great question;

"While we believe a few reservations might be desirable and meet with the approval of the American people, we can not but feel that 4 reservations and 40 amendments, as proposed by your committee, would so macerate that great document as to make it null and void; and

"We recognize in the American Federation of Labor the most effective organization opposed to Bolshevism in this country to-day, and we therefore especially protest against the proposed amendment by Senator FALL, of New Mexico, to eliminate the labor section from the league covenant. This amendment would be a repudiation of the recognized loyalty of organized labor during the war and could only have the effect of driving all labor into radicalism.

"Resolution carried, 63 members.

"[SEAL.] "UNITED BROTHERHOOD OF CARPENTERS AND JOINERS OF AMERICA,

"L. L. BISSELL, *President*.

"W. M. RADLER, *Recording Secretary*."

Mr. CAPPER presented a memorial of Local Lodge No. 87, Brotherhood of Railway Carmen, of Horton, Kans., remonstrating against the passage of the so-called Cummins bill, providing for private ownership and control of railroads, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Dickinson County, Kans., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PAGE presented a petition of Local Division No. 1, Ancient Order of Hibernians, of Rutland, Vt., praying for the independence of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. McNARY:

A bill (S. 3191) to provide for the national welfare by assuring an adequate supply of sugar for the people of the United States for the year ending December 31, 1920, conserving the supply of sugar, and controlling the distribution thereof; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. KEYES:

A bill (S. 3192) for the relief of the legal representatives of George W. Soule; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SHIELDS:

A bill (S. 3193) to authorize the Tennessee Bridge Co., a corporation chartered under the laws of the State of Tennessee, to construct a bridge across the Tennessee River near Loudon, Tenn.; to the Committee on Commerce.

A bill (S. 3194) granting an increase of pension to Erastus A. Kelly; and

A bill (S. 3195) granting a pension to John Gentry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 3196) fixing the compensation of United States customs inspectors; and

A bill (S. 3197) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide for the lading or unlading of vessels at night, the preliminary entry of vessels, and for other purposes," approved February 13, 1911; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 3198) granting an increase of pension to William S. Davidson (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARDING:

A bill (S. 3199) granting an increase of pension to Edward E. Gould; and

A bill (S. 3200) granting an increase of pension to William F. Slack; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 3201) fixing the salary of the district attorney for the eastern district of New York; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 3202) granting leave of absence to officers of the United States Coast Guard, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

AMENDMENT TO FIRST DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. JONES of Washington submitted an amendment proposing to appropriate $17,000,000 to carry out the provisions of the act approved March 12, 1914, relative to the location, construction, and operation of railroads in the Territory of Alaska, as amended, including expenses incident to conducting hearings and examining estimates for appropriations in Alaska, etc., intended to be proposed by him to the first deficiency appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

INCREASED PAY OF POSTAL EMPLOYEES.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The morning business is closed.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res.

151) to provide additional compensation for employees of the Postal Service, and making an appropriation therefor.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which had been reported from the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads with an amendment to strike out all after the resolving clause and insert a substitute.

The Secretary proceeded to read the substitute.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, I desire to offer an amendment to the amendment. Shall I do it now or at the end of the reading of the entire amendment?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment had better be read first.

The Secretary resumed and concluded the reading of the amendment of the committee, which is as follows:

That because of the unusual conditions which now exist, the compensation provided for in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920," approved February 28, 1919, the following classes of employees shall be increased as follows for such fiscal year:

(a) Postmasters at offices of the third class, assistant postmasters, and clerks, including special clerks, finance clerks, bookkeepers, and other employees of offices of the first and second class, letter carriers in the City Delivery Service, carriers in the village delivery service, employees in Government-owned automobile service, supervisory officials, railway postal clerks, including substitutes, and the assistant agent and clerks at the postal stamp agency, Dayton, Ohio, who receive compensation at the rate per annum of—

(1) $1,000, to be increased $240.
(2) $1,100 or $1,200, to be increased $200.
(3) $1,300, $1,400, $1,500, or $1,600, to be increased $150.
(4) Not less than $1,700 nor more than $2,500, to be increased $100.

(b) Printers, mechanics, and skilled laborers who receive compensation at the rate per annum of—

(1) $1,150, to be increased $150.
(2) $1,265, to be increased $135.
(3) $1,380, to be increased $70.

(c) Watchmen, messengers, and laborers who receive compensation at the rate per annum of—

(1) $1,035, to be increased $205.

(d) Clerks at division headquarters of post-office inspectors who receive compensation at the rate per annum of—

(1) $1,035, to be increased $205.
(2) $1,150, to be increased $150.
(3) $1,380, to be increased $70.
(4) $1,540, to be increased $110
(5) $1,760, to be increased $40.
(6) $1,980, to be increased $20.

(e) Superintendents, requisition fillers, packers, and laborers who receive compensation at the rate per annum of—

(1) $1,150, to be increased $150.
(2) $1,540, to be increased $110.

(f) Rural letter carriers on daily routes and rural letter carriers on two triweekly routes whose routes are—

(1) Eleven miles or less in length, to be increased $75.
(2) Over 11 miles and under 20 miles in length, to be increased $100.
(3) Over 20 miles and under 24 miles in length, to be increased $150.
(4) Twenty-four miles or over in length, to be increased $200.

(g) Rural letter carriers on triweekly routes of—

(1) Eleven miles or less in length, to be increased $37.50.
(2) Over 11 miles and under 20 miles in length, to be increased $50.
(3) Over 20 miles and under 24 miles in length, to be increased $75.
(4) Over 24 miles in length, to be increased $100.

(h) Messengers at postal-stamp agency, Dayton, Ohio, who receive compensation at the rate per annum of—

(1) $840, to be increased $160.

(i) Postmasters at offices of the fourth class to be increased by an amount equal to 10 per cent of their present compensation.

(j) Substitute, temporary, and auxiliary clerks at first and second class post offices, and substitute, temporary, and auxiliary letter carriers in the City Delivery Service shall receive during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, in lieu of their present compensation, a compensation of 60 cents per hour for each hour of service performed.

SEC. 2. That increases in compensation herein provided shall, as to officers, employees, and substitute, temporary, and auxiliary employees in the Postal Service at the time of the passage of this act, be effective as of July 1, 1919, or as of the date since that when such officers or employees entered the Postal Service; but none of the increases provided herein shall be applicable to officers and employees who have received an increase in their compensation of more than $300 per annum during the current fiscal year.

SEC. 3 That no post office shall be advanced to the next higher class as a result of the increases in compensation of postmasters herein provided.

SEC. 4. That in order to provide for the increased compensation herein authorized, so much as is necessary is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to supplement the amounts appropriated for the various classes of employees herein mentioned, in the act entitled "An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920," approved February 28, 1919.

Mr. POMERENE. Mr. President, on yesterday I took the liberty to read a telegram from the postmaster of the city of Cleveland bearing on the conditions in that post office. I have similar telegrams from the postmasters of Cincinnati, Columbus, Toledo, Dayton, Youngstown, Akron, Canton, Springfield, Portsmouth, Zanesville, and a number of other of the smaller cities of Ohio which tell substantially the same story. It is a physical impossibility for the postmasters, clerks, and carriers to keep up the post-office system with that degree of efficiency which we all desire and which the public deserves unless some attention is given to the welfare of these employees. The resignations alone from these several offices are sufficient to cripple the service. I am not going to take the time to read these telegrams, but I am going to give some of the information which I have had my clerk tabulate.

In Akron there were 26 resignations from the clerical force during the last year and 112 carriers. In Canton 5 regular clerks and 6 regular carriers resigned. In Cincinnati 40 regular clerks, 11 substitute clerks, 5 regular carriers, and 3 substitute carriers resigned. In Cleveland 54 regular clerks, 425 temporary clerks, 59 regular carriers, and 481 temporary carriers resigned. In Columbus 28 regular clerks, 5 substitute clerks, 31 temporary clerks, 5 regular carriers, 11 substitute carriers, and 3 temporary carriers resigned. In Dayton there were 90 resignations out of 230 employees; in Portsmouth 12 resignations out of a total of 32 employees; in Springfield resignations of 12 regular employees and numerous temporary employees; in Toledo resignations of 40 regular employees, 24 substitutes, 121 temporaries, or 60 per cent of the total employees; in Youngstown resignations of 20 regular clerks and 13 regular carriers; in Zanesville 2 resignations, others too long in service to accept other employment. The total resignations in these offices are 122 regular clerks, 16 substitute clerks, 456 temporary clerks, 69 regular carriers, 14 substitute carriers, and 484 temporary carriers, and nearly all of them because of the insufficient pay of these servants of the public.

I have before me an editorial in the Cleveland Press as to conditions as they exist in that city. I want to read just two or three short paragraphs from the editorial, because it confirms the information which I have just given to the Senate:

Scores of bags bursting with mail lie unopened for days at a time in the Cleveland post office. This condition is common throughout the country. Newspapers traveling between Cincinnati and Cleveland, for instance, arrive from 5 to 10 days late.

Another paragraph:

Low wages and the difficulty of getting ahead have caused many experienced postal workers to seek other work and are keeping men from entering the post-office service.

At the civil service—

And I call this matter especially to the attention of Senators who are interested—

At the civil-service post-office examinations in Cleveland a fortnight ago there were 28 applicants. Twelve hundred took the examination in November, 1916.

That tells the story. The compensation is not sufficient to get live, wide-awake capable men into the service. The marvel to me is that there have not been more resignations. If I may state a little experience that I had in my own city just a few months ago, I met one of our carriers at the foot of the elevator shaft in the building in which I have my office. He had an enormous pack of mail and I was curious enough to ask him how many pounds he had. He then had 95 pounds that he was carrying in his pack, and he said that sometimes he had even more. That is burden enough to kill a man, but the postmaster is compelled to weigh down the carriers because he can not get additional carriers who are needed for the good of the service.

In practically every branch of the public service and every branch of private service in which the Government has been either directly or indirectly interested there have been enormous increases in pay. Strikes have been threatened in order to force these increases. The mail carriers and clerks have not struck, and they ought not under any circumstances to strike. But, on the other hand, the Congress of the United States ought to be liberal enough with this class of employees so that they would not be tempted to strike. There are two sides to that proposition and two duties, one on the part of the employees and another on the part of Congress.

Now, what shall these increases be? And I shall take only a moment further. I sent out a number of telegrams to these different postmasters asking their suggestions as to what the increases should be, and I got very frank replies. Some of them made their estimate on a percentage basis, and those who thus expressed themselves said that the increase should be from 30 to 35 per cent. Others of these postmasters made suggestions as to increases in lump sums, and they vary from $150 to $300 and over, none of them below $150.

As I understand the joint resolution, the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads has dealt somewhat more liberally with the employees than did the House. I am glad of that. I will very frankly say that in certain particulars if I had been framing the bill, knowing the situation as I do in Ohio, I would have added somewhat to the increases which are proposed by the committee; but I shall accept the committee's judgment in that behalf because I understand in their judgment, all things considered, it is the best that can be done.

Every man, woman, and child in the country is interested in maintaining the efficiency of this service. We can not get live, alert men unless we give them a living wage. I hope there will be little or no opposition to the proposed increase.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, in support of the views of the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] and of the bill reported by the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, I ask leave to print as a portion of my remarks a carefully prepared statement from the post-office clerks of the State of Washington presented to the joint commission on postal salaries by Mr. J. H. Mitcham, of Spokane, Wash., a postal clerk himself, which makes a comparison that is enlightening in the consideration of this question, between the increases in the cost of living and the increases which have been made in the salaries of the postal employees.

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

Memorandum respectfully submitted by the post-office clerks of the State of Washington by J. H. Mitcham, of Spokane.

To the JOINT COMMISSION ON POSTAL SALARIES:

The purpose of this report is to show what the existing working conditions are at the present time in the first and second class post offices of the State of Washington, and also to show what the increase in the cost of living has been in this State from 1913 to 1919, and the amount of increase the clerks have received during the same time.

The principal characteristic of the following is to establish a higher permanent salary classification for the employees so that they can reasonably meet the increase in the cost of living. We also believe that a higher rate should be paid to all permanent employees. The continual shifting of temporary employees is the chief obstacle to efficient office help and a detriment to the service.

Under the present system, employees have to serve for some time as temporary clerks or substitute clerks before they are appointed as regular clerks. The salaries paid to these temporary employees are not sufficient to support them; and, consequently, in many offices of the State we have a complete turnover of substitute help every 45 days. Experience has convinced us that these clerks should be paid a higher salary, as the result will be of benefit to the department. The department would receive the benefit of experienced employees, while the employees' interest in the work would be stimulated, and the added responsibility would increase self-respect. There would be more cooperation between different divisions and branches of the service which is sadly lacking at present.

"Wages have increased 107 per cent in four years, since March, 1915," according to a statement compiled by the New York State industrial commission. "Business chronicle of the Pacific Northwest, June 14, 1919."

The average wage increase of post-office clerks have been but 15.4 per cent during the same time.

In regard to the existing condition existing in the State of Washington, we wish to submit the following for your information, from Seattle and Spokane:

SEATTLE.

Number of regular clerks, July 1, 1918	253
Number of regular clerks, July 1, 1919	285
Overtime clerks, July 1, 1918, to June 30, 1919, inclusive:	
Terminal station ... hours	10,155
Main office ... do	18,603
Stations ... do	2,252
Total ... do	31,010
Amount paid	$13,896.66

Equal to practically 13 men for 1 year at $1,000.

Amount paid in addition to above:	
Temporary substitute clerks, July 1, 1918, to June 30, 1919, inclusive	80,963.70
Regular substitute clerks, July 1, 1918, to June 30, 1919, inclusive	20,491.10
Total	101,454.80

Equal to 101 clerks at $1,000 per annum.

SPOKANE.

Number of regular clerks, July 1, 1918	92
Number of regular clerks, July 1, 1919	93
Overtime regular clerks, July 1, 1918, to June 30, 1919, approximately ... hours	5,133
Amount paid	$2,294.43

Equal to 2 men for 1 year at $1,000.

Temporary substitute clerks, July 1, 1918, to June 30, 1919 ... hours	9,726
Amount	$3,890.40

Taking these figures as a basis, it will be seen that if a higher permanent classification salary is paid all concerned would be benefited thereby and would serve to bring them into more harmonious relations with each other.

From the evidence submitted to us in reference to the increase of the cost of living in the State of Washington, we conclude as follows:

(a) A glance at the following statistics will show that there has been an approximate increase of 102 per cent from January, 1913, to July, 1919, for all commodities:

Wholesale prices.

[Issued by U. S. Department of Labor.]

	1913	1914	1915	1916	1917	1918	1919
Farm products	100	101	102	108	147	205	220
Food	100	102	106	114	150	188	204
Clothes	100	99	96	110	161	209	231
Fuel and light	100	99	86	102	170	169	181
Metal products	100	92	83	126	183	173	172
Building material	100	98	94	99	106	136	160
Chemicals and drugs	100	101	106	140	144	216	179
House furnishings	100	103	101	105	128	188	233
Miscellaneous	100	98	98	107	137	178	206
All commodities	100	100	98	110	150	185	202

(b) According to the latest and most authentic advices and report that were recently received at this office from the Department of Labor, of Washington, D. C., and from the University of Washington, who have made a very thorough investigation of the increase of the cost of living, the State of Washington will show that since the year 1913 the cost of foodstuffs has advanced 100 per cent. During the past year alone food increased 14 per cent. Since December, 1915, there has been an average increase of 120 per cent in the cost of wearing apparel.

(c) We desire to call your attention to the subject of night work in post offices. This affects the clerks rather than the carriers. In the divisions where mail is distributed, and to a lesser extent in other departments, clerks are required to begin and finish their hours of duty at all hours of the day and night. Approximately two-thirds of the workers in the mailing and city distribution sections begin their hours of duty from 2 p. m. to 3.30 p. m., finishing work from 10.30 p. m. to midnight. There is also a small number required to work from midnight to 8.30 a. m.

These workers are compelled to work largely by artificial light, causing eyestrain and the early necessity of wearing glasses. Moreover, the unnatural hours cause them to become easy prey to sickness and disease. These hours also thrust the responsibilities of family life upon the wife; children are deprived of the care and guidance which a father could give, for the father sees them only when they are asleep, or on Sundays, if he has that day free from his work. So, many children fail to develop into good citizens through lack of training which only a father can give. Heads of families find that these hours cause additional expense of light, heat, and fuel, owing to the necessity of preparing meals for the postal worker separately from the rest of the family.

We would recommend that all the employees of the Postal Service who are required to work between the hours of 6 p. m. and 6 a. m. be given a time differential by which 45 minutes shall be credited as an hour for all work performed between 6 p. m. and 6 a. m.

(d) House rent in the city of Seattle is now beyond the limits of the possible. There are practically no houses to rent, and the rent has increased to such an extent as to make it a matter of public concern.

In Spokane house rents have increased 30 per cent from July 1, 1918, to July 1, 1919, and have increased 20 per cent from July 1, 1919, to the present time, making a total increase of 50 per cent from July 1, 1918, to September 15, 1919.

We have pointed out to you briefly the materials that have soared higher, and we ask you to give us a higher permanent salary classification that will enable us to live as American citizens and bring up our children under American standards of living. The fact is that $2,500 a year will not permit an employee to save any money under the present cost of living. The University of Washington has scaled the matter down as fine as it can be done, and it allows $2,004.79 as the minimum amount to support a family of five. The Government demands of its employees a certain standard of living. Can the Government afford to demand of its employees those things when it does not provide sufficient wages to pay the cost?

We therefore earnestly urge the fixing of a higher classification: such an award will bear the fruit of tranquil and efficient service and of industrial peace for all concerned.

Respectfully submitted by the post-office clerks of the State of Washington, through J. H. Mitcham, of Spokane, Wash.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I believe that the merit of the amendment of the Senate Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to the joint resolution as passed by the House consists in a recognition of a greater need for an increase of the low classes of employees than those of the higher classes, a nicer discrimination, a more special gradation of the proposed increases with a consequent better adaptation to the respective needs of the different classes of the employees. For that reason I am glad to support the measure, and I am particularly glad to take this opportunity to express my compliments and my gratitude to the postal employees as a class for the manner in which they have conducted themselves and their organization during the critical times the country has been through in the last year or more.

I say this particularly in view of the contrast that has appeared between the patriotic attitude of the postal employees as compared with the unpatriotic and dangerous attitude that has been taken by many other classes of employees as is shown by the epidemic of strikes from which the country has been and now is suffering. Those strikes were for the deliberate purpose of cutting off production, embarrassing production, and creating suffering, and have not been confined to peace times. Many of them were precipitated when the country was facing the crisis of a great war, in which its independence was at stake and of which those who are responsible for the the cessation of essential industries caused by strikes seemed to be perfectly indifferent to the outcome of the war and to the consequences upon the Nation. During all that time the postal employees made no complaint; they redoubled their efforts under disadvantageous circumstances, inadequate force, and inadequate facilities, and they are deserving of the good will and favorable consideration of Congress and the country.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I have conferred with the men employed in the Post Office Department on many occasions and have directly heard the story of their difficult position in trying to live and support their families on the wages that have been granted by the Government. I am much pleased to see here to-day that there is no serious opposition to the joint resolution presented by the committee, which in a measure meets their demands.

I have been of the opinion since my knowledge of Washington became more intimate, that the public servants are, I may say,

not adequately compensated; that in no branch of the Government service are they adequately compensated, and that was before the pressure of the high cost of living made it almost a necessity for the Government as a measure of relief to give increased pay in the form of temporary bonuses to the public servants.

Holding that position, I am very glad to support the joint resolution.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, it is my purpose to support the joint resolution. From my understanding of conditions I have thought that this class of employees and the third and fourth class postmasters are the poorest paid of any officials and employees in the Government service. I understand, however, that an increase of $100 was allowed to these employees on July 1 and that the old bonus of $200 allowed last year is continued into this year. This joint resolution will make an additional increase of whatever the percentage is.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. KIRBY. Yes.

Mr. KING. For information, I desire to ask, am I to understand that those who are to be the beneficiaries under this joint resolution will receive $150, or whatever amount is granted under this bill, and, in addition to that and their regular salaries, receive $100 and $200 more?

Mr. KIRBY. I understand that in addition to their regular salary they received an increase of $100 on the 1st of July; that the old bonus of $200 of last year is still continued on their salaries; and that they also receive this additional increase over all that amount.

Mr. KING. That will be $450 more.

Mr. KIRBY. I do not know what the aggregate is.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will yield, I should like to ask the chairman of the committee whether the understanding of the Senator from Arkansas is correct, that those who are to be the beneficiaries of this joint resolution get, first, the compensation which is allowed them by law; second, a $200 bonus; third, the $100 increase provided in some law heretofore passed and which became operative on the 1st of July of this year; and then the amount provided in this bill, which is not less than $150; so that would be, in addition to their salaries, $450 plus to every person in the Postal Service?

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, the Senator from Utah is confused with reference to what the employees now get in the Postal Service.

Mr. KIRBY. The Senator from Utah does not state their compensation as I myself understand it to be.

Mr. TOWNSEND. No. I shall be very glad to answer the Senator's question, if he will put it to me.

Mr. KIRBY. I understand that on July 1 an increase of $100 was granted to these employees; I understand, further, that the sum of $200, the bonus of last year, is still continued, which would be $300, in addition to whatever percentage is allowed by this bill.

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is correct, except that not all of these employees received the $100 increase, because that was allowed only in connection with regular promotions; that was a part of their salary.

Mr. KIRBY. That was my understanding.

Now, Mr. President, to discuss this matter a little further——

Mr. POMERENE. Those promotions, as I understand, depended upon the length of service as well as upon the record of efficiency of the employees.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The promotions have embraced only a portion of the employees; there never has been any law providing that all clerks who have even served the same length of time should be promoted; those promoted have averaged from 60 to 75 per cent of the number of employees, the selection to be made by the department for efficiency. Those promotions were suspended for one year. This year they have been restored, but still the employees are lacking one year's promotion. We are taking the compensation which they are now receiving under the existing law and increasing it by the amount fixed in the joint resolution, provided that during the year no employee has received an increase in excess of $300.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, to discuss this matter a little further, I desire to say that when the shopmen's strike was pending I received a letter on the subject from a bank cashier who lived in a substantial town in my State. He said, "I went down to discuss this strike with a car repairer at the junction here; I discovered that he had quit work when he was receiving $3,600 a year—$300 a month." I thought that must be a mistake; but that is what the bank cashier wrote me. He further said, "No man in our bank has ever received more than $2,000 a year salary whether he be president, cashier, or occupied any other position. We live in the same town in which this other man lives, and the same high cost of living overshadows us as it does the other man." Therefore the writer of the letter did not seem to have much sympathy for a strike under those conditions.

Now, let us go a little further. The soldier has come back from service overseas, where he went to serve his country, daily risking his life that we here might live in safety. He got but $30 a month and his board. We have raised the salaries of all Government employees—first $120; last year, after the war was over, we made the increase $240 a year, and now it is proposed as to postal employees that they shall have this additional increase. I am not saying that it is wrong, but when the soldiers come to us and say that they ought to have five or six months' extra pay, amounting in all to about $150, shall we say "No." Where is there any justice in that, under the conditions as they now exist, when the man who risked his life for his country got but $30 a month and has come home broke? We gave him but $60, and shall we say, "That is the end of it with you"? Then the profiteer who had done well at home while the soldier was fighting for us all charged him about $46 for a $19 suit and left him another ground-floor start in life.

There ought to be some equality in the treatment of Government employees and of those who served the Government in its time of need. I am going to support this bill, for probably it is necessary that what it proposes should be done. I do not think there are more resignations from the Postal Service, however, in any of the cities than there have been from other business of like kind; and probably such resignations are due to the shortage of labor and the consequent increased demand for workmen. I do not think these employees will be getting more than they are worth when this increase is granted to them; but when the time comes, I think the other proposition which I have stated in regard to the soldiers ought to be remembered.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, at the proper time I shall ask for the consideration of an amendment consisting of the insertion of the word "only," after the word "year," on line 2 of page 3 of the joint resolution.

I have no doubt the committee has considered this joint resolution very carefully, and of course that involves the consideration of the reasons for the proposed increase in salaries. They have, after mature deliberation, proposed an amendment which increases the annual expenditures of the Government by something near $40,000,000. They know more than I do about the situation and the need for some readjustment of salaries and compensation of post-office employees; but I do not think that the members of the committee can be more observant than I of the general conditions applicable to this and all similar measures which we can not ignore and which will persist regardless of remedial legislation of this sort.

This is one of a series of progressive measures designed to enable the beneficiaries to overtake the high cost of living. It is a governmental experiment paralleling private experiments of similar character begun even before the war and still in operation. The theory is that when the high cost of living rises an increase in compensation will cure the difficulty by equalizing income and outgo. The fact is that these increases are not even palliatives of the evil. Their only effect is to accelerate further increases in all commodity prices. That has been recognized by organizations which on several occasions have demanded higher wages and received them. It has been conceded by the representatives of the railroad brotherhoods as being no palliative whatever but only as justifying—perhaps I should say as inevitably causing—a corresponding rise in the price of all commodities, and particularly those which are necessary to existence.

This $40,000,000, for all the good that it will do those who receive it, might just as well be taken to a crematory and thrown into the fire. This $40,000,000, Mr. President, will pass through the hands of those who receive the fund from the Government into the hands of those who supply them with their daily requirements, and consequently it will be succeeded by other bills of similar character, designed for the same purpose, and which will be enacted only to have the same result. The spectacle of the kitten chasing its own tail can be understood. The kitten is exercising and enjoying itself, interfering with nobody but amusing all. The spectacle of the American Congress taking that interesting object lesson, however, as a precedent for legislation, at the cost of millions of dollars to the taxpayers of the United States, is deplorable. When the kitten catches its tail Uncle Sam will seize the little end of the difficulty and hold it about as long.

If the salaries of these officials were doubled they would get some immediate relief, because they would have for a few days a

fair start of old High Cost of Living, but as soon as he sat up and discovered the existence of this fund, just so soon would he take to his feet and win the race as easily as ever.

We learn nothing, Mr. President, in matters of this kind, particularly where money is involved. The Government pays it; we have plenty of it; so what is the difference? These employees need relief, that I concede, but I assert that the only possible governmental remedy for the trouble—and that is an expensive one—is that which Great Britain adopted long ago and which it is still pursuing. I refer, of course, to the purchase by the Government of large quantities of the necessary commodities and furnishing them to Government employees at rates within the amount of their compensation, charging the loss to general national account. It costs very much less than this sort of thing, because the Government, as a wholesale purchaser, can in some degree dictate its own prices, which will be less than those which the individual is charged; and, as a consequence, where there is a loss to the public it is minimized, while on the other hand the employee does get something substantial. Here nobody benefits except the supply man. The employee finds, within a fortnight or so after his increase has been granted, that the balance between what he gets and what he pays out is just what it was before.

Fundamentally it does not make any difference what a man's wages are; the question is, What can he exchange them for? It goes without saying that if a man can get more of the commodities of life for $5 than he can get for $15 his $5 wage is much more beneficial than his $15 wage and is a good deal more satisfactory.

I have discussed what I have assumed and believe to be the reason for enormously advancing prices not only in the United States but the world over. I do not believe that the causes which have been assigned on several occasions by some of us for this unsatisfactory condition can be successfully challenged, and I am very sure that legislation by the American Congress, except in so far as actual profiteering is concerned and can be detected, will not only prove disappointing, but will increase that public complaint which assumes that if we will only do so we can legislate anything into existence or out of existence; that we possess here a magic power, a sort of representative necromancy, through the manipulation of which all the ills of men can be cured and all those which are threatened can be prevented.

Mr. DIAL. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Colorado yield to the Senator from South Carolina?

Mr. THOMAS. I yield.

Mr. DIAL. The Senator understands, of course, in addition to what he has already stated, that this bill also relates back to the 1st of July?

Mr. THOMAS. Oh, yes. We do not pass any special appropriation bills now but that we arrange them as the old darky arranged his coon trap, so as to catch them "a-comin' and a-gwine." Of course, it is retroactive. That has been the attitude of labor in nearly all of the demands which it has made for increased wages in the past. It has its retroactive character, established by the Government during the war, but crystallized into a precedent, so that whatever change we make will in all probability be carried back sufficiently far in the past to satisfy temporarily the demands of those whose wants are the subject of consideration.

I know that men and women are quitting the service for more lucrative employment. They will quit just the same, whether we pass this joint resolution or not. Just so long as the humbler forms of labor receive extraordinary compensation measured in dollars and cents, just so long will the salaried employee drop his job, whether it be a public or a private one, and take in exchange for it something which though harder carries increased compensation. That is human nature. School-teachers are leaving their schools in droves in different parts of the country. They are obeying the same lure, supplemented by the need for a larger income. If Senators think they can stop this exodus from the public service by the enactment of this measure, I am satisfied that they will be disappointed.

In one of the recent Sunday supplements I read a little incident of a humorous character which well illustrates the situation. It related to an engineer of accomplishments who applied for employment in response to an advertisement. The would-be employer said, "We are not employing engineers. We want workmen." He said, "I know it. I can not afford to work for you as an engineer, the pay is too small, but I want my $10 a day as an ordinary laborer, and I am applying in that capacity."

It is all very well, even in the religious world, for men to preach Christ, and Him crucified, at $10 a week, when times are normal; but $10 a day in private employment somewhere, no matter what the labor, is a good deal more attractive now, and I do not wonder that ministers of the gospel are said to be also following the general current and postponing salvation—which is now the only thing in the country said to be free—for a more propitious occasion, while taking advantage of the interesting conditions of the present time and getting enough to clothe the wife and feed the children.

When these additions are made, the amount of compensation which these employees will be receiving is very much less than the lowest prevailing standard of wages for the humblest and hardest labor. It is an unnatural condition, and the only way in which we can meet it and keep these employees is to pay the employee more than he will get by working elsewhere. But when you do that you will have another bond issue, and a heavy one.

So, Mr. President, I assert that however well intended this joint resolution may be, and however apparent the necessity for it, it will not accomplish the purpose intended, and as a consequence we shall either have to repeal it or, what is most improbable, stop this mad legislative effort to overtake the constantly increasing prices of everything in the world by legislating constantly increasing amounts of compensation.

The Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY] complains of the Government's treatment of its soldiers. His argument presupposes that the life and career of a soldier is a matter of compensation. I am not surprised that that view obtains, in view of the pension history of the country, in view of the bids we are always making for the political power of the returned soldier when organized, for we placate his vote at the public expense whenever the opportunity offers. But, Mr. President, the job of a soldier is one which imposes upon him the temporary exercise of the highest obligation of a citizen. Of course, he is poorly paid. Frequently he is poorly protected. Theoretically the Government furnishes him every thing that he needs. But the returning soldier, Mr. President, after his discharge has no difficulty in securing employment in this country if he will take it, and most of them gladly do so. I have heard of instances where jobs were offered and refused for the assigned reason that not jobs but easy positions were desired. I have heard of others that have been refused because their acceptance would remove the soldier from the excitements of city life and carry him into the country. But with aliens leaving the United States by the thousand every week, with strikes and lockouts the order of the day, with industries hungering for production and appreciating the need thereof, the soldier will do very much better and is doing very much better by going to work, either in his old occupation or in some better one, than by insisting upon bonuses from the Treasury of the United States, which can be paid only with revenues sadly needed for public administration.

Six months' pay, Mr. President, at $30 a month, is $180 per soldier. Multiply that by 4,000,000, and it totals three-quarters of a billion dollars. It must come from the pockets of the taxpayers, now sorely needed by a Government facing the certainty of a huge deficiency at the end of the fiscal year.

I do not know whether other Senators have my experience—I think they do—but I am getting scores of letters every week from taxpayers, men and women upon whose shoulders has been laid the greatest burden of personal taxation ever known in American history, and equally the greatest ever known anywhere else. They are naturally becoming restive. They should have done so long ago. About all the taxpayers are good for is to bleed them. If they do not like it, let them quit earning money or accumulating property. There are not so many of them as there are those who want the pleasure of spending it, so we are not particularly concerned about them.

But I am beginning to think they are waking up. I hope so. And when they do and focus public attention upon legislative blunders in finance and point to our prodigal extravagance and demand an accounting, they may collectively compose a political force of which we will take quite as respectful notice as we now pay to other elements of our population.

Mr. President, I have no intention, I assure the Senator having charge of the joint resolution, of offering any obstruction to its final consideration. I felt bound to state my attitude concerning it, even at the risk of tedious reiteration. But I do think, Mr. President, that we should in no uncertain way limit this increased appropriation to the current fiscal year. The joint resolution does it, probably; I am not prepared to say that it does not; but I think the insertion of the world "only" on page 3, at the end of line 2, will make it impossible to consider it hereafter as a precedent, or permit it to be used as a basis for increased permanent compensation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. NEW in the chair). Does the Senator from Colorado offer that as an amendment?

Mr. THOMAS. If there is no other amendment before the Senate, I will offer it as an amendment to the amendment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will state the amendment to the amendment.

The SECRETARY. On page 3, line 2, after the word "year" and before the colon, insert the word "only," so as to read: "The following classes of employees shall be increased as follows for such fiscal year only."

Mr. TOWNSEND. I will say to the Senator from Colorado that there is no question about that being the intent, and I believe it is effectuated by the wording.

Mr. THOMAS. It may be.

Mr. TOWNSEND. But I have no objection to inserting the word "only."

The amendment to the amendment was agreed to.

Mr. HARRISON. Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate so as not to be able to get a vote by 2 o'clock, as I understand it is the desire of the chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads to get a vote by that hour. I am very much in favor of the joint resolution, because I am sure that the increases which are provided for as a rule are all right. There may be some instances where there should have been a larger increase. I want to point out what I think are two of those instances, and I am going to propose amendments to take care of those two propositions.

If the Senator from Michigan will bear with me, I notice on page 3 that it is provided that—

Postmasters at offices of the third class, assistant postmasters, and clerks, including special clerks, finance clerks, bookkeepers, and other employees of offices of the first and second class, letter carriers in the City Delivery Service, carriers in the village delivery service.

And so forth.

But when the increases to be provided for the various employees in these various branches are stated I note that the carriers in the village delivery service are omitted. Whether it was the intention of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads not to provide an increase for the carriers in the village delivery service I do not know; but it would seem to me that they ought to be provided for the same as others.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The committee intended to provide for them, and from the information which was obtained from the Post Office Department, and we relied on the information from that department as to the salaries which were being paid, we believed that all those people came within the $1,000 class. However, I am going to propose an amendment, so that in subdivision 1 the increase shall cover those receiving $1,000 or less, inserting the words "or less."

Mr. HARRISON. The Senator proposes to amend the joint resolution on line 12, page 3, by making it read "$1,000 or less, to be increased $240"?

Mr. TOWNSEND. That is right.

Mr. HARRISON. That is thoroughly agreeable to me, and will practically take care of the amendment I was going to offer to that phase of the joint resolution, but which I will not offer in view of what the Senator from Michigan said. My proposed amendment was as follows:

Carriers in the village delivery service to be increased $240: *Provided*, That carriers serving half time shall receive one-half of such increase.

I understand that there are a good many rural village carriers who work only half time, and it would seem to me that they should not receive the whole $240.

Mr. TOWNSEND. The Senator is absolutely correct about that, and my object in putting it in here, and also putting in another provision covering in express terms "employees in the mail equipment shops," in order that that matter may go to conference and that we may find out what are the exact facts.

I have tried, as I said, to obtain full information from the department, but I shall offer that amendment, so that when the joint resolution goes to conference we can find out what the compensation is, because the committee wants to reach them all.

Mr. HARRISON. I am sure of that. I shall not offer the amendment I had prepared, because the Senator's amendment will take care of the situation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Michigan offer that as an amendment now?

Mr. TOWNSEND. No. I am going to offer it. I simply gave notice that I would.

Mr. HARRISON. I understand that the Senator from Michigan intends to offer that amendment later.

The theory of the joint resolution, I understand, is to grant a larger percentage of increase on the smaller salaries, and on the larger salaries a proportionate decrease in percentage. Carrying out that theory, I can not understand why the committee increased fourth-class postmasters only 10 per cent. I was very glad, indeed, on yesterday to hear the statement of the Senator from Michigan on a larger increase than 10 per cent to take care of fourth-class postmasters. I understand from what the Senator from Michigan said that he would not oppose a further increase to the fourth-class postmasters. A great many increases are larger than 10 per cent. Fourth-class postmasters get all the way from $200 up to $999; and to carry out the theory of the joint resolution, as I said before, the fourth-class postmasters should receive a larger percentage of increase than 10 per cent.

There are, I know, a great many postmasters who are appointed and hold the positions simply in order to bring trade, perhaps, to their places of business out in the country; but there are a great many other instances where postmasters have to provide a building, maintain a separate building, and furnish light and fuel, in order to give good service to the patrons of their particular post offices. It would seem to me that, where that is necessary, where the postmaster has to go to the expense of maintaining a separate building or a separate room, and of furnishing fuel and light, the Government ought to pay for that service.

So I offer an amendment to the amendment, which I ask to have read.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Secretary will read it.

The SECRETARY. On page 5, line 11, of the committee amendment, strike out "10" and insert "15"; also strike out the period at the end of line 12, on page 5, and insert:

And in all cases where the post office is kept in a room or building in which no other business is conducted they shall be allowed a reasonable sum, to be determined by the Postmaster General, and not to exceed $50 per quarter, to cover the cost of rent, fuel, and light.

Mr. HARRISON. I hope the committee will adopt that amendment increasing the 10 per cent increase now provided to 15 per cent, and in those cases where a separate room or building is maintained that an additional amount shall be added to that, not exceeding in any quarter $50.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the adoption of the amendment offered by the Senator from Mississippi to the amendment of the committee.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I realize that it would be impossible for me to thoroughly discuss this joint resolution on account of the shortness of the time. I want to say, however, that I believe the last amendment, offered by the Senator from Mississippi, should be amended and then adopted. I believe we should increase the amount from 15 per cent to at least 20 per cent. The salaries received by fourth-class postmasters are entirely inadequate, and unless we are to understand that the postmasters who receive these small salaries, who, of course, always live in the country, are to be discriminated against, the same as the farmers are being discriminated against whenever occasion arises, I think this provision should be increased to at least 20 per cent.

I introduced a bill some months ago providing for a fixed salary for all these postmasters. I realize it is difficult for any committee to agree on a bill that will suit every Member of this body. I realize that this is an improvement upon the present law. But I do not believe that the allowance made to the fourth-class postmaster is sufficient. I join with the Senator from Mississippi in asking the chairman of the committee to make this at least a 20 per cent increase in the salaries of fourth-class postmasters. I suppose it will be conceded that in the instances where the office is located in some place of business, where the postmaster has his business outside of the post-office business, these salaries may be adequate. But where it is necessary to rent a building, to heat it and light it, and to have some one there all the time we know that the salary is absolutely inadequate and the allowance ought to be increased.

Mr. President, I had intended to say a word or two with reference to what the Senator from Colorado [Mr. THOMAS] said a moment ago. I always listen with the greatest interest to what the Senator has to say.

But I differ with him upon the question of allowing what may be called a bonus, if you please, of making some allowance to the returning soldiers of this country. I do not know that the soldiers are asking for it, but I am reliably informed, Mr. President, that during this war the number of millionaires increased from 7,000 to 30,000—that 23,000 people in these United States were made millionaires during the war.

Mr. President, it is only fair to say that the people who unduly profited during the struggle should be made to pay a tax, which would give to these men at least a small allowance. We might find hundreds, perhaps thousands, of the boys who would not be willing to receive this allowance, but we do know that there are thousands of them who need it, and no man will deny that they deserve it.

They are not coming to Congress and asking that this shall be done, they are not saying that they are going to strike if it is not done, but Congress ought to remember that these men went on the fields of battle to sacrifice their all for no pay whatever and in the defense of their own country. Congress, I believe, has a responsible duty to perform in dealing with these men, and should not deal with them in a niggardly way.

Mr. President, I am not going to take further time, because I know the Senator in charge of the joint resolution is anxious to dispose of the measure to-day. I hope that he will accept the amendment of 20 per cent to fourth-class postmasters and let it go to conference.

Mr. WATSON. Has the Senator from North Dakota concluded?

Mr. GRONNA. I was going to say something about another section, but if I should take the time to do so I realize that the joint resolution would go over, and so I shall content myself with simply asking that the question which I raised be given consideration.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, the hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, I should like to ask the Senator from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND], in charge of the joint resolution, whether he is entirely willing to have it go over until to-morrow without proceeding with it further at this time?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I believe that the Senate is practically ready to vote on the question.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] stepped out of the Chamber, and informed me before he left that he desires to make some observations to the Senate upon the joint resolution. I told him I would inform the chairman of the committee having the matter in charge of that fact, if the hour of 2 o'clock arrived before he returned to the Chamber.

Mr. MYERS. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Indiana yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. WATSON. I yield.

Mr. MYERS. I not only know that the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] desires to discuss the joint resolution, but I myself desire to make some remarks upon it for a few minutes; I do not know just how long. If the measure is to remain before the Senate, I should be pleased to proceed now. However, I have no objection whatever to its going over. If other Senators want to bring other business before the Senate at this time, I am perfectly willing to postpone until to-morrow the few remarks I have to make.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. President, I have been led to believe that the joint resolution could be voted upon very soon—within half an hour. Of course, I realize if it is going to take more than that, if the Senator from Utah [Mr. KING], who is now absent, proposes to oppose it and take considerable time, that would of course encroach upon the regular order. I do think, however, that we ought to get a vote. May I inquire how much time the Senator from Montana [Mr. MYERS] wishes to occupy?

Mr. MYERS. I think from 10 to 15 minutes, possibly; perhaps a little longer.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Are there any other Senators here present who want to discuss the joint resolution?

Mr. CALDER. I want to occupy about 10 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. May the Chair observe that the joint resolution is the regular order. We do not pass at 2 o'clock into any other order without the action of the Senate in that respect.

Mr. MYERS. So far as I am concerned, I am willing to say what I have to say right now, if agreeable to other Senators.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, I am quite sure that there will be prolonged debate upon the joint resolution, and I trust that the Senator from Michigan will be quite content that it may go over until to-morrow. With that understanding, I move that the Senate proceed in open executive session to the consideration of the peace treaty with Germany.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have no doubt a majority of the Senate are opposed to that motion at this time, and that by a proper opposition we could defeat it. I do not care to take that attitude, however. In view of the fact that Senators seem to be insistent, and, as stated by the Presiding Officer, the joint resolution has the right of way, though there is a majority in the Senate now in favor of finishing its consideration, I am willing, under the pressure that has been urged by certain Senators, that the joint resolution may go over until to-morrow morning. Then I shall move to take it up, and I shall hope to hold it before the Senate until we dispose of it, because it is an emergency measure and ought not to be postponed for the purpose of debate or something of that kind, when no vote is expected on any other question.

Mr. FLETCHER. Will the Senator signify at what time he proposes to take it up to-morrow?

Mr. TOWNSEND. I propose to call it up to-morrow morning at the conclusion of morning business, or at the first opportunity when I can get the floor, as I did this morning.

Mr. FLETCHER. I think that is very important. I believe we lose two hours every day——

Mr. TOWNSEND. I think we are wasting time now in not going ahead and disposing of a measure which can be disposed of in a short time.

Mr. FLETCHER. If the Senator calls up the joint resolution promptly at the close of morning business to-morrow, I think we can conclude it before 2 o'clock.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I shall do that.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. WATSON. I renew my motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Indiana moves that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the treaty with Germany in open executive session.

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

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I very much regret that I was unable to conclude yesterday, and in order that I may conclude as speedily as possible to-day, I shall ask Senators to refrain from any interruption of my remarks; and I shall also ask unanimous consent to incorporate certain extracts from papers and treaties as a part of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Wednesday, October 8, 1919.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I insert at this point a summary of the subjects which I shall discuss:

1. Introduction—League of Nations Resolution, January 14, 1919.
2. Is the Old Faith Dead?
3. Washington's Philosophy.
4. A Fraudulent Scheme.
5. Defects in the Covenant.
6. Ratify this Treaty and Germany Triumphs.
7. Treaty Condemned by Common Judgment of Mankind.
8. British Masses Oppose Scheme.
9. British Labor Party Demands Amendments.
10. The Meaning of the War.
11. Territories Which We Guarantee.
12. British Rule in India.
13. The African Problem.
14. Dismemberment of China.
15. Injustice to Korea.
16. Treaty Imperils Missions.
17. Conclusion—America Must Lead.

Mr. President, on the 14th day of last January I offered a resolution which I ask to have read at this point by the Secretary as part of my remarks.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read as follows:

Senate resolution 412, by Mr. FRANCE.

Whereas on the 11th day of November, 1918, the President of the United States announced the signing of an armistice between the United States and the Central Powers, against which this Nation had been at war, the President at that time declaring, "The war thus comes to an end"; and

Whereas it has not as yet come to the knowledge of the Senate of the United States that peace negotiations have been entered into with the enemy; and

Whereas the keeping for any length of time of an American Army upon European soil is undesirable and a cause of vast expense and of deep anxiety to the American people; and

Whereas profound unrest among the people of many nations and violent revolutions in several countries, which spirit of unrest and revolution are augmented by the hardships resulting from the maintenance of armies of occupation, and by that underproduction, throughout the world, of the necessities and commodities of life which has resulted from the long withholding of many millions of men from productive industry must be a cause for deep concern on the part of the several governments: Therefore be it

Resolved, First. That the Senate, as part of the treaty-making power of the Government, does hereby consent to and most earnestly advise that, at the very earliest possible moment, negotiations be entered into with the enemy looking to the establishment of a just peace, and that all subsidiary questions which might delay the establishment of such a just peace between the nations, without which peace national stability is everywhere endangered, may be postponed for a later discussion at an international conference.

Second. That the Senate, as part of the treaty-making power of the Government, does hereby consent to and most earnestly advise that at the earliest possible moment consistent with the safety of this Nation American troops be returned from Europe; and, further, that after the establishment of peace the President call upon the Governments of North

and South America to appoint two delegates each to an international conference, to be held at some suitable time and place, to consider plans for the closer cooperation of these Governments in promoting justice, progress, and friendship among and within the said countries of the Western Continent; and, further, that the President also, at some time subsequent to this conference of the American Republics, call upon all the nations to appoint delegates to another international conference to be held at some suitable time and place to discuss and consider plans for the promotion of justice, progress, and friendship among and within the nations of the world, such conference to particularly discuss and consider plans for the removal, so far as may be, of the economic and social causes of war, and to this end particularly give attention to—

First. The congestion of population of some nations.

Second. The underpopulation of other nations.

Third. The unregulated competition between the more populous and industrial countries for the raw products and trade of the less populous and agricultural ones.

Fourth. The exploitation of the weaker and the less advanced by the stronger and more highly organized nations.

Fifth. A larger self-determination of peoples and nations.

Sixth. The possibility of the cooperation of the more advanced nations, for the improvement of the conditions of the backward countries, particularly those of Africa and parts of Asia, by the formulation of plans for the reclamation of waste lands, for the utilization of natural resources, including water powers, for wise colonization, for education, and for the spread of civilization, in the interest of those countries and of the world.

Seventh. The best means for the wider and more rapid extension of education and civilization throughout the world, looking to the ultimate elimination of national, racial, and religious antagonisms.

Eighth. The establishment of constitutional republics or of governments of such uniformity throughout the world as would make for that national stability upon which could be based a permanent international order.

Ninth. The elimination of all causes of national enmities and the establishment of friendship and justice between the nations, with a view to the ultimate establishment of a league of nations or world federation of republics, for the purpose of promoting the cause of progress and of peace throughout the earth.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I presented this resolution because I believed that then, after our valiant and invincible armies had carried our banners through battle on to victory, winning for themselves and for the Republic immortal glory, after our national honor, so long compromised, had been vindicated, after our aims had been achieved, that the fathers and mothers of America desired and had a right to demand the return home of their heroic sons, and the termination of the suspense, misery, and oppressive burdens of war. I was, moreover, fully persuaded that an undue prolongation of the status of war would threaten the stability of every nation of Europe and tend to undermine the structure of our western civilization. I was convinced also that from a peace conference held in Europe, during a status of war, and dominated by the reactionary ministers who represented governments and special interests, and not the peoples whose voices had been suppressed by despotic decrees and repressive statutes, there could come forth no international covenant dedicated to justice, to the elevation, liberation, and self-determination of peoples, to progress, to peace, to the common welfare of mankind, such as would commend itself to the aspirations of an agonized world, new-awakened to a consciousness of its destiny, and with a quickened conscience as to its responsibility.

The prolongation of the peace conference did, sirs, imperil the stability of all European Governments, and from it has come to us a peace treaty which contains within it malignant hatred for the conquered foe, violence against the rights of many peoples, injustice not only to China, a friend and faithful ally, which stood by our side and faced the fires of war, but to our own Nation, and a reactionary plan for a new armed coalition of nations, representing a small minority of the peoples of the earth, which armed coalition is designed to enforce the treaty provisions, perpetuate the wrongs which the treaty sanctions, arrogantly assert its power and authority over nonmember nations, and hold in subjection for all time not only the millions of helpless ones who have hitherto been the victims of oppression and exploitation, but those also who shall be betrayed into a surrender to this new tyrannical supergovernmental power of a liberty dearly bought and long enjoyed.

Sirs, if this has been a war of democracy against autocracy, if it has been a war for liberty, I sometimes question whether we have yet achieved either victory or peace. Peace is not here. This is the aftermath, and who shall say what the final harvest shall be from these fields plowed by shell, harrowed by shrapnel, and fertilized with the precious blood of those youth who but a few short months ago represented all that was best in man and in civilization? To-day on many fronts in Europe armies are joined in mortal combat, while starvation, pestilence, and outrage are taking as heavy a toll as reeking gun, bloody bayonet, and dripping sword. Bitter discontent, distrust, intolerance, despotism, hatred, brutality, massacre, riot, and revolution, and all the ancient greeds, lusts, and unholy ambitions of men and nations, unsated yet by this long four years' feast of blood, menace the world with further dissolution. The reactionaries stand trembling, pallid, and aghast at the wild furies which have come out of this Pandora's box of war which has been opened. But, sirs, hope still remains within the box; and it is for this Senate, by sternly refusing any compromise with that injustice which is the all-potent cause of war and revolution, to take hope out and send her forth on beneficent and healing wings to touch and comfort the souls of all those millions of the sons of men now bowed down in bondage, darkness, and despair.

Sirs, the fathers with faith established a government in harmony with universal law, dedicated it to the everlasting principles of justice, and launched it down the swelling tides of time, to move on toward a divinely appointed destiny, and I can not believe that this Senate will now wreck her by the ratification of a treaty which surrenders her sovereignty and her liberty, alters the very purposes of her formation, by making her a subservient part of a supergovernment, devoted to aims alien to her own, and pledges her the very harbinger and champion of freedom in the world to shed the blood of her sons to hold in hopeless slavery the subject peoples, whose souls long to be free from the clutch of the last great empires which shall ever be founded by subjugation and for exploitation. The gentlemen at Paris had not the faith and vision of our fathers, and so they miserably failed, and we have here a very travesty of justice in this treaty and in this plan so falsely named a league of nations. But, sirs, we must be charitable. The world was very sick while those three venerable statesmen sat at Paris seeking to repartition it in accordance with the formulæ of the old and secret diplomacy. The world was sorely stricken, and yet they sought to soothe it with beatific platitudes, while with sinister determination by the blockade during the long armistice, with the cruel weapon of starvation, they murdered the emaciated children and wasting women of the fallen foe. The censored cables kept many a secret from the sovereign American people, but when that hideous, murderous policy is known here, there will be a storm of indignation against this treaty and against those responsible for it and for that policy. The heroic British troops knew of that policy of coercion by starvation and threatened mutiny in protest. The masses of London knew it, and on a Sunday last April they marched, 100,000 of them, to Hyde Park to demand an end to the inhuman blockade. Their protestations came from understanding hearts, for many in that vast throng had known the pangs of hunger and the agony which claws and tears the hearts of parents who kneel in helplessness beside the filthy pallet of rags and straw, to close the glazing, sightless eyes of a jaundiced, waxen, emaciated child, perishing for want of bread. Sirs, those were malignant men who censored all our cables, but truth may not forever be suppressed, and when the millions of America, in cities, towns, and hamlets, all those who are devoted to our best ideals, all those who walk through peaceful country lanes, in the solemn Sabbath stillness, to unpretentious sanctuaries, to pray in deep sincerity, as did their fathers, "Thy kingdom come, Thy will be done," shall know this awful story, when they shall see the pictures we have seen of wide-eyed, famishing, wondering children, whose cries and prayers for food could not be answered because of the unspeakable cruelty of these cold-blooded ministers, there will surely come a day of retribution.

Shall we blame these venerable statesmen of a passing age, as they looked out over the mighty, seething, blazing cauldron of a world made molten in the fires of war, for seeking to pour the white-hot fluid into the molds made after the ancient fashion of the only patterns which they really knew? Shall we blame them if they sought to place this new and very heady wine of liberty into the old bottles of imperialistic form? Shall we reprimand these self-sufficient, amateurish surgeons of a world disordered and diseased if in their simple eagerness they sought to heal by covering with this new man-made, artificial skin of the so-called league of nations the feculent, festering, rotting ulcers of the world, wholly forgetting that before such sources of corruption could be cured the putrescent, pestilential sores must first be healed from beneath by the deep penetration of the purifying air and disinfecting sun of God's eternal justice?

IS THE OLD FAITH DEAD?

Mr. President, is it possible that from our minds has faded the memory of our origin? Can it be that by this subtle, superficial, modern sophistry there has been uprooted and destroyed within our hearts that sacred inheritance of an exalted faith in our own peculiar national destiny? It has been intimated in this Senate Chamber, in the very city which bears his reverenced and immortal name, that conditions have changed, and that the doctrines enunciated by Washington with reference to foreign affairs are no longer applicable. We are now asked to believe, since our indoctrination with this "new freedom," that

Washington was really quite provincial, very narrow, pitifully lacking in world vision, because, having achieved our American independence, he then advised what some are pleased to call a policy of selfish national isolation. We are now new advised that the matchless and prophetic words of his Farewell Address are out of date, because he warned "against the insidious wiles of foreign influence," against "weaving our destiny with that of any part of Europe," against "entangling our peace and prosperity in the toils of European ambition," against "implicating ourselves by artificial ties in the ordinary vicissitudes of her politics, or the ordinary combinations and collusions of her friendships and enmities." But, sirs, we would do well to remember this, that if it be true that the political philosophy of Washington is both antiquated and like tarnishing tinsel false; if there be no fundamental and unchangeable principles in accordance with which we may in such a desperate hour as this shape, with assurance of success, our temporary policies, then, indeed, is all lost. All is vanity, and—

She comes, she comes: The sable throne behold!
Of night primeval and of chaos old;
Thus at her fell approach and secret might,
Art after art goes out, and all is night.
See skulking truth, to her old cavern fled,
Mountains of casuistry heaped o'er her head;
Philosophy that leaned on Heaven before,
Shrinks to her second cause and is no more.
Religion, blushing, veils her sacred fires,
And unawares morality expires.
No public flame, nor private, dares to shine,
Nor human spark is left, nor glimpse divine.
Lo! thy dread empire, chaos, is restored.
Light dies before thy uncreating word;
Thy hand, great anarch, lets the curtain fall,
And universal darkness buries all.

As we consider to what vast, limitless, and pathless wastes we have drifted, as we behold skies dark with clouds and storm, as we hear throughout the world the ever-increasing ominous roar and reverberation of revolution, it would be well for all charged with responsibility—and that means every American—for the safety of the great Republic, caught in the cross currents and troughs of a perilous sea, to turn once more to the faith of the fathers, to read again those words written in days of clearer inspiration, to examine again with scrupulous care that mighty chart of all our liberties, the Constitution, by which they did, and we and our sons must, guide this Nation safe past those destructive shoals of ignorant materialism, sophistry, and insincere demagoguery upon which have perished the ancient empires and republics of the world.

WASHINGTON'S PHILOSOPHY.

Was Washington, after all, only a shrewd utilitarian in his enunciated foreign policy, cautiously advising "safety first" and placing peace above national righteousness and honor? Was he actuated by purely materialistic motives? Was he but a dull churl, who could not catch a wider vision of the destiny of the world, or was he too weak and cowardly to follow where he saw? Which would they have us believe? The political philosophy of Washington seems to be but little understood, and during recent weeks men have advocated wrapping his teachings in the great winding sheet of oblivion and burying them with the bones and ashes of the ancient heresies, because they say he advocated the doctrine of national isolation. I do not understand him or the fathers thus. We must read the context, study deeply his words as well as those of his contemporaries, catch his faith, perceive his love for mankind, and ponder the inspiring story of his life of selfless service if we would have a true comprehension of the profound and benevolent philosophy from which there sprang those admonitions and that most wise advice as to future national policies.

If I understand Washington aright, he was not an advocate of narrow and selfish isolation. He would not have opposed plans for international cooperation in harmony with the principles upon which this Republic was founded. That he was opposed to entangling alliances designed to further selfish and sinister ends does not prove that a true league of all the nations for purposes in line with those for which this Government was founded would have met with his condemnation. The true test of a league of nations measured by his lofty moral standards is: Is it a league of all the nations founded on justice, liberty, and the common welfare, and designed to further the interests of humanity; or is it an entangling alliance based on force, tyranny, and injustice to further the interests of a privileged few? By that acid test this so-called league of nations is condemned.

Let me now briefly state Washington's political creed, which we are now asked to repudiate, in words taken from his first inaugural and his Farewell Address.

He believed in and made "fervent supplications to that Almighty Being who rules over the universe—who presides in the councils of nations—that His benediction may consecrate to the liberties and happiness of the people of the United States a government instituted by themselves for these essential purposes." He held "that the propitious smiles of Heaven can never be expected on a nation that disregards the eternal rules of order and right which Heaven itself has ordained," and that "the preservation of the sacred fire of liberty and the destiny of the republican model of government are justly considered as deeply, perhaps as finally staked on the experiment intrusted to the hands of the American people." He went to his grave with "unceasing wishes that your union and brotherly affection may be perpetual; that the free Constitution which is the work of your hands may be sacredly maintained; that its administration, in every department, may be stamped with wisdom and virtue; that in fine the happiness of the people of these States, under the auspices of liberty, may be made complete by so careful a preservation and so prudent a use of this blessing as will acquire to them the glory of recommending it to the applause, the affection, and the adoption of every nation which is yet stranger to it." This was his philosophy. Shall we abandon it?

Profoundly reverencing the God of nations, holding "these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that to secure these rights governments are insituated among them, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed," the fathers constituted a government devoted to the achievement of these aims, "to form a more perfect union, establish justice, insure domestic tranquillity, provide for the common defense, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and our posterity," and their souls were inspired with the faith that by the example and through the instrumentality of a government so established the institutions of ordered liberty would be extended in ever-widening circles, through the centuries, to carry at last their unspeakable blessings to the remotest shores and the most distant islands of the sea where dwell the sons of men. These purposes were also to guide and to control our foreign policy, for Washington said, "It will be worthy of a free, enlightened, and, at no distant period, a great nation, to give to mankind the magnanimous and too novel example of a people always guided by an exalted justice and benevolence."

I can find no support for the contention that the fathers, particularly Washington, Hamilton, and Madison, placed any narrow limitation upon the extent of the sphere which might be embraced in governmental organization, or that they taught any doctrine of national isolation. On the contrary, they most clearly perceived that the principle of federation, with the careful maintenance of the nice adjustment and proper balance between the rights of self-determination of the parts and the surrender by a reasonable delegation of powers by the parts for the safe unification into the whole, would lend itself to most wide application and indefinite expansion. Washington asked, "Is there a doubt whether a common government can embrace so large a sphere? Let experience solve it. We are authorized to hope that a proper organization of the whole with the auxiliary agency of governments for the respective subdivisions will afford a happy issue of the experiment. 'Tis well worth a fair trial and full experiment." This question as to the extent of territory which might be embraced by a republican form of government is fully discussed in the Federalist, particularly by Madison. (No. XIV, Extent of the country no objection to the Union.) He says:

> The error which limits republican government to a narrow district has been unfolded and refuted in preceding papers. I remark here only that it seems to owe its rise and prevalence chiefly to the confounding of a republic with a democracy, and applying to the former reasonings drawn from the nature of the latter. The true distinction between these forms was also adverted to on a former occasion. It is that in a democracy the people meet and exercise the government in person; in a republic they assemble and administer it by their representatives and agents. A democracy, consequently, will be confined to a small spot. A republic may be extended over a large region.

And again, referring to the principle of republican federations, he states:

> If Europe has the merit of discovering this great mechanical power in government by the simple agency of which the will of the largest political body may be concentered and its force directed to any object which the public good requires, America can claim the merit of making the discovery the basis of unmixed and extensive republics.

And again:

> As the natural limit of a democracy is that distance from the central point which will just permit the most remote citizens to assemble as often as their public functions demand, and will include no greater number than can join in those functions, so the natural limit of a republic is that distance from the center which will barely allow the representatives of the people to meet as often as may be necessary for the administration of public affairs.

And again:

> But why is the experiment of an extended republic to be rejected merely because it may comprise what is new? Is it not the glory of the

people of America that while they have paid a decent regard to the opinions of former times and other nations, they have not suffered a blind veneration for antiquity, for customs, or for names to overrule the suggestions of their own good sense, the knowledge of their own situation, and the lessons of their own experience? * * * They reared the fabrics of governments which have no model on the face of the globe. They formed the design of a great confederacy which it is incumbent on their successors to improve and perpetuate.

The experiment, sirs, has been successful. The wisdom of the fathers has been demonstrated, for its has been, beyond question, proven that such a Federal Government as ours operates across our continent as effectively as it functioned along their coast. Who will maintain that a federation such as ours might not be extended to embrace this hemisphere? Bismarck applied the principle invoked by the fathers, modifying the application of it to suit his ends and to meet special conditions, and from discordant and belligerent states, speaking diverse dialects, he builded a single powerful empire. Her ablest statesmen have urged the application of this principle of republican federation to all the wide-extended and diverse parts within the British Empire, but the reactionaries, blinding themselves to the teachings of history and refusing to look forward to the inevitable consequences, have resisted all such benevolent and enlightened plans. Was John Quincy Adams speaking idle words at Plymouth, on December 22, 1802, when he said:

Westward the star of empire takes its way.
Let us unite in ardent supplication to the Founder of Nations and the Builder of Worlds, that what then was prophecy may continue unfolding into history—that the dearest hopes of the human race may not be extinguished in disappointment, and that the last may prove the noblest empire of time.

It would ill become us here, where by the wise application of the principle of federation we have founded a mighty empire of sovereign states, to deny the possibility of the extension of these principles to secure international cooperation for the liberation and elevation of all men everywhere. It was not because he believed in selfish isolation, it was not because he desired to confine to a narrow sphere the application of this principle, that Washington warned against foreign alliances. It was, rather, because he clearly perceived the fact which we must now recognize that while this Nation might from time to time alter its temporary policies from reasons of expendiency it could not abandon its principles or depart either in its foreign or domestic activities from those exalted purposes to which it had been dedicated without complete self-destruction. He warned us that we must not form permanent alliances with Europe because her interests and her purposes were alien to our own. He who votes to make this Government a part of an international government or a constituent member of a supergovernment not devoted to the identical purposes and clearly expressed aims of our Constitution has cast a vote to destroy his country. Sirs, to forsake these principles and purposes or to compromise with policies which violate them by the adoption of this treaty would be, in my judgment, nothing less than treason of the most perfidious brand. To do so would be treason, because it would be betraying all that is best, the very soul and spirit of our institutions. It would be most perfidious because it would be accomplishing the end with a fraudulent document which is not what it purports to be and which is designed to entice men by an appeal to their highest motives to commit an unspeakable wrong.

It would be no superhuman task to establish in time cooperation between the nations of the earth in accordance with the well-known principles of federation, but nothing in that direction can be achieved if these fundamental rules are disregarded:

First. The purposes of the federation must be those announced in our own Constitution—the promotion of justice, liberty, and the common welfare.

Second. There must be a universal and equitable application of the principle of self-determination within such federation.

Third. There must be just methods for the representation of the nations in the government to which there is to be a delegation of powers.

Fourth. There must be no elimination of, or discrimination against, nations desiring membership.

Fifth. The government to which there is to be a delegation of powers must be subject and easily responsive to popular control.

Sixth. The constituent nations must themselves all have forms of government responsive to popular control.

Seventh. There must be three perpetually independent coordinate branches—legislative, executive, and judicial—in the government to which there is to be a delegation of powers.

Eighth. There must be clear provisions for amendment and for judicial interpretation.

While it must be apparent that at the present time the conditions in the world are not favorable to the formation of such an international federation, yet the first stages in the establishment of voluntary international cooperation might now well be undertaken. It must be recognized, however, that these well-known principles may not be disregarded in the organization of international government if we are to hope for success, and further that almost every one of them is flagrantly violated in this crude document which has been submitted to us after it had been drawn by Englishmen.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President——

Mr. FRANCE. The English reactionary leaders are not only notoriously ignorant of but obstinately opposed to the principles of republican federal government, because this form is inconsistent with the aristocratic, imperial, and colonial system, as it has existed for so many years to the enrichment of the upper classes of England. This document breathes not the free spirit of the fathers who laid the foundation of this Republic but the spirit of those same aristocratic Englishmen whom the fathers opposed because the fathers could not consent to the enslavement of mankind to selfish greed.

I now yield to the Senator from Illinois.

Mr. McCORMICK. Mr. President, I sought to interrupt the Senator a moment ago, when he was speaking of the necessary provisions for judicial interpretation, to ask if, under the contemplated covenant, the body which sought to act or acted under its terms would not also be the sole judge of the legality of its action under the covenant?

Mr. FRANCE. That is true. That body, the council, would exercise legislative, executive, and judicial powers, and the fathers well understood the very essence of despotism to be a consolidation of legislative, executive, and judicial powers in one man or body, and this council, which is proposed, would have all of the very nature of despotism within it.

A FRAUDULENT SCHEME.

Mr. President, I venture to say that but relatively few men in the United States have carefully studied the league of nations scheme, but as more do so and as it becomes better understood its fraudulent and dangerous character becomes more and more apparent. It is represented to be, and by many here apparently believed to be, a covenant for the establishment of a society of all the nations for the preservation of the peace and security of the world. It, in reality, creates a new armed coalition participated in by a few nations representing a small minority of the peoples of the earth. It will be dominated by the imperialistic nations—Great Britain, Japan, and France—and its principal objects are to guarantee the territorial integrity of these Empires; to make safe the spoils of war; to preserve the status quo with its cruel system of colonial expansion and human exploitation; to force, by a war after the war, the Germans to fulfill the drastic, oppressive, and really impossible provisions of the treaty; in short, to form a supergovernment to be controlled by a group of nine men who purpose, by their schemes, to defeat the rising hopes of millions of men for emancipation from unfavorable conditions and liberation from foreign control.

Sirs, the world is laughing at us for our serious consideration of this monstrous scheme. This treaty, in which we would compromise with injustice, is so deceptive as to have the appearance of being a part of a huge confidence game. By its submission the world tragedy partakes of the melodrama. It is not strange that bitter laughter should have greeted the appearance of this scheme in the House of Commons. The Right Hon. David Lloyd-George, M. P., first lord of his treasury and prime minister of His Majesty the King of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Ireland and of the British Dominions Beyond the Seas, Emperor of India, might well often chuckle by his fireside as we sit here in solemn deliberation upon whether or not we shall ratify a solemn contract by which, for no consideration in return, we irrevocably pledge the blood of American youth to fight for the preservation of all of His Majesty's vast dominions and for the perpetuation of a system by which the English dukes and lords grow fat upon the spoils taken from the toiling and impoverished millions of that Empire, to whom the determination of their own destiny has been denied. It is scarcely to be marveled at that His Majesty should have conferred upon this canny and too clever politician and diplomat the Order of Merit.

[From the New York Sun, Aug. 7, 1919.]

LLOYD-GEORGE IS HONORED BY KING—CONFERS ORDER OF MERIT FOR SERVICES IN WAR.

LONDON, *August 6.*

King George to-day conferred upon Premier David Lloyd-George the Order of Merit as a sign of his appreciation of Lloyd-George's war services.

In a letter to the premier, dated Buckingham Palace, August 6, announcing the award, the King says:

"MY DEAR PRIME MINISTER: Honors and rewards to the officers of the army, navy, and air force having been submitted to Parliament, I feel that my people will share with me regret that it is not possible to

express the nation's grateful recognition of the persistent services rendered by the prime minister both in carrying the war on to a victorious end and in securing an honorable peace. To rectify somewhat this omission and personally to mark my high appreciation of these services it gives me great pleasure to confer upon you the Order of Merit.

"Believe me, yours, very sincerely,

"GEORGE R. I."

The House of Commons to-day gave a formal vote of thanks to Marshal Foch, of France, the allied commander in chief, and the various military and auxiliary services of Great Britain that served in the war. The vote included mention of the British women's organizations.

King George could scarcely do less, and even a hundred thousand pounds and an earldom would not be too much for such a service.

DEFECTS IN THE COVENANT.

I can not discuss all of the defects of this league of nations scheme, which is both organically unsound and ethically indefensible, but I desire to recapitulate, without extended comment, some of the most serious defects which have already been fully discussed by others.

1. There is no declaration of human rights and no dedication of it to the securing of justice, liberty, and the common welfare.

2. It is a close coalition, which exercises the power to exclude nations.

3. This coalition arrogantly assumes to dictate to and control nonmember nations.

4. There is created a despotic oligarchic supergovernment not subject to popular control.

5. There is no provision guaranteeing the right of withdrawal, this only being possible by unanimous consent.

6. There is no controlling and directing power residing in the popular assembly, which is in reality the league.

7. The chief powers are lodged with the small body, the council, which can exercise them arbitrarily at will and without control.

8. The interrelations of assembly and council are not defined, but certainly there is no control of the council by the assembly.

9. There is no provision for open sessions of the council.

10. There is no mention of a quorum, and four out of nine of the council might meet and take any action.

11. Each member of the council would have vested in him incredible power to commit his country to obligations of war or peace, and such member need not be chosen by the people.

12. Clauses dealing with armament production are weak and ineffective; the permitting of the taking into consideration by the council of geographical situations in deciding armaments, leaving the way open to competition in armaments.

13. Members of the league "undertake to respect and preserve the territorial integrity" of the various nations without regard to the question of justice.

14. We surrender our rights to settle by peaceable methods our own disputes with other nations.

15. There are no adequate safeguards against war.

16. There is no distinction made between offensive and defensive war, and a member nation could not defend by force its territory from invasion.

17. There is no clear definition of what are international and what domestic questions.

18. The provisions for making amendments are very obscure, a fatal defect, in view of the crudeness of the whole document.

19. There is no definite time fixed after which peoples held as mandatories shall be free.

20. Members reserve the right to exclude nonmembers from trade with mandatory colonies.

21. We shall be expected to assume control over Armenia, Turkey, and the most turbulent portions of Europe, this meaning continued war.

22. A single member of the council could prevent our making a treaty with another nation which it was to our interest to make.

23. The Monroe doctrine is not safeguarded.

24. It is not a true league of nations, and members are not given the same powers and proportionate representation.

25. It is a coalition seeking to achieve selfish competitive ends by the compelling power of force, rather than a league of cooperating nations seeking to secure worthy aims by the persuasive power of justice.

I believe also there is no constitutional grant which gives to the Federal Government authority to delegate to our member of the council of the league such vast prerogatives and powers as he would exercise.

A most excellent monograph entitled "What Every American Should Know About the League of Nations," by William George Jordan, concisely and ably discusses some of these and other vital objections to the league, and I would ask to have that monograph printed as part of my remarks but for the fact that it has already been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 7, 1919, at the request of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE], to which RECORD I would refer those desiring to read the monograph.

RATIFY TREATY AND GERMANY TRIUMPHS.

Sirs, the recommendation of this treaty, with its league of nations scheme, is the logical culmination of a foreign policy of almost unbelievable stupidity, and if we should place our hands to its ratification we would, in my judgment, make Germany triumphant and prepare the way for a greater and perhaps a final world disaster. We would be setting the mighty stage of the world for that ultimate bloody tragedy, a war between the East and the West, which might culminate in the subjugation of the occidental by the oriental civilization. Many thoughtful men were disturbed when they perceived that Germany was planning a Mittel Europa and considered it a grave menace when she sought to drive her railway down to Bagdad to find an outlet at Basra on the confluence of the ancient Tigris and Euphrates near the Persian Gulf. They trembled because it seemed to portend a movement toward the fulfillment of her dream of universal empire. It was a narrow and perilous path across Bulgaria, Turkey in Europe, and Asia Minor, between the Mediterranean and Black Seas, to the desert sands of the Arabian Peninsula between the Euphrates and the Persian Gulf eastward and the Red Sea on the west, but it was, with all its perils to Germany, the path of lesser resistance. It was most perilous because the French were anxious, Great Britain was deeply concerned, while the giant Russian Empire on the east, holding Central Asia and Turkestan, covetous to control every shore of the Black Sea and Constantinople, watched with unresting, envious eyes Germany's every movement, couched ready to spring at any moment. It had been a keen contest and a long one—that between European diplomats for the control of the Near East—and the clash came at last with an assassination in Serbia and then followed the world calamity. But, sirs, what were those small opportunities and plans of Germany as she, surrounded by hostile powers, cautiously sought to push her way southeastward, compared with the vast possibilities of greater dominion which will lie extended before her after the ratification of this treaty? This new-armed coalition which we plan will set up a new balance of power, but will Germany be weakened or can she by it be isolated?

Does the new international scheme substitute true international cooperation for the common welfare for international competition for selfish and imperialistic aims? This plan surely preserves the old order of competition in armaments, in military power, in the extending of spheres of influence, in plans for a greater domain. How will Germany be placed in this new competition? Will there be no opportunity for her diplomacy and for the secret machinations of those who were her military overlords? Why, sirs, this treaty gives her unparalleled opportunity, which it is hardly conceivable that she will not embrace.

In the first place, we play into the hands of her former military masters by making with her people the very kind of peace these military lords warned them we would impose—a peace which humiliates, enslaves, and places burdens upon the masses of the people almost too heavy to be borne, and then by the six months' starvation of her women and children during the armistice we put a more bitter hatred, the very iron into the souls of her men which makes them fit material to be forged into a mighty weapon by these military masters. Of Russia, on the east, once her mighty competitor and adversary, we have by our incompetence and folly made an enemy, and she, by her wiles, has made a friend. Having, because of ignorance and prejudice, alienated from the Allies the great Russian peoples, we now, as if that were not enough, despoil China to enrich Japan, and turn deaf ears to the cries of helpless Korea, craving justice and ambitious for that very liberty which our own missionaries have taught her to love, while through Russia, China, Korea, and through Tibet and friendly Turkey in Asia the way is open for Germany to cooperate with outraged, starving, revolutionary India and Egypt, already in rebellion. Great Britain sees the peril, and now seizes Persia for protection, thus irritating France and increasing the enmity of the eastern powers. Ratify this treaty, sirs, and you squarely divide the Occident from the Orient and make all the nations of the east, except Japan, with their all but limitless resources of man power and territory, the natural allies of Germany. You place the Germans, with their unusual capacity for military and commercial organization, in command of a situation which might be used by them for the destruction of the western civilization. I submit herewith a synopsis which will roughly indicate, as it is only approximate, my views as to what will be the new realignment of nations after the formation of our coalition, outside of which will be so many other nations which must of necessity and in self-defense form a coalition in opposition.

Principal nations inside of our proposed league or coalition.

United States	100,000,000
United Kingdom, less Ireland	41,126,040
France	39,602,258
Belgium, 1910	7,423,784
Italy	36,546,437
Portugal	5,957,985
Poland	12,247,600
Roumania	7,508,009
Greece	4,821,300
South Africa	8,256,810
Australia	4,895,894
New Zealand	1,099,449
Japan	60,666,777
Canada	7,206,643
Bolivia	2,889,970
Brazil	24,618,429
Cuba	2,627,536
Ecuador	1,323,900
Total	368,818,821

Principal nations outside of our proposed league or coalition.

Ireland	4,390,219
Austria	28,718,928
Hungary	22,784,531
Bulgaria	4,337,516
Germany, 1914 (estimated)	67,812,000
Luxembourg	259,891
Montenegro	436,789
Russia	148,303,000
Turkey	1,891,000
Egypt	15,969,000
Asiatic Russia	21,632,000
Asiatic Turkey	19,382,900
China	320,650,000
Korea	16,913,224
Indian Empire	315,156,396
Afghanistan	6,380,500
Argentina	7,885,237
Mexico (estimated)	15,501,684
Spain	19,950,817
With a total population of	1,038,355,632

There should probably be included in the list of nations outside of this proposed league or coalition, the aggregate population of which I have estimated to be about 1,038,355,000, over 100,000,000 of population, representing the peoples of Africa, outside of Egypt and South Africa, who will really have no voice or representation in our league under the proposed organization.

There are several of the more important European countries whose alignment with one or the other of these two groups will for a long time remain doubtful. I refer particularly to—

Norway, with a population of	2,391,000
Sweden, with a population of	5,521,000
Denmark, with a population of	2,775,000
Holland, with a population of	5,945,000
With a total population of	16,632,000

Not only will the treaty create a division of the world into two coalitions, but careful examination of and reflection upon this list will make it clear that practically every country of those outside of the proposed league or coalition has some real present or some past historic grievance against one or more of the members of the league. It would be impossible within a reasonable time to review or even enumerate these grievances, some of which will be at once apparent, and others of which, if less immediately apparent, are no less real. To our enemies during the war, who must remain our open and avowed enemies, as we are to be theirs under the provisions of this treaty, we have driven Russia by our Quixotic and irrational policy of military intervention, while Ireland, Egypt, the Indian Empire, China, Korea, Afghanistan, Mexico, and Spain are, because of the circumstances, both naturally and by the terms of the treaty sympathetic with those enemies.

Sirs, a wise statesmanship must be guided by practical considerations as well as by high ideals, and it would be difficult to prove that to be a wise diplomacy which would place the United States in an armed coalition with countries possessing aggregate populations of, as I have indicated, only 368,818,811 in opposition to a possible coalition against it of nations possessing an aggregate population of 1,038,355,632, in view of the fact that ours, the smaller coalition, is formed in large part for the exploitation of and for the purpose of holding territory wrested by force, and with utter disregard of justice or of right, from those peoples in the other coalition who possess an overwhelming superiority of men and territory, and that the smaller coalition thus insolently assumes the right to dictate to and control the peoples who are not to be admitted.

It has always been the guiding policy of this Nation never to fear to stand in the minority or alone for international justice and righteousness; but we, who have always feared to act even with a majority for the sanction and perpetuation of injustice, should not now be criticized for refusing to stand with a small minority of the peoples of the world in the defense of a plan which, because of its injustice, has incurred the condemnation of the overwhelming masses of mankind. By the very nature of the covenant we by ratifying it invite disaster.

> Thrice is he armed that hath his quarrel just,
> And he but naked, though locked up in steel,
> Whose conscience with injustice is corrupted.

Sirs, as we sit here, out beyond the Atlantic, beyond the territorially tiny United Kingdom, beyond the devastated fields of France, beyond the vanquished and famishing Central Empires, beyond distracted Poland, beyond the Carpathians and the vast plains where Russia and Siberia, our new and mighty enemies, lie; still far beyond there stretches the vast domain of the half-slumbering, taciturn, infinitely patient, but now restlessly stirring East, the vast, mysterious Orient, whose uncounted millions, with sad, all-seeing eyes, burning with the deep wisdom of the centuries, with hearts on fire, with piled-up decades of unrequited wrongs, now gaze so fixedly, suspiciously, and cynically at us to see how much is after all our true devotion to those principles of justice which we have praised, and whether, with this small plan devised by self-sufficient and complacent men of reactionary thought, we can compose a world distracted with war and turbulent with revolution.

European statesmen—men dominated by bigotry, hatred, intolerance, criminal ignorance, colossal egotism, and acting with utter lack, it seems to me, of a true confidence in the capacity of their fellows for self-government, and without true faith in the common destiny and brotherhood of man, together with an utter failure to comprehend the awful lessons of this war—have devised this plan, which squarely divides the East from the West, and which, sirs, if it shall be ratified, in the end may cause the "Star of Empire" on its further unresting westward way to pause once more above China, Egypt, and India, first cradles of the race.

TREATY CONDEMNED BY COMMON JUDGMENT OF MANKIND.

I wish that more of our people might realize the fact that this treaty and this covenant, devised by a few men to serve special and narrow interests, have been met by the condemnation of the common judgment of the overwhelming majority of mankind. I have already referred to the fact that nations with populations aggregating more than a billion of people, indeed, more than two-thirds of all the inhabitants of the earth, are either merely excluded from the league or are directly injured by it, and hence must be, of course, in opposition to it. But, in addition to this, men of liberal mind everywhere, who have carefully examined its provisions, find themselves compelled to denounce both the method and the whole nature of the plan. No more eloquent condemnation of it could be written than that contained in the manifesto of Gen. Smuts, the one figure who loomed in stature so greatly above the men who were assembled working out their narrow plans at the peace table at Paris. I quote from the manifesto:

> I have signed the peace treaty not because I consider it a satisfactory document but because it is imperatively necessary to close the war. * * * The promise of the new life, the victory of the great human ideals for which the people have shed their blood and their treasure without stint, the fulfillment of their aspirations toward a new international order and a fairer, better world are not written in this treaty. * * * There are territorial settlements which will need revision. * * * There are punishments foreshadowed over most of which a calmer mood may yet prefer to pass the sponge of oblivion. There are indemnities stipulated which can not be exacted without grave injury to the industrial revival of Europe, and which it will be in the interests of all to render more tolerable and moderate. * * * The abolition of militarism * * * in this treaty is unfortunately confined to the enemy.

The French Liberals have been active in their opposition to the scheme, as they are convinced that the league does not meet with the requirements for a true society of nations, and that the treaty is not in harmony with the 14 points as specifically laid down by President Wilson.

[From the New York Times, Apr. 12, 1919.]

FRENCH LABOR BODY AGAINST THE LEAGUE—SAYS IT IS NOT WILSON'S—CONDEMNS POLICY OF ARMED INTERVENTION AND BLOCKADE.

PARIS, *April 11.*

A placard was posted through Paris to-day by the General Federation of Labor, entitled "An appeal to public opinion and the workers." It contains the following reference to the league of nations:

"Our diplomats offer us a project of a league of nations which is not the society of nations such as was prescribed in the 14 points of President Wilson. The peoples of the entire world in their thirst for justice acclaimed these 14 points and we accepted them. The French working class, faithful to its conception of a war on war, rises against the sabotage of peace."

The placard condemns the policy of blockade constraints and political and armed interventions. It protests against the expedition to Russia, and asks for the conclusion of a real peace to which all peoples can subscribe.

On May 11, 1919, the general assembly of Socialists, an important political body, at Paris, adopted resolutions against the peace treaty, in which it was stated:

> Justice is violated in nearly every phrase.

The Labor-Socialist conference at Berne condemned the treaty.

[From the New York Times, May 14, 1919.]

Failure to include Germany and Russia in the league of nations, the statement asserts, must be righted speedily if the league is to be made effective for preventing war. The limitations of German armaments without application of restrictions to other nations also is criticized, and the attention of the labor world is called to the danger resulting from the establishment of the boundaries of Poland, which, it is held, does violence to the rights of peoples to choose their political allegiance, and, by separating German States into two separate parts, these things are said to create a danger which will remain a source of trouble and ill will.

The callous handing over of Shantung, with its resources and 40,000,000 to 50,000,000 Chinese, to Japanese economic control can not be passed over in silence. The statement says:

"This peace is not our peace. The nations are still menaced by the policy of the victors in sharing the spoils without thought of the inevitable consequences."

The Women's International Conference for Permanent Peace at Zurich sent the following communication to the peace conference:

[From the New York Globe, May 15, 1919.]

By guaranteeing the fruits of secret treaties to the conquerors the terms of peace have tacitly sanctioned secret diplomacy, denied the principle of self-determination, recognized the rights of the victors to the spoils, and created all over Europe discords and animosities which can only lead to future wars. "By demanding disarmament from one set of belligerents only the principle of justice is violated and the rule of force continued. By the financial and economic proposals 100,000,000 people of this generation in the heart of Europe are condemned to poverty, disease, and despair, which must result in the spread of hatred and anarchy within each nation."

The Italian Liberals have also expressed similar convictions.

BRITISH MASSES OPPOSE SCHEME.

Sirs, the people of the United States have been deceived by the men who had selfish interests to serve, by the American autocrats and British lords who have been controlling the news agencies, censoring the cables, and suppressing those facts which they thought too tough for the unsophisticated understanding of the American people. We have been kept in ignorance of the true conditions in Europe, but, in various ways, we have learned enough to fill us with a deep distrust for the methods of the reactionaries who are fathering this scheme, but also with a hope and confidence that the liberal-minded, liberty-loving men of England are in perfect unity with their liberal-minded, liberty-loving brothers of this great Republic in their aspirations for a better world order and in their unqualified repudiation of this unholy plan. This treaty is, from a selfish standpoint, highly advantageous to England, and, in a large sense, inimical to the interests of all other nations, and it is for this reason that men who feel a pride in the spirit, in the achievements, in the best traditions of the English race, may well rejoice over the fact that in this world crisis there are millions of men in England to whom the principles of justice mean more than mere temporary advantage unjustly gained, and who are hence opposing this plan which would immensely strengthen the British Empire, because it seems to them to violate those principles of liberty, justice, and humanity which have always been so dear to every unperverted English heart. The view of the masses of Englishmen seems to be expressed in a statement in the London Herald of May 8, 1919, which I quote:

There is no honor left for any of us. The league of nations is a body without a soul. President Wilson has been beaten. He forced public acceptance of his ideals on the other powers, but they have beaten him secretly. He compromised on essentials, and therefore the details have gone astray. From the moment he abandoned the first of the 14 points he abandoned them all.

I quote also from J. L. Garvin, in the English Sunday Observer, of May 10, 1919:

These terms give no fundamental solution to any European problem. They resolve in the vicious circulence of the old diplomacy, they repeat the fatal precedents which have always led back to war and made the end of one struggle the direct cause of another. There will be quarrels, conspiracies, agitations, assassinations, revolutions, and collapses.

I quote the following from the London and Manchester Daily News, of September 13, 1919:

But the golden moment was lost. Europe needed food, and work, and peace to heal its wounds. But it was denied these things. Its wounds were kept open and inflamed. Six precious weeks were wasted on the "Hang the Kaiser" election in this country, an election in which the mind of the nation, instead of being moved to great issues, was saturated with the basest appeals to revenge and ignorance, and we emerged from that saturnalia to the discussion of peace with the atmosphere poisoned by false issues and shameful commitments. We have never recovered from the indelible crime. It involved us in the French peace of revenge instead of the American peace of healing, and its fruits are scattered over Europe in famine, disease, revolution, war, and all the miseries of a great continent collapsing deeper and deeper into barbarism. President Wilson got his league of nations, but he got it at a price that threatens to make it little more than the pious aspirations of the Holy Alliance. Under French inspiration we plunged, with Mr. Churchill joyously leading, into the infamous war on Russia, which will live as the most shameful chapter in the history of this country. French generals were discovered prancing over Europe like conquerors, and our own troops, under the impulse of an insane imperialism, were pushed forward into advantures beyond Bagdad and into Turkestan which was ingeniously disguised under the name of Transcaspia.

BRITISH LABOR PARTY DEMANDS AMENDMENTS.

I have not seen in any of the American daily newspapers any discussion of the most important fact that the British Labor Party, representing, it is estimated, about 20,000,000 of the citizens of the United Kingdom, has advocated amendments to the covenant of a most vital character, which, if adopted, would alter the whole nature, structure, and purpose of the covenant plan. There can be no doubt that the British Labor Party now directs the destinies of England and that at the next election it will come into full control. Indeed, I am informed that even the conservatives are inclined to look with favor upon the British Labor Party coming into power. No adequate conception of conditions in the United Kingdom can possibly be obtained by a perusal of the American newspapers, and my knowledge of the situation there has been gained from the personal communications of my brother, Mr. Royal Wilbur France, an attorney, of New York City, who went to England on professional business in the spring months of this year, and whom I requested to put himself in touch with the thought and feeling of the real present leaders of Great Britain toward the great international problem, and it was to comply with his request for a statement of the position of the British Labor Party toward the league of nations that the following manifesto was issued by the joint secretaries. Until this manifesto was brought back and given some publicity by the press most of us here were under the impression that the people of England were practically unanimous for the league. I ask that this manifesto may be printed in the RECORD at this point of my remarks:

[Trade-Union Congress and the Labor Party. Special national conference to consider the Allies' proposal for the league of nations will be held at Central Hall, Westminster, S. W., on Thursday, Apr. 3, 1919. Chair to be taken at 10.30 a. m. by Mr. G. H. Stuart Bunning, M. P., chairman of the parliamentary committee.]

LEAGUE OF NATIONS COVENANT.

The joint committee, having considered the text of the league of nations covenant, are of opinion that it is defective in certain important particulars and required to be amended to bring it into conformity with the proposals of the international working class movement. The league of nations, in order to establish and maintain world peace, must be based on direct representation from parliaments, and not merely from governments, so as to secure and maintain its democratic character and prevent it being used as a buttress to executive authority; it should include all the nations of the world willing to join in creating it and accepting its obligations. It should contain provisions for control of armaments, definitely declared to be a step toward national disarmament, for freedom of trade, and for carrying into effect an international labor charter.

Oh, Senators, do you realize what it means when a great political party, which is soon to come into power in England, should write a sentence like this:

It should impose upon the signatory nations the responsibility of holding colonies and dependencies in wardship for the purpose of training and educating them in political qualities which will enable them ultimately to practice self-determination, and, in accordance with the proposals in the labor war aims, this provision should apply to all such colonies and not merely those lately under German control. On these points we regard the league of nations covenant, issued from Paris on February 15, as defective and unsatisfactory, and we are of opinion that the British representatives at the peace conference should be called upon to propose and support amendments which will alter the scheme in accordance with the above conditions and so make it acceptable to the democracies of the world.

Further, the joint committee is strongly convinced that the immediate and total abolition of conscription in all countries is an inseparable part of a successful league of nations. We consider that the gigantic military estimates recently presented to the House of Commons are conceived in the old spirit which brought about the war and has been discredited thereby; they are calculated to fasten compulsory military service on this country, and as a consequence on other countries, as a permanent part of national policy. In our judgment, therefore, the Government should be pressed to reduce these estimates and to instruct its delegates at the peace conference to work for the total and universal abolition of compulsory military service.

The joint committee will circulate to all the affiliated organizations at the earliest possible moment the full text of the league of nations covenant with the amendments which we consider necessary.

Affiliated trade-unions, socialist societies, and cooperative societies may send one delegate for every 2,000 members or fraction thereof. Voting cards will be issued on the basis of one card for every 1,000 members or fraction thereof upon which affiliation has been paid. Affiliated local labor parties or trades councils may send one delegate and shall be entitled to one voting card for each delegate. A fee of 2/6 must be paid for each delegate.

Delegates' forms are inclosed herewith and should be returned immediately.

Yours, faithfully,

C. W. BOWERMAN,
A. HENDERSON,
Joint Secretaries.

32 AND 33 ECCLESTON SQUARE, *Westminster, S. W.*

I also hold in my hand a document which contains the amendments which were considered by the joint committee of that party to be necessary in order that the fundamental defects of the league of nations plan might be remedied, these amendments being calculated to alter the purpose, method of organization, control, and operation of the league. The essential points contended for by the British Labor Party are, first, that the league of nations should be a society made up of all the nations; second, that there should be a democratic control of the league

by a body of delegates chosen from the national parliaments; third, that all colonies should be held in wardship to be fitted by education and civilization for ultimate self-determination; fourth, the abolishment of conscription and the making compulsory the reduction of national armaments.

Mr. SHERMAN. Will it disturb the Senator if I ask leave at this point to insert a statement from a Japanese newspaper on the character of the Crown or the King in Japan, the imperial authority?

Mr. FRANCE. It would be highly pertinent to what I am saying.

Mr. SHERMAN. It is a translation of an editorial in the Niroku, a Japanese newspaper, published in the Japan Advertiser on May 9, 1919:

The imperial family of Japan is as worthy of respect as God, and is the embodiment of benevolence and justice. It is the parent not only of her 60,000,000 but of all mankind on earth. The league ofnations, proposed to save mankind from the horrors of war, can only attain its real object by placing the imperial family of Japan at its head, for to attain its object the league must have a strong punitive force and a supernational and superracial character, and this force can only be found in the imperial family of Japan.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield to me a moment?

Mr. FRANCE. Certainly.

Mr. KING. Apropos of the statement made by the Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN], I think he should take into account the fact that many of the writers in Japan speak in a superlative way, and the whole literature of Japan, or at least the political literature of Japan, does not support the proposition that the Emperor is regarded as ruling by divine right. I concede that there are a few of the Japanese who take that position, but Japan is fast becoming a liberal empire, and the present premier of Japan, Mr. Hara, entertains as liberal views in regard to democratic principles and the triumph of them as almost any statesman in the democratic nations of this hemisphere or of Europe.

Mr. FRANCE. If that be true, I would say to the Senator that, inasmuch as the British Labor Party, which will shortly come into power, favors a democratic or popular control of the league, if Japan would also favor such democratic control, the Senate of the United States would seem to be the only body standing in the way of such democratic control, since France and Italy seem not to be opposed.

Mr. KING. I do not know whether that is a challenge to any position which I assumed or whether it calls for a reply. If the latter, it would be impossible, in the time which would be permitted without trespassing upon the time of the able Senator, for me to make reply. But I submit, and I think I speak for the minority side, at least, and for many of the majority, that the Senate of the United States regards the league of nations as a democratic platform, so to speak, and not reactionary in the sense that is implied by the Senator from Maryland.

Mr. FRANCE. In that respect the several Senators who entertain that view differ with the 20,000,000 of men in the British Labor Party, and I believe differ with the great masses of the American people who are devoted to the principles of democratic control throughout every department of Government, and who feel that a control of international affairs by a council of nine men not to be elected by the people but to be appointed by Governments would be both undemocratic and dangerous.

As I consider these amendments suggested by the British Labor Party most important, I ask that they be printed in the RECORD at this point as part of my remarks, the articles to which the amendments refer being the articles of the original draft of the league.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, it will be so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Trades-Union Congress and the Labor Party amendments to the covenant of the league of nations Thursday, Apr. 3, 1919. G. H. Stuart-Bunning, chairman; C. W. Bowerman, Arthur Henderson, joint secretaries.]

Amendment to articles 1 and 2:

That the body of delegates should be chosen from the national parliaments by some such method as proportional representation, so as to secure an accurate representation of national opinion. Each nation should have five representatives and have votes upon a graded system.

Amendment to article 3:

That the executive council shall consist of 11 members, including representatives from the five allied powers and from Germany and Russia, and that it be so constituted as not to be independent of the body of delegates.

Amendment to article 4:

That the regulation of the activities of the league shall be under the control of the body of delegates and not of the executive council.

Amendment to article 5:

That the international secretariat shall be under the final control of the body of delegates and not of the executive council.

Amendments to article 7:

1. That, as this article contemplated the starting of the league without invitations being sent to Russia or any of the late enemy countries, the article be redrafted so as to provide that these countries may take part in the inauguration of the league.

2. That any country accepting the purposes, the constitution, and the obligations of the league may notify its willingness to join the league, and, if there be no objection on the part of a majority of the executive council, shall be admitted a member of the league; but if there be such objection, the decision shall rest with a majority of the body of delegates. The debates on this subject must be held in public.

Amendments to article 8:

1. That no armies should be raised by conscription.

2. That as "geographical considerations" carry with them policies of national defense by rival armaments, their mention in this article assumed a military menace which the league of nations ought to remove and not encourage.

3. That the manufacture of armaments should be under the direct control of the league, as well as whatever forces are necessary for police purposes.

4. That as there is no real security for peace which does not include national disarmament, a declaration to that effect should be included in this article.

Amendments to article 15:

1. That it be provided that the secretariat itself may draw the attention of the executive council to any matter which in its opinion may result in war.

2. That here and elsewhere the high contracting parties be bound to submit full information of matters in dispute, together with any pronouncements made upon them by the executive council or body of delegates, to the national parliaments concerned.

Amendments to article 16:

1. That wherever coercive powers are taken which may involve the interest of small States, provisions should be inserted securing for these States special consideration.

2. That before a state of war is declared the body of delegates shall meet and decide what course of action can best be taken.

Amendments to article 19—

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, the provisions of article 19 of the original draft of the covenant are identical with those of article 22 of the revised draft. The language of both articles is practically the same. This article deals with the subject of colonies and territories "which as a consequence of the late war have ceased to be under the sovereignty of the States which formerly governed them and which are inhabited by peoples not yet able to stand by themselves under the strenuous conditions of the modern world," and the doctrine is announced that to these peoples, colonies, and territories, "there should be applied the principle that the well-being and development of such peoples form a sacred trust of civilization, and that securities for the performance of this trust should be embodied in the constitution of the league." The plain implication of the language of this article is that these peoples who are not yet fitted for self-government should be held under tutelage until, by the application of a constructive colonial policy, they shall be elevated, educated, and fitted for self-determination. A careful consideration of the past colonial policies of the imperial nations, of the language of this article, and of these seemingly insignificant amendments to this article proposed by the British Labor Party will make it clear how revolutionary in their nature these amendments really are. I read the amendments:

1. That the provisions and obligations of this article be applied to all peoples in the position of those dealt with in this article.

2. That the article be strengthened by protecting the natives from exploitation by the alienation of lands or the destruction of custom which secures the economic liberty of the people.

Should such amendments as those be adopted and their provisions observed in letter and spirit, none of the sacrifices of the war would have been in vain, for the new world order would have been born. For generations great English patriots of liberal thought have urged both the high obligations and the practical advantage of a complete renunciation of colonial policies based upon the principle of exploitation, but all in vain, for reactionary ministries have successfully resisted their most eloquent pleas for such beneficent reforms. These same reactionaries at Paris were in the saddle, but their victory there will be turned into a defeat, for there has now arisen in England this great liberal party of the masses of the people representing that world-wide movement which must result in the ascendancy of those principles which are consistent with the great process of world evolution through which all men everywhere must at last be uplifted.

As further expressing the views of the British Labor Party toward the treaty—and I would remind you that the British Labor Party is made up not alone of manual laborers and mechanics but of professional and intellectual workers as well—I desire to offer for the RECORD two manifestos recently issued by the leaders of the British Labor Party. I ask that they may be incorporated in the RECORD without reading.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. If there is no objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

LABOR AND THE TREATY.

To the EDITOR OF THE MANCHESTER GUARDIAN:

SIR: We, the undersigned, declare our most emphatic repudiation of the action by which Germany has been forced to put her signature to what all sane men know is destined to be a scrap of paper. Germany has been forced to sign a peace pledging herself to hand over enormous indemnities and at the same time to give up those mineral and agricultural resources which alone would have made possible not only the

payment of indemnities but the barest sustenance of millions of her own people.

Germany has, in fact, been forced to promise the impossible. Had she not done so, the food supply on which the lives of her people depended would have been ruthlessly cut off. In other words, we put the women and children into the firing line, and the Germans had to give in. One hundred thousand persons, mostly women and children, have already perished since the armistice as a result of the blockade. Our Government was and is prepared to sacrifice countless more, to treat the German or any other recalcitrant nation as one vast *Lusitania*. In any event one of the first fruits of the peace treaty will be the massacre of babies, who by the cession of cows are to be deprived of their milk. Thousands of others will perish as their fathers find themselves deprived of the means of earning a living.

Labor has had no part in the making of the treaty. It is a settlement opposed to every ideal for which labor stands. Even the league of nations is a league of governments and not of peoples. It must be labor's task to democratize it. Labor all over the world is familiar with the hunger weapon, which for centuries has been used against it by the government classes. For the enforcement of the terms it is to-day being used against the women and innocent children of working people. Labor, with all its power, can, and must, once and for all, put an end to this crime.

Yours, etc.,

ROBERT SMILLIE.
ROBERT WILLIAMS.
C. T. CRAMP.
J. BROMBLEY.
GEORGE LANSBURY.

JUNE 27.

[From the Manchester Guardian, weekly edition, Friday, July 4, 1919.]

BRITISH LABOR LEADERS ON THE PEACE TREATY.

We, the undersigned, desire to emphatically protest against the conditions of the peace treaty submitted to the German Republic. Though we sign this statement in our personal capacity, we are confident that we represent the overwhelming opinion of the labor movement of Great Britain.

In our opinion the proposed treaty of peace is open to the gravest objections from the point of view of labor. As labor, notwithstanding the definite promises given by Mr. Lloyd-George, was not consulted in the framing of its provisions, labor can not be expected to accept responsibility for them.

The treaty was elaborated in secret by an inner ring composed of ministers of a few great powers. It follows the lines of the old secret diplomacy, whose methods have been universally condemned by the democracies.

It violates the pledges given to labor by the statesmen of this country, particularly those given by Mr. Lloyd-George in his speech to the trade-unions on January 5, 1918. We call attention in this regard to the handing over of large populations in the Saar district, in the new Poland, and in other areas to alien governments without consulting their wishes; to the economic ruin planned by commercial rivals against the German people; to their exclusion from the league of nations; to the seizure of all German colonies and stations by the allied and associated Governments; and to the disarmament on the side of the Allies. In all these respects the treaty is a breach of faith with labor.

Further the treaty violates the definite agreement on the basis of which Germany laid down her arms. The Allies agreed to make peace on the basis of the 14 points of President Wilson and the principles contained in his speeches of July 4 and September 27, 1918. This agreement has been treated as a scrap of paper. The treaty constitutes, therefore, a breach of faith with Germany and a serious blow to international morality.

It violates the principles of a peace settlement laid down in the memorandum on war aims adopted by the Labor Party in December, 1917, and confirmed by the resolutions of the international conference at Berne in February, 1919. It is thus a direct defiance of labor opinion throughout the world.

It shows no recognition of the change brought about by the German revolution and the advent of social democracy to power in that country. The German people are compelled by it for a long and indefinite period to do slave labor for foreign capitalistic governments.

So far from making all wars impossible, the treaty contains within it the germs of new conflicts arising out of the grievances of people ruled by alien governments and penalized economically. It thus makes future wars almost inevitable. It creates a condition of unrest and injustice which must make the league of nations, if it survives at all, merely the instrument of imperialist domination. The germ of good which the league undoubtedly contains would thus be rendered sterile.

The treaty, in short, restores the old conditions of the balance of power, and thereby necessitates the maintenance of conscription and of great armaments generally, and in particular it requires an army of occupation for an indefinite period.

We consider it to be the duty of labor to work for the revision of the treaty at the earliest possible moment in order that it may be brought into harmony with the ideals for which the working classes of this country have made such colossal sacrifices.

W. Barber, Bradford Trades Council; Margaret G. Bonfield, National Federation of Women Workers; Fred Bramley, Associated Society of Locomotive Engineers and Firemen; D. Carmichael, London Trades Council; C. T. Cramp, National Union of Railway Men; Margaret Llewellyn Davies, secretary, Women's Cooperative Guild; T. Gavan Duffy, Cumberland Iron Ore Miners; Joseph F. Duncan, secretary, Scottish Farms Servants' Union; Allen Gee, General Union of Textile Workers; Alex Gossop, National Amalgamated Furnishing Trades Association; Duncan M. Graham, M. P., Hamilton; John Hill, United Society of Boilermakers, Iron and Steel Shipbuilders; George Lansbury, editor, Daily Herald; William Lunn, M. P., Rothwell; Neil Maclean, M. P., Govan; R. Morley, Workers' Union; T. C. Morris, National Union of Railway Men; J. W. Ogden, past president, Trades Union Congress; W. Shaw, Glasgow Trades Council; Robert Smillie, president Miners' Federation of Great Britain; Alf. Smith, secretary, London and Provincial Licensed Vehicle Workers; Philip Snowden, chairman, I. L. P.; Ben C. Spoor, M. P., Bishop Auckland; Robert Williams, secretary, National Transport Workers' Federation; James Winstone, South Wales Miners' Federation.

THE MEANING OF THE WAR.

Mr. FRANCE. We can not hope to solve the large and complex problems of the reconstruction period; we can not formulate any rational plan for the amelioration of present conditions, for the rapid progress of the world toward that state which would warrant some hope of a permanent peace, until we have seriously sought to comprehend the true significance of this war. We face to-day a situation to meet which narrow and materialistic creeds looking to immediate party ends and policies of mere expediency directed to separate and selfish national interests are not enough. We must invoke a profounder political philosophy and seek, as we grope through a veritable world chaos, to lay hold upon a faith which shall disclose the direction of the movement of the everlasting and resistless forces underneath the world. If we seek to interpret the revelation as it is written, not on the imprinted sacred parchments alone, but within the glowing retorts of science, in the ancient tomes of historic and philosophic lore, and on that brilliant-colored, gorgeous, fire-and-sun-illumined manuscript of nature, which, as a ceaselessly unwinding scroll, lies vast expansed before the gaze of all, we can not escape the conviction that if human reason is in harmony with reality, if the human intuitions are capable of catching any vision of the infinite plan, then the purpose of the whole world process must be a steady evolution of all men toward a larger freedom, toward political liberty, making possible intellectual emancipation through education, toward the liberation of the spirits of all men from bondage by the establishment everywhere of conditions conducive to the utmost development and realization of the highest capacities and possibilities of every race and of every individual, toward that civilization which shall comprehend the world, and to which each of all the uplifted and enlightened peoples shall make that rich contribution which shall be the highest product of its own peculiar temperament and genius.

We called this a war of democracy against autocracy. It was a pleasing platitude, but it told at once too little and too much. This has been no war between mere governmental forms. Not governments and nations only, but ideas and ideals have contended. This has been the most violent of all of the manifestations of that age-long conflict between reaction and reform, between the rusty, bloody, iron-bound past and the golden future, between the old ruthless rule and repression by the sword and scepter and that new kingdom of the spirit which shall bring the abundant life and liberty to all men everywhere.

This war has not been what it was designed by the malignant reactionaries of the Old World to be. It was designed to be a security war. It was purposed to make monarchy, aristocracy, dukedoms, feudal estates, colonial expansion, and profitable human exploitation both safe and permanent. It was planned by a few rulers who hated liberty. Emperors dreamed of extending imperial dominions. For example, Nicholas Romanoff, Czar of all the Russias, the mightiest and most cruel of monarchs, cold, heartless, absolute despot of the most despicable government with which the toiling sons of men were ever cursed, seated in all his splendor upon a throne of gold, surrounded by sycophantic courtiers, did not foresee the end. Czar he was, but yet the weak and contemptible tool of cruel, corrupt, and worse than swinish bureaucrats, whose palaces were sties and whose depravities shaped their policies.

Nicholas Romanoff, clothed with all the pomp and circumstance of royalty, "and all the large effects that troop with majesty," dreaming of yet greater power and vaster empire, little thought that from that soil, steeped through the centuries with the blood of innocent men, tortured and slain by the decrees of absolutism, there would so soon spring forth the fragrant flowers and blessed fruits of liberty, and that autocracy in his most sacred and royal person was to drink to the dregs the bitter cup of Siberian exile and of death, which he and his tyrant sires had pressed so remorselessly to the lips of youth and maiden, old men and children, martyred for their love of liberty. The great empires fought to realize imperialistic ambitions, and they struggled until two of the mightiest of them all—Russia and Germany—blinded and bloody, staggered and fell to ruin, while two hundreds of millions of men long enslaved found freedom. But for what did the masses of the people, in the war, contend, and what is it which they now demand?

I invite no controversy on the point, but yet I must believe that of all the millions of the sons of men who offered up their lives upon those crimsoned fields there were but very few who did not feel that they were making holy sacrifice to promote a wider spread of liberty throughout the world. I can not be convinced that there was in the nineteen hundred and fourteenth year after Christ a government or a ministry in all

the world which would have marched its armies into battle if within those valiant soldiers' hearts there had not throbbed the faith that they did fight for a larger liberation of mankind.

I grant you that the Russian serfs, little children of centuries of darkness and oppression, enslaved by ignorance and superstition, as they stood in serried ranks gazing up at the shining, sacred icons of their faith held aloft by holy priests before the regiments, did not comprehend it all, but they believed and died, more than a million of them, for conscience and for freedom.

I grant you that the soldiers of the German armies, the only armies in all the history of the world which ever took the field without illiterates in them, were blinded with fanaticism and made a frightful blunder, as they advanced, following for so many months the victorious eagles of the Kaiser, firm in the faith that by their bloody bayonets and dripping sabres and their Kultur salvation to the world must come.

We know the spirit of our men and how they sacrificed for greater liberty and for the whole world's larger opportunity. This has been, to the people, a liberty war, and as men have fought for liberty from governmental oppression, so now in every part of the world they are demanding self-determination and a larger liberation from the compression of such confining and unhappy conditions and circumstances as prevent their true growth and expansion.

This scheme seems to have been designed to prevent the realization of these aspirations.

The two greatest surviving Empires—France, republic in form, imperial in policy and tradition, and Great Britain, shaken, weakened, exhausted, bled white—clutch frantically to save the old order from destruction. France and Great Britain, their rulers and not their peoples being represented at Paris, have devised this plan with which, by appealing to the dire necessity and not to the mere cupidity of Japan, her population crowded to suffocation, by bribing her with the rich Province of Shantung, and by appealing to the lofty idealism of the American people, they now hope to form a new armed coalition of empires of which this Republic will be a member, which coalition will not only be pledged to preserve the old order, the territorial integrity of the empires as they did exist, but also the vast added territory and peoples taken as the spoils of war. Great Britain, France, and now Japan, under the leadership of their present reactionary rulers, desire this imperialistic peace and this coalition, which they will dominate, for the protection of all their vast dominions.

TERRITORIES WHICH WE GUARANTEE.

Under article 10 of the covenant, we undertake to respect and guarantee the title of these great Empires to all their territory, regardless of the character of the title and whether it be justly or unjustly held. It would be well for us before we sign this guarantee to briefly survey the huge holdings of lands and peoples which we take upon ourselves the obligation of preserving. I submit herewith tables showing the principal possessions of the Japanese Empire, of France, and of Great Britain, which I ask to have incorporated in the RECORD as part of my remarks. The tables are well worthy of study.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, permission is granted.

The tables referred to are as follows:

Japanese Empire.

	Area.	Population.
	Square miles.	
Japan, principal islands (1916)	148,756	55,965,291
Korea, deprived of independence (1907)	84,738	16,913,224
Formosa, taken from China (1895)	13,944	3,710,848
Karafuto, taken from Russia (1905)	13,253	95,194
	260,691	76,684,557

Interests in Shantung taken 1919.
Interests in Manchuria, Kwangtung, 1905.
All islands formerly owned by Germany situated north of Equator.

France.

	Acquired.	Area.	Population.
		Square miles.	
France		207,054	39,602,258
Andorra		191	5,231
Colonies in Africa:			
Algeria	1830-1902	184,474	5,563,828
Sahara		1,544,000	800,000

France—Continued.

	Acquired.	Area.	Population.
		Square miles.	
Colonies in Africa—Continued.			
Tunis	1881	50,000	1,953,000
Senegal	1637-1889	1,478,000	1,247,000
Upper Senegal and Niger	1893		5,598,000
Guiana	1843		1,812,000
Ivory Coast	1843		1,417,000
Dahomey	1893		911,000
Mauritania	1893		600,000
Congo	1884	669,000	9,000,000
Reunion	1649	970	174,000
Madagascar	1643-1896	228,000	3,512,690
Mayotte	1843	790	97,000
Somali Coast	1864	5,790	208,000
In Asia:			
India	1679	196	268,499
Annam	1884	256,000	16,990,223
Cambodia	1862		
Cochin-China	1861		
Tonking	1854		
Laos	1894		
In America:			
St. Pierre and Miquelon	1635	93	4,652
Guadeloupe	1634	722	212,430
Martinique	1635	385	193,000
Guiana	1626	32,000	49,000
In Oceania:			
New Caledonia	1854-1887	7,650	50,600
Tahiti, etc	1841-1881	1,544	30,600
Total colonies		3,449,614	40,702,523
Total controlled by France		3,656,859	80,310,017
Summary:			
Asia		256,196	17,268,728
Africa		3,151,024	32,893,513
America		33,200	459,082
Oceania		9,194	81,200

The British Empire.

	Acquired.	Area.	Population.	Character.
		Square miles.		
United Kingdom		121,633	46,089,000	
Europe:				
Gibraltar	1704	2	16,000	
Malta	1800	118	224,000	
India:				
British	1639-1876	1,093,074	244,267,000	Illiterates number about 294,877,000
Feudatory States		709,555	70,889,000	
Asia:				
Cyprus	1878	3,584	299,000	Mohammedans—56,400.
Aden, Perim, Socotra	1876-1905	10,387	60,000	
Ceylon	1795	25,332	4,547,000	Educational system defective.
Straits Settlements	1786-1824	1,600	813,000	Chinese and Malays predominate.
Federated Malay States.	1874-1895	27,506	1,150,000	
Other Malay States	1885	23,486	970,000	
Borneo, Brunei, and Sarawak.	1881	77,103	700,000	Savages of low type
Hongkong and Territory.	1841	391	529,000	English instruction in schools.
Wei-hai-wei	1898	285	150,000	
Australasia:				
Australian Commonwealth.	1803	2,974,581	4,896,000	
Papua	1887	90,540	200,000	Only mission schools.
New Zealand	1840	104,751	1,100,000	
Fiji	1874	7,083	166,000	Uncivilized natives.
Tonga, Solomon, and Gilbert Islands.	1899	15,000	205,000	Many natives are Christians.
Africa:				
Ascension	1815	34	200	European population.
St. Helena	1651	47	3,600	
West Africa:				
Nigeria	1884-1886	336,080	17,500,000	Still have slaves in southern part.
Gold Coast and Protectorate.	1650	80,235	1,500,000	Only about 2,000 Europeans.
Sierra Leone and Protectorate.	1787	31,000	1,400,000	Only about 700 whites.
Gambia and Protectorate.	1618	4,500	146,000	About 1,500 enrolled pupils in schools.
Mauritius and dependencies.	1810	809	384,000	Mostly Indians.
Seychelles	1806	156	24,000	Fairly good educational facilities.
Somaliland	1884-1886	68,000	300,000	Nomadic Mohammedan people.
East Africa Protectorate.	1888	246,800	4,040,000	Paganism prevails.

The British Empire—Continued.

	Acquired.	Area.	Population.	Character.
		Square miles.		
West Africa—Continued.				
Uganda Protectorate	1888	109,119	2,955,000	Natives about 2,950,000, one-fifth of whom are Christian.
Zanzibar and Pemba	1890	1,020	200,000	Natives mostly Mohammedan.
Nyasaland	1891	39,573	1,140,000	Mostly Europeans.
Union of South Africa	1806-1900	473,100	5,973,000	Over 3,000,000 profess no religion.
Rhodesia	1888-1893	440,000	1,650,000	Natives number about 1,620,000.
Swaziland	1890	6,536	100,000	Only about 1,100 whites.
Basutoland	1868	11,716	406,000	Very few Europeans.
Bechuanaland	1885-1891	275,000	125,000	Natives barely civilized.
Egypt	1870	350,000	12,569,000	Moslems form 91.8 per cent of population.
Anglo-Egyptian Sudan.	1899	1,014,000	3,400,000	About 5,000 scholars.
America:				
Canada	1583	3,729,665	8,361,000	
Newfoundland and Labrador.	1583	162,734	257,000	
British Honduras	1638	8,598	42,000	
British Guiana	1803	89,500	314,000	
Bermuda	1609	19	20,000	
Bahamas	1666	4,404	58,000	
Turks and Caicos Islands.	1666	224	6,000	
Falkland Islands	1865	7,500	3,220	
Jamaica	1655	4,207	906,000	
Cayman Islands	1655	89	6,000	
Barbados	1605-1625	166	184,000	
Windward Islands	1638	527	176,000	
Leeward Islands	1623	715	128,000	
Trinidad and Tobago.	1797	1,868	372,000	
Total for British Empire		12,784,755	441,919,000	
Summary:				
United Kingdom		121,633	46,089,000	
Europe		120	240,000	
India		1,802,629	315,156,000	
Asia (except India)		169,677	9,218,000	
Australia and Pacific Islands		3,192,755	6,567,000	
Africa		3,487,725	53,816,000	
America		4,010,216	10,833,000	
		12,784,755	441,919,000	

Mr. FRANCE. As a result of the war the British Empire will probably add to her territory, through the all too transparent sham of mandatories, the following principal areas:

	Square miles.
German East Africa	384,180
German Southwest Africa	322,450
German Samoa	1,000
German islands south of Equator	95,450
	803,080

An area almost one-third of the area of the United States.

In addition to this, she has strengthened her influence over Tibet, and she has more recently taken control of Persia, where in all probability the history of her acquisition of Egypt will be repeated; and if this occurs, 628,000 square miles and nine and one-half millions more of people will thus be added to the Empire. Under article 10 we guarantee, as will be apparent from an examination of the titles to the territories of these empires, the perpetuation of many an injustice. We guarantee Korea, Shantung and Manchurian Kwantung to Japan, Hongkong to Great Britain, and French Indo-China to France against the manifest rights of China. I mention these merely by way of illustration.

These are some of the territorial boundaries which we pledge blood of American youth and our treasure to maintain, wholly in the interests of foreign empires, and in violation in many instances of the principles of justice and of right. Have we forgotten that the material questions as to the new boundaries of the world's countries are not the vital ones for the new diplomacy? It was because it used the formulæ of an outworn and discredited diplomacy, boundaries, spheres of influence, the subjection of weaker peoples to the strong, that the peace conference failed so utterly. The members of that conference forgot they needed to direct their policies so that they would run parallel with the trend of great events. They needed only to seek the best means by which there might be achieved the speediest liberation, elevation, and preparation for self-determination of all peoples. It makes no difference whether yonder map of Africa shall largely carry the pink tint of Britain, the brown of Germany, the purple of France, the yellow of Portugal, or the green of Belgium, if there shall be justice done the natives there, and if all those peoples earn is used for their own good, if the taxes levied upon them are for their own advancement, and not for the enrichment of imperial treasuries or parasitic absent landlords.

Has the rule of these great empires whose territory America is asked to guarantee been so successful and humane that we are justified, while these imperial powers control, in becoming helpless cotrustees and equally responsible with them, as we pledge our blood and treasure for the perpetuation of that rule? Has the sway of Great Britain been so benevolent in India that we can with confidence promise that we would serve the cause of justice if we did conscript our youth to fight with any power which might threaten to disturb it? What also of the rule of the British Empire in Egypt and in Africa? Has France uplifted the natives of the Senegal and Niger Colonies? Has Belgium carried the best ideals of civilization into the Belgian Kongo? I have never contended that it was the duty of America to correct by force of arms all the abuses of the world, to wage an open war against the unspeakable inhumanities of the imperialistic systems; but, sirs, now we are asked to pledge ourselves to perpetuate cruel wrongs which are revolting not only to the principles of our Government but to the best sentiments of the English race.

BRITISH RULE IN INDIA.

Sirs, do you feel justified in the ratification of a treaty under which this Republic guarantees to perpetuate the rule of the British aristocracy in India, a rule out of harmony with all of the best traditions of the English people, one characterized by a ruthless exploitation which has received for generations the condemnation of the liberal statesmen of England?

You can not convince the American people that the rule of Britain in India has been benevolent. The American youth of several generations have learned at their mothers' knees, in their churches, and at their schools the tragic story of India's poverty and agony as she lies helpless and prostrate in error's chains. They have seen the ghastly pictures of those weak, emaciated, poverty-stricken Hindus, human specters, living skeletons, 50,000,000 of whom suffer the unceasing torture of hunger gnawing at their vitals as they live ever in the deep gloom of ignorance and sorrow and under the ever-haunting shadow of death by slow starvation. They have heard the tragic, awful history of her cholera, plagues, and famines, and have given generously for her relief. India, one of the earliest homes of our Aryan race, was in some respects the greatest of all the empires. Her civilization reaches back beyond the dawn of history. Three thousand years before the Christian era she carried on an extended commerce with mighty Babylon. Two thousand years before Christ the Egyptian monarchs wore her exquisitely woven fabrics and used her fine muslins for the winding sheets of their sacred dead. Six centuries before our era on the banks of the Indus our Aryan ancestors had builded a civilization, with customs, arts, architecture, and literature of peculiar dignity and beauty. They worked with marvelous skill in iron, copper, brass, and the precious metals. In their sculpture they emulated and approached the matchless purity and beauty of the Grecian marbles. In their philosophy they surpassed the Egyptians and anticipated the Greeks. The Brahman priests of India advanced the astronomy of China and Egypt. Her science, agriculture, and industry flourished through wonderful centuries and she grew in wealth and power, her fabulous riches at last making her the treasure house of the world. In the fifteenth century the tales of her marvelous resources became known to the western peoples. The Portuguese came, then the Dutch and the French, but after the Battle of Plassy, in 1757, England's supremacy was established and she assumed responsibility for India's destiny. Judged by the ancient standards, Britain's rule might find something to commend it, but measured by the best traditions and ideals of the English people, no man can successfully defend it. India was rich. The British exploitation, which has exalted and enriched England, has stricken India down into the depths of desperate poverty.

INDIA'S POVERTY.

Edmund Burke said, in 1783:

> There is nothing before the eyes of the natives [of India] but an endless, hopeless prospect of new flights of birds of prey and passage, with their appetites continually renewing for food that is continually wasting.

The Rev. Abbe J. A. Dubois—1820—English missionary of Mysore, said:

> Alas, it is not Bibles the poor Hindus want or ask for; it is food and raiment. When the belly is empty and the back bare, the best disposed, even among the Christians, feel themselves but very little inclined to peruse the Bible.

Sir W. W. Hunter—1880—said:

There remain 40,000,000 of people who go through life on insufficient food.

Sir Charles Elliot—1888—chief commissioner of Assam, said:

Half the agricultural population do not know from one year's end to another what it is to have a full meal.

Sir William Digby—1900—in Prosperous British India, states:

In 1900 the agricultural population increased by 60,000,000. If the same income remains in 1900 as in 188-, it follows that 40,000,000 (according to Sir W. W. Hunter) plus 50,000,000 make 90,000,000, who are continuously hungry in British India at the beginning of the twentieth century.

R. C. Dutt—1902—an English authority, states:

The extreme poverty of the people is becoming patent every day. * * * It is estimated from official records that one-fifth of the Indian rural population, or between forty or fifty million people, are insufficiently fed, even in years of good harvest. * * * India alone sends us a tragic tale of poverty, famine, and death.

Rev. J. T. Sunderland—1905—American missionary in India, states:

The poverty of India is something you can have little conception of. * * * The extreme, abject, the awful poverty of the people.

Hon. Samuel Edwin Montagu, state secretary for India in 1917, stated:

But it (India) is still a country of poverty. The majority of the people live on a few rupees a month, and it takes three rupees to make an American dollar. Their country has vast resources awaiting development, but the people are still very poor.

R. C. Dutt, in his Economic History of India, 1900, states:

The appalling poverty and joylessness of his life under such conditions can not be easily pictured. His hut is seldom rethatched and affords little shelter from cold and rain; his wife is clothed in rags; his little children go without clothing. Of furniture he has none; an old blanket is quite a luxury in the cold weather, and if his children can tend cattle or his wife can do home work to eke out his income he considers himself happy. It is literally a fact and not a figure of speech that agricultural laborers and their families in India generally suffer from insufficient food from year's end to year's end.

Mrs. Annie Besant, June, 1919, in the London Daily Herald, states:

About half the people of India get only one meal a day and that is not a sufficient meal. The average life of an individual is only 23 years; in England it is 40 years and in New Zealand 60 years. The real danger is a hunger revolution.

Sir Frederick Treves, 1904, then the most distinguished surgeon in England, stated, after a visit to India:

Possibly the first impression of India which succeeds the realization of the strangeness of all things is an impression of teeming life—of the unwonted numbers of living beings, human and animal, who crowd the land. The country would seem to be overrun by a multitude of men, women, and children, all of about the same degree, a little below the most meager comfort and a little above the nearest reach of starvation. These are some of the great hordes who provide in their lean bodies victims for the yearly sacrifice to cholera, famine, and plague. Plague will slay 20,000 in a week, cholera ten times that number in a year, and the famine of one well-remembered time accounted for five and a quarter millions of dead people.

The extreme poverty of India is indicated by the following figures giving the comparative per capita wealth and income for several of the countries:

Comparative table.

	National wealth per capita.	National income per capita.
United States	$2,154.00	$372.00
Great Britain	1,913.00	232.00
France	1,238.00	182.00
Germany	1,512.00	156.00
Austria-Hungary	1,121.00	112.00
Italy	555.00	111.00
India	70.00	9.75

These figures are compiled from the World Almanac.

There is abundant evidence in the testimony of Englishmen that poverty in India has been for years increasing. S. S. Thorburn, financial commissioner of the Punjab, said that "seventy millions of Indians are in such a condition of hopeless poverty that nothing can relieve them." This poverty has been brought about by the vast and continuous drain by England on India's resources. After the battle of Plassy this drain began. Brooks Adams, in his "Law of Civilization and Decay," page 305, states:

The savings of millions of human beings for centuries, the English seized and took to London, as the Romans had taken the spoils of Greece and Pontus to Italy. What the value of the treasure was no man can estimate, but it must have been many millions of pounds—a vast sum in proportion to the stock of precious metals then owned in Europe.

This plunder and exploitation has continued in various forms. F. J. Shore, a retired Bengal administrator, states:

The fundamental principle of the English has been to make the whole Indian nation subservient, in every possible way, to the interests and benefits of themselves. They have taxed to the utmost limit; every successive Province, as it has fallen into our possession, has been made a field for higher exaction, and it has always been our boast how greatly we have raised the revenue above that which the native rulers were able to extort. The Indians have been excluded from every honor, dignity, or office which the lowest Englishman could be prevailed on to accept.

A. J. Wilson, in The Fortnightly Review, March, 1884, states:

In one form or another, we draw fully thirty millions of pounds a year from that unhappy country (India), and then the average wage of the natives is about £2 per annum, less, rather than more, in many parts. Our Indian tribute, therefore, represents the entire earnings of upward of six million heads of families, say of thirty millions of people. It means the abstraction of more than one-tenth of the entire sustenance of India every year.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. LENROOT in the chair). Does the Senator from Maryland yield to the Senator from Nebraska?

Mr. FRANCE. I do.

Mr. NORRIS. I should like to inquire from whom the Senator is reading?

Mr. FRANCE. A. J. Wilson, an Englishman, in the Fortnightly Review. These are nearly all extracts from the writings of Englishmen. I have not quoted anything from the writings of any other than the English, except in one instance, where I quote from J. T. Sunderland, an American ex-missionary, a profound and sympathetic student of Indian affairs. I have purposely not chosen any criticisms which were not written by Englishmen themselves.

This statement would seem to be almost incredible but for the supporting evidence we find on every hand of the continual drain on India by England in the form of interest, of official salaries, and of land taxation. In his work on "Famines in India," page 17, R. C. Dutt, also an Englishman, shows clearly that "the intensity and frequency of recent famines are greatly due to the resourceless condition and chronic poverty of the cultivators, caused by the overassessment of the soil on which they depend for a living."

In this work Mr. Dutt pleads for tax reforms and asks that the tax "rate may not exceed one-fifth of the gross produce of the soil in any case"—preface 15—and states, "the principle was adopted in the settlement of the central Provinces that one-half the net product of the soil should be paid." "Virtually, therefore, the rent fixed was one-third of the gross produce," and cesses for improvements are levied in addition to this.

Keir Hardie stated:

The amount of taxes raised direct from the peasant is from 50 per cent to 75 per cent of the value of the yield of the land, in addition to which they have to pay local cesses, and various other small items, so that probably not less than 75 per cent of the harvest goes in taxes. * * * It is this fact which keeps the people of India in a condition of hopeless grinding poverty.

The burden of such taxation can be better understood when we recall that the Indian income is about $10 per capita per year, and that even very light taxes must oppress those who are so poor.

Of course, the people have the poorest and scantiest of clothing and the utmost insufficiency of fare. Quoting from another Englishman: "It is unusual to find a village woman who has any wraps at all. Most of them have to pass the night as best they can in their day clothes, a petticoat, wrapper, and bodice. As a rule they and their children sleep, in the cold weather, during the warm afternoons and in the early hours of the night."

The people can exist, if existence it can be called, on almost nothing. "The most instructive fact brought out by inquiries into the condition of five families of the laborer class was the extraordinary cheapness of a bare subsistence. A Baiga basket maker, whose family consisted of his wife and two small children, made on an average 12 baskets a week, which he sold for 2 pounds of unhusked rice or millet each. His monthly earnings were thus about 100 pounds of unhusked rice, worth rather less than a rupee. The family not only managed to live on this, supplemented with jungle fruits and roots, but saved annually about a rupee's worth of grain, wherewith they purchased the scanty clothing which sufficed for them." This should be, as it probably is, the world's record in cheap living. The average works out thus:

	s.
Total earnings in food per annum	16
Less saving for clothing	1
Leaving for food	15

This was to be divided among four persons. (Digby "Prosperous British India," p. 499.)

A native peasant of India is fortunate to have for a meal one handful of rice once a day. Truly, it is a land of hunger. Hardie said:

The real rat plague in India is poverty, and the flea which spreads the disease is the Government. The emaciated, bloodless bodies of the ryot has not plague-resisting powers, and so the fell disease finds him an easy victim.

The Rev. J. T. Sunderland, formerly missionary from America, a deep and sympathetic student of India, in the New England Magazine, September, 1900, said:

The fact that at the end of 200 years of commercial dominance, and more than 40 years of absolute political sway, we are confronted with such indescribable poverty of the people, and with famine after famine

of such magnitude and severity as to make the world stand aghast, seems to prove beyond answer that England * * * has not made the welfare of India the first aim, but has subordinated India's good to her own enrichment. We have the hideous business that Rome and Spain were engaged in so long, and for which in the end they paid so dear. Called by its right name: What is the treatment of India by England? It is national parasitism; it is the stronger nation sucking the blood of the weaker. It is imperialism.

The deaths from famine, from 1854 to 1901, are estimated at 28,825,000, and during the last 10 years of that period the average was 1,000,000 deaths each year, or on the average, as has been calculated—

Two British subjects passed away from starvation or starvation induced diseases every minute of every day and every night from January 1, 1899, to September 30, 1901. (Digby, "Prosperous British India," page 130.)

The people live in miserable, dark, unventilated huts, with thatched roofs often out of repair, and Johns Scurr, in the London Herald, of May 4, 1919, describing the living conditions of the millhand, said:

The vast masses of the millhands are housed under the most indescribable, filthy conditions, and one is not surprised to learn that the people die of famines, plague, and cholera like fleas.

One of the further causes of this poverty, in addition to the drain by official salaries, interest and high taxation, has been the virtual destruction by discriminatory tariffs against India and in favor of England, designed to exclude Indian fabrics from the English and European markets, of the cotton-weaving industry of India. Owing to the unjust and oppressive tariffs the distaffs of India disappeared before the power looms of Manchester. The manufacturers of England cruelly crushed out their helpless Indian competitors.

ILLITERACY.

Propose this test to any colonial policy. Does it seek to educate the colonial peoples? If it does, its aim is elevation and liberation. If it does not, it is directed to that heartless exploitation which ends in the degradation of the native people. By this test England has failed. India had an educational system. The English destroyed it. The sums spent by England for education in India are pitifully small, $0.015 per annum per capita, as against the $4 per capita which we have expended in the Philippines. Only 6,780,721 out of about 75,000,000 children in India attend school, and the illiteracy among these people, who are of the very highest intellectual capacity, is 93 per cent, whereas during our 20 years of rule in the Philippines we have reduced the illiteracy there to 56 per cent. Seven per cent of the Hindus of the Aryan race, after 140 years of British rule, are literate, as against 44 per cent of the Filipinos after 20 years of our rule there. England's national policy, for so long dictated by a reactionary aristocracy, has never been favorable to the education of the masses at home, and it has opposed comprehensive plans for the education of the colonial people. Against this reactionary policy the liberals of England have for years protested. With reference to colonial peoples the British ruling class has said:

We do not want generals, statesmen, and legislators; we want industrious husbandmen.

In July of 1833, during a memorable debate upon the question of education in India, particularly with reference to the education of Hindus for public office, Lord Ellenborough said:

We had won the Empire of India by the sword, and we must preserve it by the same means, doing at the same time everything that is consistent with our existence there for the good of the people.

On July 10, 1833, Macaulay, speaking in opposition to Lord Ellenborough and in favor of the bill, which was to prevent the exclusion of Hindus from office in India, enunciated in a few great, burning, and immortal sentences the principles upon which a sound and upbuilding colonial policy should be based:

We are told that the time can never come when the natives of India can be admitted to high civil and military office. We are told that this is the condition on which we hold our power. We are told that we are bound to confer on our subjects—every benefit which they are capable of enjoying? No. Which it is in our power to confer on them? No. But which we can confer on them without hazard to our own domination. Against that proposition I solemnly protest as inconsistent alike with sound policy and sound morality. * * * It is the most childish ambition to covet dominion which adds to no man's comfort or security. To the great trading nation, to the great manufacturing nation, no progress which any portion of the human race can make in knowledge, in taste for the conveniences of life, or in the wealth by which those conveniences are produced, can be a matter of indifference. It is scarcely possible to calculate the benefits which we might derive from the diffusion of European civilization among the vast population of the East. It would be on the most selfish view of the case, far better for us that the people of India were well governed and independent of us than ill governed and subject to us—that they were ruled by their own kings, but wearing our broadcloth and working with our cutlery, than that they were performing their salaams to English collectors and English magistrates, but were too ignorant to value or too poor to buy English manufactures. To trade with civilized men is infinitely more profitable than to govern savages. That would indeed be a doting wisdom which, in order that India might remain a dependency, would keep it a useless and costly dependency, which would keep a hundred millions of men from being our customers in order that they might continue to be our slaves. It was, as Bernier tells us, the practice of the miserable tyrants whom he found in India, when they dreaded the capacity and spirit of some distinguished subject, and yet could not venture to murder him, to administer to him a daily dose of the pousta, a preparation of opium, the effect of which was in a few months to destroy all the bodily and mental powers of the wretch who was drugged with it, and to turn him into a helpless idiot. That detestable artifice, more horrible than assassination itself, was worthy of those who employed it. It is no model for the English nation. We shall never consent to administer the pousta to a whole community, to stupefy and paralyze a great people whom God has committed to our charge for the wretched purpose of rendering them more amenable to our control. What is that power worth which is founded on vice, on ignorance, on misery, which we can hold only by violating the most sacred duties, which as governors we owe to the governed, which as a people blessed with far more than an ordinary measure of political liberty and of intellectual light, we owe to a race debased by 3,000 years of despotism and priestcraft? We are free, we are civilized to little purpose if we grudge to any portion of the human race an equal measure of freedom and civilization.

Are we to keep the people of India ignorant in order that we may keep them submissive, or do we think that we can give them knowledge without awakening ambition, or do we mean to awaken ambition and to provide it with no legitimate vent? Who will answer any of these questions in the affirmative? Yet, one of them must be answered in the affirmative by every person who maintains that we ought permanently to exclude the natives from high office. I have no fears. The path of duty is plain before us, and it is also the path of wisdom, of national prosperity, of national honor.

The destinies of our Indian Empire are covered with thick darkness. It is difficult to form any conjecture as to the fate reserved for a state which resembles no other in history and which forms by itself a separate class of political phenomena. The laws which regulate its growth and its decay are still unknown to us. It may be that the public mind of India may expand under our system till it has outgrown that system; that by good government we may educate our subjects into a capacity for better government; that, having become instructed in European knowledge, they may, in some future age, demand European institutions. Whether such a day will ever come I know not, but never will I attempt to avert or to retard it. Whenever it comes it will be the proudest day in English history. To have found a great people sunk in the lowest depths of slavery and superstition, to have so ruled them as to have made them desirous and capable of all the privileges of citizens, would indeed be a title to glory all our own. The scepter may pass away from us. Unforeseen accidents may derange our most profound schemes of policy. Victory may be inconstant to our arms, but there are triumphs which are followed by no reverses. There is an empire exempt from all national causes of decay. These triumphs are the pacific triumphs of reason over barbarism; that empire is the imperishable empire of our arts and our morals, our literature and our law. (Vol. 19 (3d ser.), p. 536.)

What a great colonial policy is outlined in these most eloquent words. Would that England might have followed the vision of that imperishable empire declared by this gifted and devoted champion of the oppressed. But it was not to be. Bourbonism never yields. It must be broken, crushed beneath the tires of time and progress. Great Englishmen have seen the vision, but the iron clutch of the reactionaries could not be loosed.

And so, at the conclusion of this war, when the millions of India, whose sons had fought for England and for us on the strength of our promises of self-determination and freedom for all peoples, demanded that right of self-determination, the infamous Rowlatt act was passed, making the discussion of those demands a crime punishable with penalties of utmost severity. And then occurred one of the most impressive spectacles of our generation. Millions of the people of India, on a given day, without respect to the creeds which had divided them, forsook their tasks and went into each other's temples and mosques to pray for liberation. Unarmed, they undertook a passive resistance. They threw themselves before moving cars and were killed as a protest against their slavery. Yet these unarmed, helpless, protesting people were ruthlessly mowed down by the British machine guns and slaughtered by bombs from the air. Thus did England answer their plea for the self-determination which she and we had promised would be the fruit of this war. And at this very moment, I am informed, Indian troops are being used to crush that same plea for the fulfillment of our promises in Egypt and in Ireland, the sons of a poor and crushed people being employed to keep other oppressed peoples in subjection.

The yellow grain comes only from the flail and purified gold only from the fire. England needed to be chastened, and she has now passed through the furnaces of trial and agony.

Her reactionary representatives and colonial administrators at Paris tried to play the old diplomacy and wrote this despicable document; but, sirs, retribution, slow-footed, but inevitable, has overtaken them. At last the fires of liberty which Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, and Lincoln kindled here upon this Western Continent have illuminated the world and are consuming the old order. They have now warmed the hearts and are now shining in the faces of the 20,000,000 of members of this great new liberal party in England, who in the increasing light have themselves seen and have sworn to achieve what our common ancestors foresaw.

England has failed in India, failed in Egypt, failed in all of Africa, because of the successful resistance by her reactionary leaders of this great colonial policy which has been urged by Macaulay and a long line of illustrious English liberals, and which now, under the liberal leadership which has been all but established in England as a result of the war, will become her permanent national policy. But in spite of what we hope from

that liberal leadership in England, and however much we may desire to cooperate with it, we can not justify ourselves in signing and sealing an international contract which gives and guarantees to England nearly 931,000 additional square miles, a territory in area of approximately one-third of the United States, in Africa, and places in her charge more than 11,000,000 additional helpless African natives, in view of her past policy in the Dark Continent, which policy has been characterized by heartless exploitation, with practically no attempt to benevolently and intelligently elevate the peoples there.

THE AFRICAN PROBLEM.

The African problem is a stupendous one, and, sirs, in it are involved momentous issues affecting the whole future history of the world. This vast continent, with its nearly eleven and one-half millions of square miles of territory, embraces almost one-fourth of the land surface of the earth, and must, perhaps, become in time the great basin into which shall overflow the populations from the congested countries. Take continental Europe, with its 3,795,788 square miles; India, with its 1,766,642 square miles; China, with its 1,532,420 square miles; the United States, with its 3,092,679 square miles, and lay them all down on Africa, and there will still be room to spare; add Ireland, Scotland, and Wales, and even then Africa's great stretches will not be covered. Of this territory, England now holds, including Egypt and the Anglo-Egyptian Sudan, about 3,701,411 square miles, an area much greater than the total area of the United States, while the addition of the German colonies would increase her holdings to about 4,632,411 square miles, embracing the most desirable portions of the continent. There on that continent are uncomputed resources of coal, minerals, water powers, and agricultural lands. There can be found every variety of climate, the hot, dry air of the desert, the damp and dangerous miasmas of the jungle and swamps, many of which await reclamation, and the cold, invigorating air of plateau and mountain. One-fourth of the world's gold and 80 per cent of the world's diamonds come from Africa.

Consider the gold produced in Africa and taken for the benefit and enrichment of the white races:

West Africa (since 1880)	£17,099,000
Transvaal (since 1884)	514,700,000
Rhodesia (since 1898)	36,580,000
	£568,379,000 or $2,841,895,000

In 1915 the gold production of South Africa alone was £38,639,043. The value of the diamonds from South Africa had reached up to 1914 the huge sum of £169,342,868. Fabulous values in ivory, minerals, agricultural and natural products, and in heavy taxes and rents levied upon the natives have been taken by the English from Africa, while many millions of native inhabitants to whom belonged this great wealth still live under the same conditions of darkness, heathenism, and savagery as those which prevailed when the kings of the first dynasty ruled in Egypt 40 centuries ago.

Under the system of colonial administration and exploitation which has existed for so many years it has seemed perfectly natural and entirely proper for Englishmen to go to Africa and take up the land, forcing the native owners to become their tenants and to pay henceforth to them rentals for the lands upon which they and their ancestors had dwelt for countless generations. The native Africans now pay for the huts which they themselves have builded, have owned, and in which they reside, rentals to Englishmen of £2, £6, or £7 per year, and often, not content with the mere demanding of rental, the new owners often eject the native from the lands which have been taken from him, issuing to him summary commands to move on, to forsake forever the pleasant valleys or the hillsides to which his simple native heart has been devoted.

Maurice S. Evans, an English authority on Africa, states in this connection:

> One does not need a vivid imagination to picture the utter dismay brought to these people, living on ground familiar to their fathers, on getting such notice without warning. Just lately, since attention was called to the matter by the native affairs commission, it has received some thought from the Government, but they are placed in a dilemma by their own action. A large block of land in the upland districts has been bought by the Government from private owners for European closer settlement. This area at present carries a large native population; it is their ancestral home. Notice has been served on kraal heads, representing 5,000 souls, that the land has been transferred and they are liable to eviction. What will be done with them or where they will find new homes no man can say. Two outstanding features of native character complicate the problem. The first is the intense local attraction to his home and neighborhood, often the home of his fathers before him. The second is the childlike procastination of an awkward or troublesome question. * * * Rather than leave the old kraal site, with all its associations, he will promise any rent or undertake any obligation to furnish labor, only realizing the onerous or impossible nature of the contract he has undertaken when due fulfillment is demanded. (Black and White in Southeast Africa.)

In spite of the vast expanse of African territory and the comparative sparseness of its population, yet because of the huge holdings of land by Europeans, "the native question is the land question," and the one great need of the black man is land, while the demand of the white man is for labor.

In Africa as elsewhere the European colonists are generally opposed to the education of the natives. The European in Africa says, as Mr. Evans states, "An educated nigger is a spoiled nigger," and, further, as bearing upon the attitude of the colonists toward education, Mr. Evans states:

> Many of those who are hostile or apathetic to the work now undertaken by the missionaries are willing to tolerate some teaching of religion but are opposed to giving the natives education.

He continues:

> It will come as a surprise to many to learn that missionary effort is the only force which has yet, in any direct way, attempted the education and uplifting of the Abantu people over a large portion of Southeast Africa. Governments have given grants in aid to the work, only amounting in all to a niggardly percentage of the direct taxes paid by the natives; but there are no Government schools or a single institution in the whole country run solely by the Government for the training of the natives in arts or industry.
>
> So that the missionary stands to the native for religion, education, for all help he may get to make his life cleaner, more moral, and more in keeping with the ideals of the white man at his best. And as it is in the position of this single altruistic force that we have to regard the missionary, we can surely hardly overestimate his importance as a factor in our inquiry.

Mr. President, for myself I can not feel otherwise than that this Republic is under peculiar and heavy obligations to insist now upon some form of international cooperation which will inaugurate a policy for the elevation, education, and civilization of the oppressed peoples of Africa. The countless wrongs which have been committed by the better circumstanced men of the white races against the less fortunate dark-skinned people call for expiatory sacrifices, and shall we now, as we face the task of world reconstruction, refuse it? I believe that the German African colonies present an opportunity and a grave responsibility which this Nation must squarely face. I believe that the men of this Republic should be willing and eager to share the white man's burden in Africa, that we should not hesitate to go there to work side by side with our English and French brothers for a greater, better Africa, for the ultimate establishment there of a civilization compatible with the rich and distinctive genius of the African races. It would be a great and noble enterprise, and one well worthy of our best traditions, and in it I believe the Americans of African descent would gladly perform a large and important part. Our party, sirs, the party of Lincoln, is pledged to the furnishing of fair opportunities and the best educational facilities to the colored people of America. For myself, although I am a southern man, believing firmly in their capacity for growth and large achievement, I would extend to our colored people here every opportunity in their own schools for education which the whites enjoy in theirs. I would build for the colored people schools, colleges, and universities, throw open to them agricultural, technical, medical, and engineering courses, training them in large numbers in practical, industrial, and theoretical knowledge, each to the limit of his capacities, and then point out to those who had enjoyed these inestimable advantages of civilization their duty and responsibility for sharing in the work of upbuilding the civilization and promoting the welfare of Africa.

Under such a sound American policy it might well be, by another of those strange, mysterious processes of Providence, which are never comprehended until they reach their fulfillment, that the dark-skinned peoples brought here from the vast reaches of African plateau and tropical forest, as it appeared for so long to the material eye, only for exploitation, for toil without recompense, were in reality called as a chosen people that in their servile bondage here they, like the ancient Israelites in Egypt, might be prepared to sense the higher service; called that they might be uplifted to the light, to the appreciation and assimilation of our civilization, instructed in our morals, in our laws, in our faith; that they might be touched and nurtured by the spirit, dedicated by the benediction of our great Lincoln, and emancipated in truth; that they might have lighted in their souls with us at our common altars the sacred flame of liberty; that they might in large numbers voluntarily go back to the great country of their origin as missionaries, teachers, torch bearers, to carry and place that flame on new altars of liberty and enlightenment which white and colored Americans might together labor to erect there; that into the darkness of that continent might through them be poured a flood of light; that through them the wastes might be reclaimed, the degraded redeemed, the vast resources developed until, with the 150,000,000 of Africans uplifted and liberated under the inspiration and by the help of their American brothers, there should be founded upon that now dark and unhappy continent a new great sister

republic, which, with its material achievements and moral triumphs, would surpass the glories of the Golden Age of the ancient Egyptian dynasties.

[At this point Mr. FRANCE yielded the floor for the day.]

Thursday, October 9, 1919.

DISMEMBERMENT OF CHINA.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, I desire now to refer to the subject of the dismemberment of China.

Sirs, Africa has been the helpless victim of European ambition. For decades the great empires, like a pack of hungry lions, have been growling and snarling over her bleeding carcass, each battling for a larger share, while at many a critical time this contest of greed has brought the whole world to the brink of war. Some of the roots of this World War reach to the soil of Africa, and its most bitter fruits took some flavor from that destructive, corroding acid of hatred which was generated in the tropic, humid atmosphere of Africa, on the desolate shores of Lake Tanganyika, and northward, where the Belgian Kongo, closely joining the frontiers of the German East Africa colonies, made impossible the realization of Britain's dream of a railway from Cairo to the Cape, without a concession from one of these two powers. Germany refused a right of way, and Belgium, later granting it, was compelled to rescind the action because of German protestation and intimidation. But, sirs, the path has now been opened, blasted by machine guns and cut with gleaming swords.

The notorious open partitioning of Africa, to which the United States, although represented at the Berlin conference of 1885, has never given any sanction by its ratification of the General Act of that conference, is now being brought to its completion.

Article VI of Chapter 1 of the General Act reads as follows:

Provisions relative to protection of the natives, of missionaries, and travelers, as well as relative to religious liberty.

VI. All the powers exercising sovereign rights or influence in the aforesaid territories bind themselves to watch over the preservation of the native tribes, and to care for the improvement of the conditions of their moral and material well-being, and to help in suppressing slavery, and especially the slave trade. They shall, without distinction of creed or nation, protect and favor all religious, scientific, or charitable institutions and undertakings created and organized for the above ends, or which aim at instructing the natives and bringing home to them the blessings of civilization.

Christian missionaries, scientists, and explorers, with their followers, property, and collections, shall likewise be the objects of especial protection.

Freedom of conscience and religious toleration are expressly guaranteed to the natives, no less than to subjects and to foreigners. The free and public exercise of all forms of Divine worship, and the right to build edifices for religious purposes, and to organize religious missions belonging to all creeds, shall not be limited or fettered in any way whatsoever.

In the hot competition between the powers for greater territory and larger spheres of influence the high obligations recognized in this article have not been met. Spoliation, exploitation, and oppression have characterized the administration of the nations which have profited so richly by this division of the Continent of Africa.

The partitioning of Africa finds its parallel in the more stealthy but persistent, and no less effective, efforts for the division of China among the powers, all of which partitioning and spoliation of Africa and Asia, in the past, and that now contemplated in the present and in the immediate future, the United States is asked by this treaty to approve, to undertake to "respect and preserve," to guarantee the title of the despoilers to the territory taken even against the claims of the rightful owners. England, in order to continue her profitable opium trade through India, with the Chinese smugglers, in violation of Chinese law, a trade most destructive to the Chinese, but highly profitable to the English, engaged in 1840 in the unrighteous and, to our western civilization, disgraceful "opium war" and emerged, although a victor with unclean hands, demanding a heavy indemnity from China and the cession of Hongkong. This was the beginning of China's dismemberment, and since that time the extension of European and Japanese spheres of influence in China has gone on rapidly. England has surveyed this process with complacency, for a strong, free Chinese Republic would constitute a dangerous precedent, which might further arouse the ambitions of other eastern peoples, and thus sooner or later menace England's sway in India, Ceylon, and the East Indies, where, some time in the near future, England undoubtedly designs to increase her power. This treaty carries forward the policy of partition in China, strengthens the hold of the European powers there, and makes the United States particeps criminis in the nefarious plan. We do not know what may be the secret agreements between England, France, and Japan with reference to the Far East, but certainly we can not participate profitably in the spoils while probably England will control and hold Palestine, Arabia, Persia, Tibet, Burma, Western Siam, and Kwantung, in addition to Hongkong, Weihaiwei, and her other eastern possessions. France may secure permanently Yunnan, Kwansi, Indo China, and Tonkin and Eastern Siam, while Japan, no doubt, in addition to her present possessions, will seek to extend her power into Siberia. Japan now has a strangle hold on China. With Korea, Manchuria, Port Arthur, a portion of the Liaotung Peninsula, Kiaochow, and Shantung, not considering Formosa, she controls Peking, thus dominating the northern as England at Honkong and in Tibet holds the southern gateway to China. These territorial acquisitions, together with railway and mining concessions, the presence of foreign troops and police, post office and customs agencies, render China, so long as she assents, subject to foreign domination. The day will certainly come, if this treaty is signed, when China, perhaps aided by Germany, Russia, and India, will rise in her might to demand her freedom and the return of her ancestral territory, and then, under the provisions of this treaty, we shall be expected to call the American youth to fight perhaps by the side of Japan, on the side of injustice, oppression, exploitation, for the perpetuation of the cruel wrongs which have been done China, a great, though helpless because hitherto pacifist, nation. Japan furnishes, however, a striking example of the ease and rapidity with which the oriental peoples can adopt the customs, the civilization, and that dangerous militarism which has been developed in the West, and it would not be impossible for China to secretly and swiftly emulate the island empire, and as a huge militaristic nation assume the leadership of the East.

INJUSTICE TO KOREA.

We can not sign this treaty without an utter disregard of our moral and treaty obligations to the Korean people. Article 1 of our treaty with Korea, of May 22, 1882, provides:

If other powers deal unjustly or oppressively with either Government, the other will exert their good offices, on being informed of the case, to bring about an amicable arrangement, thus showing their friendly feelings.

At the time when Japan was making the first move toward depriving Korea of her independence, when she was undoubtedly dealing unjustly and oppressively with Korea, the Emperor of Korea did appeal to the United States for assistance, but the good offices of the United States, pledged under the treaty, were not exerted, in accordance with the treaty provisions, in Korea's behalf, as the communication from Horace M. Allen, then American minister to Korea, to the Secretary of State of the United States, herewith submitted, will indicate:

LEGATION OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
Seoul, Korea, April 14, 1904.

SIRS: * * * All these matters [diplomatic pressure in regard to various concessions] are naturally of serious concern to the Korean Emperor. He falls back in his extremity upon his old friendship with America. It is my endeavor to soothe him all I can, at the same time pointing out to him how the course of his Government during the past few years could not well lead to any other result than something like the alliance of February 23. I have not encouraged him to send a high official as minister to Washington in order to invoke the good offices of the United States, as it seems to me that would only be an embarrassment.

At the same time I may as well inform you that the Emperor confidently expects that America will do something for him at the close of this war, or when opportunity offers, to retain for him as much of his independence as is possible. He is inclined to give a very free and favorable translation to article 1 of our treaty of Jenchuan of 1882. I trust to be able to prevent a direct invocation of this treaty, however, though I am obliged to assure His Majesty that the condition of Korea is borne in mind by the United States Government, who will use their good offices when occasion occurs.

I have the honor to be, sir, your obedient servant.

HORACE M. ALLEN.

At the beginning of the war between Japan and Russia, Japan stated that she had entered upon the war to preserve the political independence and territorial integrity of Korea, and (article 3 of her treaty with Korea, Feb. 23, 1904) that—

The Imperial Government of Japan definitely guarantee the independence and territorial integrity of the Korean Empire. * * *

But on November 17, 1905, another treaty was forced by Japan, at the point of the sword, upon Korea, which placed in the hands of the Japanese Government the control and direction of the foreign affairs of Korea, practically depriving her of independence. On July 24, 1907, all administrative measures were made subject to the Japanese resident general, and on August 22, 1910, Korea was formally annexed by Japan, and more than 17,000,000 people of Chosen, the beautiful "Land of the Morning Calm," a people with an illustrious history of independence dating back to the distant centuries, became the subjects of an alien power, which since that time has not ceased to exploit and oppress them, while America, keeping silence, in violation of her treaty obligation to tender her good offices in such a case, is now expected by the ratification of this treaty to guarantee, respect, and preserve the territorial integrity of Japan, and thus to rivet for all time the shackles upon the proud, noble, and liberty-loving people who appealed to us in vain in their hour of need. I shall not attempt to recount the long story of the cruel wrongs inflicted upon this

helpless people, of oppression, insult, violence, outrage, suppression of free speech, arrest and torture of Christian leaders and teachers, the suppression of learning, the indignities to Korean women, the marching of modest Christian girls naked through the streets, the iniquitous spy system, the insolence to American missionaries, and the murder and crucifixion of Christian Korean men, since reports containing most of these facts have aready been printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD. The story of Korea's subjugation and oppression constitutes one of the most tragic and moving chapters in all the history of the ancient Orient. The Korean appeal can scarcely be disregarded as we consider this treaty which would forge forever the chains of bondage upon her. I quote from this appeal, adopted by the Korean congress, held on April 14, 1919, at Philadelphia:

For 4,000 years our country enjoyed an absolute autonomy. We have our own history, our own language, our own literature, and our own civilization. We have made treaties with the leading nations of the world; all of them recognized our independence, including Japan.

In 1904, at the beginning of the Russo-Japanese War, Japan made a treaty of alliance with Korea guaranteeing territorial integrity and political independence of Korea to cooperate in the war against Russia. Korea was opened to Japan for military purposes and Korea assisted Japan in many ways. After the war was over Japan discarded the treaty of alliance as a "scrap of paper" and annexed Korea as a conquered territory. Ever since she has been ruling Korea with the autocratic militarism whose prototype has been well illustrated by Germany in Belgium and northern France.

The Korean people patiently suffered under the iron heel of Japan for the last decade or more, but now they have reached the point where they are no longer able to endure it. * * *

We appeal to you for support and sympathy because we know you love justice; you also fought for liberty and democracy, and you stand for Christianity and humanity. Our cause is a just one before the laws of God and man. Our aim is freedom from militaristic autocracy; our object is democracy for Asia; our hope is universal Christianity. Therefore we feel that our appeal merits your consideration.

You have already championed the cause of the oppressed and held out your helping hand to the weak of the earth's races. Your Nation is the hope of mankind, so we come to you.

TREATY IMPERILS MISSIONS.

Mr. President, this brings me to a discussion of a subject of vital interest to the American people, and one to which I believe their attention has not been called in connection with this treaty; I refer to the great cause of the missionary movement throughout the world. Sirs, in a peculiar sense, this Republic is a missionary country, for not only have we been intrusted with the establishment here of institutions for the promotion of political and religious liberty, which would arouse the emulation of other nations, but we have also considered ourselves charged with the specific duty of giving of our treasure and sending forth our sons and daughters into the most benighted lands in order that in all places of darkness there might be lighted the flame of the true monotheistic religion and of that civilization which we seek here to bring to its first complete manifestation.

In view of the fact that many of the great treaties in the past have contained clauses specifically guaranteeing religious freedom and the rights of citizens, without molestation, to preach and practice their religion, which guaranties have gone far toward making possible systematic missionary work, it is most significant that the peace conference at Paris declined, although I believe urged by the representatives of certain great missionary bodies to do so, to include in the treaty or in the covenant general clauses specifically safeguarding these fundamentally important rights. To comprehend that state of mind which led the reactionary and imperialistic ministers who dominated the Paris peace conference deliberately to refuse to incorporate in this document provisions for protecting the missionaries in their work, it is necessary for us to grasp the profound importance and significance of the great missionary movement, for then only can we appreciate the almost instinctive opposition to it, particularly at this time, on the part of those imperialists who are seeking to compose a restless world, to stay revolution, and to reduce again to stagnant acquiescence in the old imperial system of subjugation and exploitation the millions of now aroused and rebellious peoples of the world.

During the war the imperialists yielded to the suspicion that Christian missionaries might become political propagandists, and this suspicion has guided their policies with reference to the missionaries in the various countries. By the establishment of the precedent under which missionaries from some countries will be excluded from the territories of others, by the obstinate refusal to definitely safeguard missionary interests in the treaty, as well as by conditions which have naturally grown out of the war, the whole missionary movement would seem to be now placed in extreme danger. The British are now excluding, with some possible justification, German missionaries from India and Africa; the Japanese are suspicious of and openly hostile to Christian missionaries in Korea; the British certainly would exclude from India any American missionary who preached the doctrine of political self-determination, which is founded upon the principles of true religion, or who was sympathetic with the laudable aspirations of the people of India for education and liberation, while China, if done the harsh injustice which has been planned against her by this treaty might well rataliate by excluding the missionaries who might desire to come from the countries which will have so grievously wronged her. This war after the war, this determination of the imperialists to maintain the old order of holding peoples against their will, in subjection for exploitation, may result in making it necessary for the man whose conscience compels him to obey the missionary mandate to violate the laws of country, the decrees of empires, and the dictatorial regulations of the imperialistic supergovernment, which this covenant creates.

In a large sense the great missionary movement may be considered to be an organized voluntary attempt on the part of generous, liberal-minded, and beneficently motived men to correct the delinquencies, soften the asperities, and counteract the inhumanities of the imperial governments, the dominating purposes of which are those of exploitation. The missionary goes not alone as a religious proselyte; he goes as a teacher, as the exemplar, as the bearer of the torch of civilization. He teaches toleration, liberation, and universal brotherhood. He is the courageous explorer of unknown lands, the hardy and heroic pioneer who, with most limited means and often in the face of insuperable difficulties and dangers, battles on the extreme frontiers of the world for those great principles upon which alone can be based the better order. His churches, hospitals, religious and industrial schools are the outposts from which radiate those influences which alone can stimulate and accelerate the forward, upward movement of the backward peoples of the earth. One eminent authority states:

Missions are, however, a far greater thing, after all, than simple proselytism. It would require many a volume to tell of what they have done for civilization, freedom, the exploration of unknown regions, the bringing to light of ancient literatures, the founding of the science of comparative religion, the broadening of the horizon of Christian thought in the homeland, and the bringing of distant peoples into the brotherhood of nations. These are results that can not be put into figures. While it is true that very diverse opinions are held concerning missions, it is indisputable that the most favorable testimonies come from those who have really taken the most pains to examine and understand their work. The one discouraging feature from the Christian point of view is the backwardness of Christendom in its great enterprise.

When we consider the importance of this work, not only from the standpoint of religious interests but with a view to its social and political significance, as bearing upon the future peace of the world, it is appalling to consider how vast is the field and how comparatively little has already been accomplished. I am submitting herewith two most important tables which are well worthy of careful examination, since in a general way they furnish a survey of what has been achieved, the great work which remains to be done, and the most inadequate voluntary agencies with which at present we are seeking to accomplish it.

Statistics of the great religions of the world.

[From the Blue Book of Missions, 1907.]

	Christians.			Jews.	Mohammedans.	Buddhists.	Hindus.	Confucianists and Taoists.	Shintoists.	Animists, Fetishists, etc.	Unclassed.	Totals.
	Protestants.	Roman Catholics.	Eastern churches.									
Africa	2,665,000	2,493,000	3,799,000	381,000	50,910,000	11,000	277,000	31,000	.....	97,179,500	125,500	157,722,000
America, North	64,488,000	36,693,000	1,000,000	1,069,000	15,000	5,000	94,000	85,000	.....	20,000	8,002,000	111,651,000
America, South	362,000	36,125,000	.....	22,000	10,000	.....	108,000	4,000	.....	1,262,000	63,000	37,956,000
Asia	1,542,000	5,385,000	17,144,000	482,000	141,456,000	137,900,000	209,152,000	291,030,000	24,900,000	41,436,000	5,693,000	876,120,000
Australasia	3,424,000	964,000	1,000	17,000	3,000	4,000	1,000	31,000	.....	40,000	70,000	4,555,000
Europe	92,922,000	183,754,000	98,213,000	9,247,000	3,575,000	.....	.....	.....	.....	.....	1,319,000	389,031,000
Mavlasia	416,500	7,095,500	.....	3,000	20,860,000	.....	27,000	570,000	.....	16,445,000	62,000	45,379,000
Oceania	247,000	129,000	.....	1,000	.....	15,000	.....	65,000	.....	507,000	18,000	982,000
Aggregate	166,066,500	272,638,500	120,157,000	11,222,000	216,630,000	137,935,000	209,659,000	291,816,000	24,900,000	157,069,500	15,352,500	1,623,446,000
	558,862,000											

Summary of protestant missionary work.

	American.	British.	German.	Other societies, viz, Paris Society, Swiss Romande, Netherlands societies, Scandinavian societies, etc.	Totals for Christendom.	Totals for 1895 (showing growth between 1895 and 1907).
Ordained missionaries	1,911	1,980	932	912	5,735	4,028
Laymen	535	1,738	168	361	2,802	1,477
Unmarried women	1,527	2,332	150	378	4,387	2,578
Ordained natives	2,312	2,141	197	623	5,273	4,295
Communicants (full members)	545,180	565,179	240,883	466,208	1,817,450	995,793
Numbers added in 1906	63,916	38,614	25,983	12,336	140,849	63,081
Adherents	1,286,259	1,398,306	540,073	1,136,500	4,361,138	2,770,801
Schools	8,855	11,789	2,878	5,346	28,868	19,384
Scholars	344,213	619,399	139,891	199,402	1,302,905	786,002

Protestant Missionary Income.

1895	£2,724,194
1900	3,095,915
1905	3,932,377
1906	4,256,029
1907	4,473,933

The Statistical Atlas (1910) puts it at £5,071,225, of which British and American societies each find about £2,000 and German societies £427,455.

The chief missionary countries have been Great Britain, the United States, and Germany. Great Britain and America have jointly and about equally carried on approximately four-sixths of the missionary activities; Germany, one-sixth; and the French, Swiss, Netherlands, and Scandinavian societies about one-sixth; and, therefore, with the closing of the German missions much heavier obligations will be thrown upon those other countries, particularly upon America and England.

When we consider that, according to these tables, there are in the world only about 558,862,000 Christians and but 11,222,000 Jews, there remaining over 1,000,000,000 of people who are without education and the true faith of monotheism, in the absence of which genuine civilization is impossible, and that, it is estimated, all of the missionary activities of the past have secured but about 10,000.000 of converts, it becomes apparent how inadequate have been the means hitherto employed, how heavy is the obligation resting upon the enlightened countries for the performance of this vitally important work, and how disastrous it would be to ratify a treaty which does not safeguard its continuance and provide positively for its extension.

Every church, Protestant and Catholic, should protest against the omission from this treaty of such safeguarding clauses. Attention has already been called to the fact that pagan influences must have prevailed at Paris, since the name of Almighty God is not mentioned in the treaty, but here is additional evidence, since sinister influences must have prevented the protection by clear definition and specific provisions of the great fundamental rights of religious liberty, the right to worship God according to the dictates of conscience, which implies the right to obey the missionary command.

In article 22 of the covenant provision is made that in Central Africa the "Mandatory must be responsible for the administration of the territory under conditions which will guarantee freedom of conscience and religion." In article 86 the Czecho-Slovaks and in article 93 the Poles accept and agree "to embody in a treaty with the principal allied and associated powers such provisions as may be deemed necessary by the said powers to protect the interests of inhabitants of that State who differ from the majority of the population in race, language, or religion," and in article 438 "The allied and associated powers agree that where Christian religious missions were being maintained by German societies or persons in territory belonging to them * * * the property which these missions possessed shall continue to be devoted to missionary purposes, and the allied and associated governments while continuing to maintain full control * * * will safeguard these missions."

Thus only in connection with Czechoslovakia, Poland, Central Africa, and former German territory is there any safeguarding of religious rights, and this apparently only for commercial and political purposes. I fail to find any other mention of religion or religious freedom in the treaty, and there is no positive affirmation, as I have indicated, of guaranties of those rights to hold, practice, preach, and disseminate religious faith which are so essential.

Other great peace treaties have safeguarded these rights. I quote from several treaties as examples:

[1713. Utrecht, treaty of (general), between Great Britain and France, March 31–April 11, 1713.]

ART. 21. The most Christian King will, in consideration of the friendship of the Queen of Great Britain, grant, that in making the treaty with the empire, all things concerning the state of religion in the aforesaid treaties of Westphalia, so that it shall plainly appear that the most Christian King neither will have nor would have had any alteration made in the said treaties. (In Chalmers, George. A collection of treaties between Great Britain and other powers. London, 1790, vol. 1, p. 384.)

[1713. Utrecht, treaty of (general), between Great Britain and France, March 31–April 11, 1713.]

ART. 5. * * * In the business of religion there shall be an entire liberty allowed to the subjects of each of the confederates, as also, if they are married to their wives and children; neither shall they be compelled to go to the churches or to be present at the religious worship in any other place. On the contrary, they may, without any kind of molestation, perform their religious exercises after their own way, although it be forbid by the laws of the kingdom, privately and within their own walls, and without the admittance of any other persons whatsoever. * * * (In Chalmers. Collection, etc., vol. 50, p. 395.)

[1763. Paris, treaty of.]

ART. 4 (covering Nova Scotia, Canada, and Cape Breton Island). * * * His Britannic Majesty * * * agrees to grant the liberty of the Catholic religion to the inhabitants of Canada. He will in consequence give the most precise and most effectual orders that his new Roman Catholic subjects may profess the worship of their religion, according to the rites of the Romish Church, as far as the laws of Great Britain permit * * *. (In Chalmers. Collection, etc., vol. 1, p. 472.)

ART. 20 (repeats the above for Florida, as well as for all the Spanish possessions in North America to the east or to the southeast of the river Mississippi). (In Chalmers. Collection, etc., vol. 1, p. 497.)

[1878. Berlin, treaty of.]

ART. 5. (Bulgaria.) The freedom and outward exercise of all forms of worship are assured to all persons belonging to Bulgaria, as well as to foreigners, and no hindrance shall be offered either to the hierarchical organization of the different communions or to their relations with their spiritual chiefs.

ART. 27. (Montenegro.) In Montenegro the difference of religious creeds and confessions shall not be alleged against any person as a ground of exclusion or incapacity in matters relating to the enjoyment of civil and political rights * * *.

(Freedom of religious worship worded in the same way as article 5 above.)

ART. 35. (Serbia.) (Same wording as article 5 above.)

ART 44. (Roumania.) (Same wording as article 5 above.)

ART. 62 (deals with religious liberty in general for Turkey): In no part of the Ottoman Empire shall difference of religion be alleged against any person as a ground for exclusion or incapacity as regards the discharge of civil and political rights, admission to the public employments, functions, and honors, or the exercise of the various professions and industries.

All persons shall be admitted, without distinction of religion, to give evidence before the tribunals.

The freedom and outward exercise of all forms of worship are assured to all, and no hindrance shall be offered either to the hierarchical organization of the various communions or to their relations with their spiritual chiefs.

Ecclesiastics, pilgrims, and monks of all nationalities traveling in Turkey in Europe or in Turkey in Asia shall enjoy the same rights, advantages, and privileges.

The right of official protection by the diplomatic and consular agents of the powers in Turkey is recognized both as regards the above-mentioned persons and their religious, charitable, and other establishments in the holy places and elsewhere.

The rights possessed by France are expressly reserved, and it is well understood that no alterations can be made in the status quo in the holy places.

The monks of Mount Athos, of whatever country they may be natives, shall be maintained in their former possessions and advantages, and shall enjoy, without any exception, complete equality of rights and prerogatives.

(Sir A. Oakes and R. B. Mowatt, Great European Treaties of the Nineteenth Century. Oxford, 1918.)

[1815, Vienna, treaty of.]

Article 21 (property of religious establishments to remain in statu quo).

ART. 46 (covering the free town of Frankfort). * * * Its institutions shall be founded upon the principle of a perfect equality of rights for the different sects of the Christian religion * * *.

ART. 77 (covering the rights of the inhabitants of the Canton of Berne). * * * shall enjoy in every respect, without any distinction of religion * * * the same political and civil rights * * *.

(Sir A. Oakes and R. B. Mowat, Great European Treaties of the Nineteenth Century. Oxford, 1918.)

On yesterday an attempt was made on the other side of the Chamber to convey the impression that all the churches of America were for this treaty unamended. Such an impression,

if conveyed, is absolutely erroneous. I have in my hand a copy of a letter from the Federal Council of Churches, in which that council asks for amendments safeguarding these religious rights. I ask to have it inserted in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The matter referred to is as follows:

[Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, National Office, 612 United Charities Building, 105 East Twenty-second Street, New York, Rev. Charles S. Macfarland, general secretary.]

MAY 23, 1919.

To the MEMBERS OF CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, D. C.

SIRS: I take pleasure in conveying to you the following action taken by the Federal Council at its special meeting held in Cleveland, Ohio, May 6–8, 1919: It was—

"*Resolved*, That we express our gratitude for the establishment of the league of nations as agreed upon by the Paris peace conference and pledge our support in securing its ratification by the Senate of the United States and our devotion to make it a success.

"*Resolved*, That we urge the incorporation at an early date into the covenant of the league of nations of a clause guaranteeing freedom of religious belief.

"*Resolved*, That we urge the incorporation at an early date into the covenant of the league of nations of a clause guaranteeing equality of race treatment, understanding by this the equal treatment in respect of the law and its administration in the case of aliens lawfully within the territory of the Government concerned."

Faithfully, yours,

(Signed) CHARLES S. MACFARLAND,
General Secretary.

Mr. FRANCE. Mr. President, much as I desire to see a new and better international order, I am not one of those who can indulge in the seductive dream that by the swift stroke of a few score of pens on parchment, through the instrumentality of a mere treaty, without further toil and sacrifice, by seer, saint, and martyr, without the further heroic march and struggle of missionary through the forest and the jungle, over the marshes and across the desolate plains where men live like the wild beasts with which they contend, without further teaching and enlightenment, without the further education and elevation of peoples and the elimination of those false and pagan philosophies which keep the souls of so many millions in degradation and desolation, all of the sons of men of every race, tribe, condition, and nation can be united into a universal brotherhood which shall be dominated henceforth and forever by charity, by the two great golden, royal commandments, and that throughout the widest confines of the earth the eternal words of the spirit shall become the accepted law of mankind.

Sirs, so great a good can not come to man in such an unearned manner. Not through the promulgation of a statute, but by the regeneration of men, by the spirit, must such a millennium come. Unscrupulous men are playing now upon the highest human hopes to accomplish their own base ends, but there can be no excuse for those who would vote to ratify a treaty which fails to safeguard only those processes by which this unspeakable good may be at last accomplished. I appeal to the people of the churches of America. I appeal to the great church missionary leaders, some of whom, I believe, know the circumstances under which the machinators of this treaty at Paris refused to safeguard missionary interests, to demand in terms which may not be disregarded the rejection of this scheme which imperils the great educational missionary movement throughout the world.

I can not now even attempt to detail all of the wrongs which this treaty either creates or perpetuates. I hope at some future date to speak along this line on Ireland and the relation of the treaty to the cause of Irish freedom, which must be close to the hearts of America. If I were to attempt to state the case of Egypt, of Persia, of Russia, of Hungary, of Syria, and of all of the other lands whose hopes of self-determination and freedom this infamous instrument would condemn to perpetual defeat, I would trespass too far upon your time and still my point would not be made more clear. It is because I believe in the principles for which we fought that I can not believe in this treaty, which is the complete negation of all of those great principles. It is the adoption and not the rejection of this treaty which will break the heart of the world.

CONCLUSION.

Sirs, for too long have I trespassed upon your patience and with an argument so discursive that I must most briefly summarize it.

1. This Nation may not join or become part of any international government or supergovernment formed to achieve aims other than those to which our Government is dedicated—to establish justice, promote the general welfare, and secure the blessings of liberty to all.

2. There need be no narrow limitation placed upon the extent of the sphere which may be embraced in a republican federation if the well-known principles of federation are applied, which principles this covenant violates.

3. This covenant forms a new coalition of 358,000,000 of people as against a possible second coalition, as I have shown, of more than 1,000,000,000 of people, most of whom the smaller coalition plans to control if not to exploit.

4. The plan is condemned by an overwhelming majority of mankind and by nearly all men of liberal thought in the countries most deeply concerned.

5. The British Labor Party demands amendments of a vital character, looking to a true society of nations, and the end of colonial exploitation.

6. That the war has been a liberty war to usher in a new order, while this treaty is designed to preserve the old.

7. By article 10 we would guarantee title to much territory illegally gained and unrighteously held, and become responsible for intolerable conditions in all parts of the world, particularly in India, Africa, and Korea.

8. I indicated, through a quotation from Macaulay, the proper principles which should guide a wiser colonial policy.

9. I indicated our obligations to Africa, and how they might be met.

10. I have shown that this plan imperils the cause of missions and indicated, in the tables which I have submitted, the scope and significance of missions.

Sirs, we have a peculiar national destiny, that of demonstrating to the world the transcendent excellency and the universal applicability of free republican government and of persuading all other peoples to the adoption of those institutions and ideals which will assure to them the blessings of an ordered liberty. We may not adapt ourselves to the governmental forms or accept the purposes of other nations in place of those to which we owe such high and holy allegiance. We may not move backward, retreating to join the empires where they stand. We may not work out the pattern of our destiny by the plan which guides us, if we interweave the golden strands of our ideals of universal liberation with the coarse material and disintegrating fibers of their lust and greeds for exploitation. We may not stand with them under banners of lesser significance or service than our own. We may not follow their flags to the unceasing drum beat of empire round the world. We may not conscript American freemen, nourished with the milk of liberty at parental breasts, to keep step with the march of mercenary armies bent on the ancient errands of subjugation and exploitation. We may not carry our "banners of the dawn" back into the night. To do so would be to destroy our fair Republic, to extinguish the illuminating fires of liberty flaming on our altars, and to plunge the world into the blackness of despair. We must rather resolutely plant our own incomparable standard high, advance forward toward the future, and, swearing a fresh devotion to its great and best traditions, call the other nations to our colors. Let us rest serene in the faith of our fathers, that under the reign of everlasting and immutable law there can be no national security which is not founded upon right, no true victory which is not a moral victory, no permanent peace which is not established upon justice.

This being forever true, we might set our hands as proud victors to the ratification of this despicable document, deceiving ourselves into the fatuous belief that a permanent peace has been secured. But, sirs, within the shadow, unseen by mortal eyes, is fixed a Power which has ordained that men shall move forever on toward perfect justice and toward a larger liberty, and to Him through the unresting, turbulent, warring years which will follow this treaty's ratification, all the evils, the cruelties, the inhumanities sealed within it will cry out; to Him will still arise the supplications of many peoples held in bondage; to Him be uplifted the wasting, shackled arms of the oppressed; to Him will ascend the resistless pleas of centuries of unrequited wrongs; from Africa, where the heartless greed of the white man has been a withering curse to the black; where the slave trader buys from the native the wife he loves for the liquor which in his abject misery he craves; where tonight unnumbered thousands sweat through the wretchedness of unending hours, in filth and physical agony, which we have not sent our science to relieve; from plague, cholera, poverty, and hunger stricken India, where millions of our noble Aryan race are born to misery, live in dark illiteracy and heathenism, to be murdered at the last by the inhumanity of their more happy circumstanced brothers across the western seas; from beautiful Ireland, soul sickened at hope too long deferred, yet yearning with all the unquenchable passion of her youth for freedom and for the restoration of her national life; from Christian Korea, crying to be rescued from the ruthless clutch of her cruel pagan master and tormentor; from China,

despoiled, ravished, and disillusioned as she was awakening from her centuries of slumber to a clearer conception of freedom and the ideals of our western civilization; from Russia, somewhat delirious and helpless with her new-found freedom, but receiving from us calumny, abuse, and the murder of her sons in an illegal, bloody war, when she had pled for succor, peace, and healing; from all the more than five hundred millions of the sons of men who, because of their exploitation, lie down to-night in cheerless huts, in the blackness of heathenism, upon floors of dirt, their souls dumbly, blindly as the inarticulate beasts, in their utmost wretchedness appealing to the Power which they themselves have not been taught to know. And, sirs, this Republic, if she should desert her purposes and her standards by the ratification of this treaty, must be arraigned at the last before that eternal Power of justice to answer why to all these cries for vindication and for liberation she turned deaf ears, and to her must come, if she shall participate in all these wrongs, the certain punishment and destruction which has been measured out through the past years to all those nations which could not hear the call of duty and refused to obey the mandates of the higher law.

I must believe that there can be no permanent peace until there shall be an end of imperialistic exploitation, until national and international purposes shall run in harmony with those underlying forces which forever move on to ethical ends. Of the Civil War, Lincoln said what may be equally said of this war:

> This is essentially a people's contest. On the side of the Union it is a struggle for the maintaining of that form and substance of government whose leading object is to elevate the condition of men, to lift artificial weights from all shoulders, to clear the paths of laudable pursuit to all, to afford an unfettered start and a fair chance in the race of life.

This "leading" object of our domestic policy must also be the determining purpose of our foreign policy. We must not seek a negative and passive peace to preserve the status quo, but an affirmative upbuilding peace which shall give birth to the new world order.

Washington, Hamilton, Jefferson, Adams, Lincoln, Cleveland, McKinley, and the immortal Roosevelt cherished international amity and peace. Propose to their philosophy a league of nations, and back the answer most certainly must come, "What kind of nations? Will they be of the 'form and substance of the republic,' and shall each be dedicated wholly to the elevation and emancipation of mankind?" Propose to their philosophy a league of peace. I think I hear the answer, "What kind of peace?" Shall this unceasing and increasing tide of human events, which we have believed moved on to distant and divinely appointed ends, find at last a mechanical termination in one vast stagnant pool of passivity and of universal pacificism, which, static, stale, foul, motionless, and scummed, shall mark the death of all this forward surge and struggle of the world? Can you have doubt that they would say: "Peace, sirs, in itself may be a miserable aim. Peace must be made an incident in a larger, effective, reformative, and upbuilding plan."

Have you a doubt of this? Then call upon the ashes of these mighty men to answer from their urns or let their spirits speak and tell if it were better had they not bared their breasts to battle for the right and for the rights of men, or call them with the long glory roll of America's immortal martyrs. I think you hear the answer pealing and re-pealing down the corridors of the years, ever swelling, now rising with the ringing voices of our last honored, heroic dead, whose sacred dust lies beneath the simple crosses on the silent fields of France or in our most peaceful churchyards:

"There is a price which, by the eternal law of God, the sons of men dare not to pay for peace."

The victory of this war was an American victory, and it is for this Senate, by declining to compromise with injustice, by refusing to lower or carry back our standards to see that the peace is made an American peace.

I know that there are some of these new promiscuous internationalists who, extolling the achievements of other nations, decline to admit the distinctive glory of their own. I wish that all such might be made to remember the story of that battle which raged between Chateau-Thierry and Dormans, beginning on that eventful Saturday night, the 14th day of July, 1918. The Americans had waited through the long day in their trenches, expectant that at any moment the German hordes, supported by artillery, machine guns, and armed tanks, would come plunging, crushing like thunderbolts of iron and steel through our lines. Evening came, and slowly over the miles of winding trenches was thrown the soft mantle of the silent night—silent but so full of portent. At Paris, but 47 miles away, sweet-toned cathedral bells tolled forth the solemn hour of midnight, while pure, brave women and helpless children slumbered in peace and confidence that their defenders would stand like walls of steel and everlasting granite between them and those who would so ruthlessly ravish and destroy.

It was a half hour after midnight when suddenly from beyond the woodland, far off in the distance, there shot up tongues of flame, and then came the muffled thunder of artillery, the ominous opening of the second Battle of the Marne, destined to be remembered through future generations as the greatest of the decisive battles of all time. From that half hour after midnight there was no rest. All through the night our troops suffered the incessant roar of a terrific cannonade, while bursting bombs split the air and hissing shells plowed with giant furrows the scarred ground over against and all about them.

When the first dawn painted the eastern sky with red and gold, the Germans, behind a hellish barrage, launched a mighty, furious charge. It struck and shook the American lines; all was chaos, din, and confusion; an inferno of noise; the wild, crashing thunder of reeking guns; deafening explosions; the mad onrush of thousands of men. Men fell groaning. Men grappled with men, and bayonets sank home in quivering flesh. Our men resisted to the utmost. Yet on they came, division after division, the best shock troops of the Kaiser's hosts. On they came, bronzed, lean, hungry, muscular, their sunken eyes burning with the deep fires of hellish hate. On, on they came in such a flood that human flesh could not withstand the onslaught. It was a terrible, a desperate, a magnificent charge. Backward and forward surged and seethed the waves of living, panting, desperately struggling men, until finally, now fighting calmly and heroically, now resisting with the fury of madmen, the American troops yielded, step by step, and the Stars and Stripes were forced to give ground, slowly, haltingly, retiring. It was the supreme hour of battle. The Germans were over the Marne, marching on like infernal machines against the crumbling French and American lines—and Paris 47 short miles away.

The communication wires were crackling, electric with warning signals, while excited messengers in breathless haste panted out to the assembled staff officers at the French headquarters the fateful information that the Germans were smashing on resistlessly and that our lines had broken. What was to be done? The consultation was brief, the decision prompt, the order was issued from the French headquarters to the French divisions and to the Americans, struggling with determination, to fall back to safer positions. You will recall the deathless words of the American officer who received this command:

> We regret being unable on this occasion to follow the counsels of our masters, the French, but the American flag has been forced to retire. This is unendurable and none of our soldiers would understand their not being asked to do whatever is necessary to reestablish a situation which is humiliating to us and unacceptable to our country's honor. We are going to counterattack.

Shall I say that this was the decisive event of the battle? I can say more, for it was the turning point of the war, a critical, a supreme moment in the history of civilization. For many weary months the Allies had been on the defensive. Now all was changed. "We are going to counterattack." The order was given to Americans, to company, to battalion, to regiment, that whole magnificent division; and, oh, how gallantly, how madly the Americans charged with a courage and a desperation which were to thrill a waiting world. On, on they charged, down into the valley of the Marne, driving the Germans into the river. On, on over the Marne, up, up those bloody slopes to St. Germaine, to Jaulgonne, to Goussancourt, on to the historic Fere en Tardenois. On, on through the Bois de Dole, which should now no longer be called the "Woods of Sorrow," but the "Woods of Glory"; on, on to the River Vesle and to an immortal victory. The dangerous German salient, which like a monstrous serpent's deadly fang had threatened Paris, was destroyed. Paris was saved.

For swift as a flame their heroism spread northward through all the serried ranks of the French and British hosts, and within a few hours the allied lines, not to be outdone in valor, had launched another magnificent attack between Albert and Montdidier, and within a few brief, glorious, and victorious days, days of tremendous and terrific combat, the menacing salient at Moreuil was also broken and the strategic and historic city of Amiens, which had for months lain helpless in imminent peril beneath the frowning and threatening guns of the enemy, was relieved.

You know the rest of the story—of the fall of Rosieres, of Chaulnes, of Roye, of Noyon, of Lens, of the breaking of the Hindenburg line. The American counterattack had inaugurated and developed a mighty allied offensive, and the carefully laid plans and the stupendous efforts of the German generals and of

the German hosts for their rush to the sea, for their capture of Paris, for victory, and conquest, were shattered. America had led to victory.

Sirs, in the making of this treaty European purposes and aims prevailed, and we deeply regret that on this occasion once more we are unable to follow the counsels of our French and British brothers, but to do so would be to permit our American principles and ideals to go down to a disastrous defeat. The ratification of this treaty by the Senate would again create a situation "humiliating to us and unacceptable to our country's honor."

We must refuse all compromise with injustice and dishonor, and standing firmly our ground demand such drastic changes in this covenant as would make it conform to the great purposes and ideals not only of this Nation, but of the new leaders of Great Britain as well, as expressed in the amendments suggested by the British Labor Party, and, failing to secure such radical amendments, reject the whole treaty and summon the world again into a council, which shall, without prejudice, passion, or hatred, formulate plans for an upbuilding peace, a peace of purpose and of progress, a peace consistent with our best traditions, and with the highest aspirations of the English race. In all that I have said in condemnation of the colonial policies which have been dictated by the British reactionaries, I have intended no unkindness to the noble English people, and, indeed, the most severe criticisms which I have made were embodied in words written by Englishmen themselves. A reactionary administration here joined with the reactionary ministers of England and France in the formulation of this plan, which has received the criticism and condemnation of the masses of France and England, as it will receive the same from the liberal-minded millions of America, when they shall understand the scheme. Never were the masses of England and America closer together, never were hands clasped across the seas in firmer friendship. We are bound now to our English brothers by ties stronger than language and blood, for in this war there has been created a new kinship between the liberty-loving men of England and those of America, a new and more intimate community of purpose and ideals, a new shared sense of responsibility to the backward peoples, a new conception as to the meaning of "the white man's burden."

Some one has said that when the cup of human abominations becomes filled the Almighty generally interposes. In 1917 the world's cup of wrongs, agonies, and abominations was overflowing, and there came an unmistakable summons to this Republic, which she heard, interpreted, and at once obeyed. She called her sons to her armies, to her shops, to her factories, to flaming forges, glowing ingots, and to ringing anvils, and placed herself in splendid shining armor, putting upon her mighty limbs all of the habiliments of war, to stand forth the invincible champion and vindicator of human rights. This Republic must now move forward beneath the incomparable flag which, new baptized in war, has taken on a fresh beauty and significance, to a peace which may be permanent because broad based upon the principles of eternal justice and the inalienable rights of men, and as the leader she must call to her exalted standards and ideals that vast procession of mankind whose so eager eatward-looking faces now begin to shine with the first crimsoned glance of radiant sun rising in splendor on a better age.

Mr. NELSON obtained the floor.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator yield to me to suggest the absence of a quorum?

Mr. NELSON. Oh, no; let us go on; I do not care.

Mr. President, I shall ask the indulgence of the Senate for only a few moments, and I shall occupy the time in stating some general propositions which I think may be of interest.

> Night wanes—the vapours round the mountains curl'd
> Melt into morn, and light awakes the world.

Mr. President, a spark from a small Balkan State kindled the great conflagration of war in Europe, for which Germany had long prepared the combustible material. It spread like a whirlwind from the banks of the Danube across the Rhine into innocent and neutral Belgium and thence into trembling and agonized France. Most of us had at the beginning no idea that the conflagration would spread to the hither side of the Atlantic and involve our country in the vortex, though to a few of us this seemed from the start inevitable. Three thousand miles of ocean were, as it turned out, to give us no immunity. It became in time a great World War; the greatest of all known in history. All Europe, except a few small neutral nations on the outer fringes, was involved, and even these did not escape some of the tragic and sad incidents of the war.

For two years and eight months the war dragged its horrid, barbaric, and uncertain course before our country was impelled to enter the struggle. The German submarines were attempting and threatening to exclude and isolate America from all commercial intercourse with Europe. This was the apparent spark which aroused the spirit of our people to the striking point. But the heart and soul of America was not enlisted in the great conflict because of the submarine nor for the purpose of transplanting democracy to Europe. The inspiration came from a deeper and more profound source. The trend of events, before and during the war, clearly indicated that Germany aspired to world dominion and world control and that France, Belgium, and England stood in her pathway as obstacles, to be first vanquished and overcome. Could she succeed in this, all Europe would be at her mercy and under her control, and her system of autocracy and ruthless militarism would be paramount throughout the Continent, and the subjugated States, as well as the small neutral States, would be to a greater or lesser extent mere vassals of her Empire.

The German menace was twofold. It was not only one of mere brute force, but the sinister and ruthless character of its system and methods was even more to be dreaded. Had complete success crowned the efforts of Germany in the war, as she had planned it, America would have been regarded by her as an open and free field for her exploitation, and the Monroe doctrine would have been regarded as a "mere scrap of paper."

With this view of the case, as I have briefly outlined it, it seemed to me and to many others that it was our war from the very beginning, even before we formally entered therein, and that the Allies were in fact fighting our battles on the plains of Belgium and France, where we subsequently came to their relief, and where, by so doing, we made it our war as much as theirs. It was not until our people had become fully awake and alive to the character of the German menace that the heart and soul of America emered the Great War—a World War—with a few small neutral nations as spectators. It was a menace from Europe that threatened us, and we had to meet and overcome that menace on the battle fields of Europe, more than 3,000 miles from our shores.

One supreme lesson comes to us from this war, and that is this: Our country can no longer isolate itself on the Western Hemisphere in peace or in war, or occupy an attitude such as that of Japan prior to the advent of Commodore Perry. Neither commercially, industrially, nor politically can we isolate ourselves from Europe. Any menace from that source which vitally affects our commerce and trade, our political well-being, or national existence must always concern us. The avenues to Europe and to all her people must always be open to us. Chaos and anarchy there react on us here to a greater or lesser extent. We can not carry on intercourse with any country given over to lawlessness or to any form of anarchy or mob rule. Neither can we afford to allow any nation to become a power which inherently and by its very nature and methods aims at world dominion and world control. Such a power may at any time, as in the recent war, become a continuing menace to the safety, peace, and prosperity of our country. More danger to America lurks in the East than in the West, in Europe than in Asia.

Any nation seeking to dominate and control all of Europe will, if successful in its purpose, be a standing menace to the welfare, the prosperity, and the independence of America. Overcrowded Germany, if England, France, and Italy were rendered helpless, would soon flood South America with her emigrants; and Argentina, Uruguay, and Brazil, and other States of South America would in the near future become German colonies, for the Monroe doctrine would not prove much, if any, obstacle to the all-conquering Teuton with his relentless war machine.

It was a world's war in which our Nation engaged, and it was an enemy seeking world power and dominion that we fought and vanquished; yes, fought and vanquished on the plains of Europe. The war has not settled the use of the submarine—the ostensible, but not real, cause of the war. The most that can be said is that for the time being, and perhaps for some years to come, the fangs of war have been extracted from the enemy; but to what extent and for how long none of us can easily foretell.

Germany is likely to turn her face to the east and seek to exploit Russia, as she aimed to exploit Belgium and France. She owes much of her growth in the past to aggressions against her neighbors. Austria was her victim on the southeast, Poland on the east, Denmark on the north, and France on the west. These conquests were the boast and the pride of her statesmen and generals. Not content with despoiling Denmark in 1864 and thus getting control of the Baltic and the North Sea, in this war she aimed to secure a footing on the coast of Belgium and northern France for the purpose of controlling the British Channel and securing access to the Atlantic by that route.

Who can doubt, if he has studied the facts, that Germany, with her allies—Austria-Hungary, Bulgaria, and Turkey—bred

and fostered a world's war, and that this war was on their part a menace to the remainder of the civilized world, including our own country?

Such a war manifestly entails upon the countries who were successful in the war the duty for their own future protection, if for nothing else, to secure and establish a world peace, a peace that will cover the entire field of combustion.

The field of peace is as broad as the field of war. As the welfare and safety of America impelled us to make war in Europe, why should not the future welfare and safety of our country impel us, in conjunction with our allies, to prevent the recurrence of such a war? A spark from petty Serbia kindled the flames of a war which involved practically the entire civilized world, our own country included. A spark from some other source in Europe may easily start a conflagration resulting in another great world war into which our country will be as likely to be drawn as into the late war; for such a war would, no doubt, involve blockades and stoppage of intercourse by submarines and other methods.

Modern medical science has devoted its skill fully as much to the prevention as to the cure of disease, with wonderful results and blessings for the entire human race. Sound statesmanship should act on the same principle.

It seems to me that that statesmanship which is oblivious to the importance of providing by all reasonable methods against the recurrence of war in the future, and insists on standing still until war actually occurs, is short-sighted, lives in the past, lacks wor d vision, and overlooks the fact that a world's war should result in a world's peace, and that such a peace should, as far as possible, be of a permanent character.

It will not do for such narrow and selfish views to hide themselves behind a "holier than thou" cry of patriotism, or, as they choose to call it, "Americanism." Patriotism and Americanism are not confined to those who thus shout. The Bible tells us that—

> Not everyone that saith unto me Lord, Lord shall enter into the kingdom of heaven; but he that doeth the will of my Father which is in heaven.

I can not sympathize with that sentiment which would have our country crawl into a closed shell with no other label than the Monroe doctrine.

There should be and is a conscience of nations as there is of individuals. The Poles, the Czechs, and the Slavs rendered us and our Allies considerable assistance in the war, and they were in one form or another encouraged, led to believe, and promised that they would secure their independence if the enemy was defeated. The treaty has carried out this promise. Provision is made for an independent Poland and an independent Czechoslovakia. And now the question is, Shall we treat these provisions of the treaty as "mere scraps of paper"? Shall we now utterly abandon these new States and give ourselves no concern whatsoever about their future welfare? Shall we become to them a mere national mummy, wrapped in the folds of the Monroe doctrine? I do not believe the American conscience will stand for this or suffer it to be called "Americanism." This is counterfeit "Americanism." The people of our great Republic occupy a higher moral level than this. They have a conscience that brooks no national injustice; they are above and beyond the supreme selfishness that such conduct implies. Peace will come to Europe when oppressed peoples and suppressed nations come into their own.

Our country can be of great service to them without resorting to war. There is no need to obligate ourselves, nor should we obligate ourselves to make war in their behalf. But let it be understood that the United States is vitally interested in their existence and will look with extreme disfavor on any tampering with their independence. Such a course will greatly tend to stabilize the situation in Europe.

The recent war demonstrated to the world that our country was a veritable Samson among the war-making nations of the Old World. The heavy hand of Uncle Sam throttled the German monster of war more thoroughly than it had ever been throttled before. With this experience fresh in mind, it strikes me that the frown of Uncle Sam will be more effective and go farther than ever before, and these new nations are certainly entitled to his frown in their behalf.

But there is another view of the situation that is palpable to me. The danger of future war lurks in Germany more than anywhere else in Europe. A rejuvenated and restored France on her west, a vigorous Czechoslovakia on her southeast, and an organized and well-established Poland on her east will serve to show the German people that free and independent self-governing nations are not a myth, and that military autocracy is a monster of the most hideous mien, from which they will in due time seek to be relieved. Such free governments, if successful, as I feel and hope they will be, can not be otherwise than a great object lesson to the German people who are entitled to a free and liberal government.

These new States will also be of great help to stabilize conditions in Russia and relieve the poor people of that country from the terrors of Bolshevism, which has not only been a curse to them but has reached out its poisonous fangs to other parts of the world—our own country with the rest. Bolshevik emissaries in considerable number have been sent to us, and as a by-product of their activity we have with us the so-called parlor Bolshevik—the slimiest and most dangerous specimen of the entire nefarious brood.

There can be no real peace of the world with the Bolsheviki rampant in Russia. They are not only a menace there but they are spreading their activity and nefarious propaganda not only in the rest of Europe but also in America. The gospel and propaganda of Bolshevism is a serious disturbing element in our own midst at this very time, to which we ought not to close our eyes or be entirely oblivious. The cure lies in extinguishing the Bolshevik terror in Russia and in aiding that country to establish a free and liberal government of law and order. Dry up the fountainhead of Bolshevism over there and the rest of the world, our own country included, will secure some relief from this terrible moral pest that seeks to undermine and destroy all stable governments the world over.

Neither should we be oblivious or indifferent to the conditions in the Balkan States and Turkey, both a breeding ground for wars, past and future. The peace of Europe has often been broken and war engendered from these sources. If these five or six petty Balkan States, under the leadership of Serbia, can be welded into a confederacy, after the plan of Canada, Australia, and South Africa, it would tend more than anything else to stabilize conditions there and remove the incentive for war, and they would cease to be a football for Austria.

A spark from Serbia ignited the train which brought on this Great War. The wise course is to smother the embers and combustible materials found in these regions in the manner I have indicated.

And are we not interested in opening the Bosporus and the Dardanelles to the commerce of the world, and ought we not to take an interest in American schools and missionaries in Turkey—and I was glad to hear my friend from Maryland [Mr. FRANCE] call attention to that subject. Are we to treat these countries, these regions, as a "no man's land," devoted to chaos and anarchy? There was a time, long ago, when we sent our men-of-war to chastise the Barbary pirates without even a declaration of war; but now, when we are still technically at war, the treaty of peace being still unratified, we grow nervous over the landing of a few American marines and sailors in a small port of the Dalmatian coast, and this nervousness is of a piece with the greater nervousness manifested toward England and Japan. When all other arguments against the treaty fail, those who openly or covertly desire the defeat of the treaty resort to a scare about these countries, and paint in lurid colors the threatening dangers from Japan in the east and England in the west.

Their attacks are concentrated on countries that were our allies in the war rather than on the common enemy. These were favorite tactics during the war of those who were opposed to the war or who sympathized with the enemy. The letters I receive indicate that this class of men are now greatly in evidence against the treaty. But how those whose heart and soul were in the war can now assume such an attitude seems to me passing strange. They seem to forget how easily and swiftly France and Belgium would have been conquered if England had not entered the war as promptly as she did. They seem to forget that the Briton, the Australian, the New Zealander, and the Canadian soldier fought side by side and shoulder to shoulder with our brave boys on the fated fields of France. They seem to forget that they are of the same blood and the same language as our own people. They seem to forget that in all the elements of a free Government and personal liberty these countries stand on a par with ours. They seem to forget that aside from the peculiar Federal system of our Government, the fundamental principles of our constitutional liberty came from England and were established by the so-called English revolution of 1688. For over 100 years Canada, on our northern boundary extending from ocean to ocean, has, barring some Fenian raids from our country into theirs, been an open door to us and to them, barring only trade and tariff regulations. We have lived at peace with them and they with us, and it is difficult to see what danger threatens us from this source. Is it not more likely and more probable that the English-speaking nations will make common cause against a common enemy?

But the strangest thing of all is that those who are so nervous about England are also so very nervous about American soldiers

rendering any assistance to the anti-Bolsheviki in Russia. They seem to be anxious that the Bolsheviki should have a free hand.

As to Shantung, while I am clear that it should be restored to China, and I believe it will be, let it be remembered that except for the war Germany would have retained her hold on Shantung, and as between her and Japan I can not see why any of us should prefer Germany. When Germany some years ago seized the Shantung Peninsula, I did not hear any patriots in this Chamber making a violent protest against it.

Since Commodore Perry opened the doors of Japan she has become the most progressive nation in the Orient, while China has in the meantime made little or no progress. Japan may be fairly called the Yankee of the Orient. But bright and energetic as the Japanese are, still we do not want them in our midst. Their proper place for expansion is the Orient, in the midst of the yellow race, where they may be able to extend their civilization and energy to their slovenly and nonprogressive neighbors. The population of Japan, within the narrow confines of its Island Empire, is congested and manifestly needs a field for expansion. We do not want the Japanese with us, nor for that matter are they wanted anywhere on the Western Hemisphere. Their proper field is the Far East, the Orient, where the white race can not be at home.

Hermit Korea, in spite of all that has been said to the contrary, is reaping the benefits of the progressive energy of Japan. Public buildings, railroads, highways, and bridges have been built where none existed before. Agriculture and trade have been developed, law and order established such as was never known before, and new life and new energy have been infused into the sodden, listless masses, some of whom have protested against being aroused from their state of lethargy and inertness; but they have protested without knowing what was for their own interest.

What Great Britain has done for South Africa, Japan will, no doubt in a measure, do for Korea, though on different lines. And as to only half-developed southeastern Manchuria, the seat of the Manchu dynasty, which proved of no great blessing to China, what harm can happen to our country or to any of the nations of the west from the further development of that country under the auspices of Japan? Only those capitalistic exploiters and promoters who hover for prey in backward and dormant countries will feel called upon to protest. A developed Orient, developed for production, commerce and trade, for law and order, can not but prove of advantage to our country and to the whole civilized world.

Mr. President, I have thus briefly called attention to some of the problems involved in a permanent peace of the world. Such a peace should succeed such a war, and our country is vitally interested in the one as much as we were in the other. We do not want another such war, and therefore our country should cooperate with our allies, as we did in the war, in securing the blessings of a permanent world's peace, as necessary and essential for the prosperity and well-being of our country as for any other country on the face of the earth.

In conclusion, Mr. President, permit me to say that I have not made these remarks under the idea that I am a statesman. I am further from that than any other man in this Chamber. Neither have I said it so much because of my being a Senator from Minnesota. It has rather been the spirit of old Corpl. NELSON, of the Fourth Wisconsin, that has made these remarks to you.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SMOOT in the chair). The suggestion of the lack of a quorum is made, and the Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gronna	Nelson	Smith, Ga.
Ball	Hale	New	Smith, Md.
Bankhead	Harris	Newberry	Smoot
Borah	Harrison	Norris	Spencer
Brandegee	Hitchcock	Nugent	Stanley
Calder	Jones, N. Mex.	Overman	Sutherland
Capper	Jones, Wash.	Owen	Thomas
Chamberlain	Kenyon	Page	Townsend
Colt	Keyes	Phelan	Trammell
Curtis	King	Phipps	Underwood
Dial	Kirby	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Knox	Ransdell	Walsh, Mass.
Fernald	Lenroot	Reed	Williams
Fletcher	Lodge	Robinson	Wolcott
France	McCormick	Sheppard	
Gay	McNary	Shields	
Gerry	Moses	Smith, Ariz.	

Mr. DIAL. I wish to announce the absence of my colleague [Mr. SMITH of South Carolina] on account of illness in his family.

Mr. GERRY. I announce the absence of the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR], in attendance upon a meeting of the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. CURTIS. I desire to announce the necessary absence of the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] on official business.

Mr. PHELAN. I wish to state, in behalf of the Senator from Washington [Mr. POINDEXTER], that he is detained by a session of the Committee on Naval Affairs.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-five Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present.

Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts. Mr. President, to defeat the Germans and to destroy their great military machine was not the chief motive which induced the United States to enter the battle fields of Europe at a time when the fortunes of the Allies seemed darkest and almost hopeless.

To be sure, the defeat of the German armies was and had to be the immediate tangible objective. This, however, was to us only a means to bring about certain results. Victory has now come. For the past nine or ten months there has been in every section of our country a continuous procession of victorious home-coming American boys. The sacrifices in human life, the sufferings of the maimed and wounded in our Army and Navy, the struggles of our people at home in their efforts to support our armies abroad, we have declared time and again during the war, from the floor of Congress, from every platform and pulpit in the land, should not be in vain.

Are we keeping faith with the American people? What did we promise the 4,000,000 American boys whom this Government called into the military service of the country? To these men of the Army and Navy, and their fathers and mothers, yes, to all the people of this country, we made two solemn promises, which in their importance overshadow all other promises, all other objects we set out to attain.

We promised, first, that we would not consider this war won until we had liberated from bondage and oppression the enslaved peoples of Europe. It is true, Mr. President, that the American people can justly claim that they have had a part in winning independence and freedom for some of these races in Europe. But we have not fully kept our promise. Indeed, our failure has cast an added gloom over the hearts of all liberty-loving peoples who still remain in oppression.

We made another pledge. We have repeatedly assured the American people that they were fighting to make democracy safe for the world; that we entered the war to protect the rights of small nations; but important as these aims were, we promised above everything else to do our utmost to bring about, after the overthrow of the German military power, an organization or union of the civilized nations and peoples of the world in one great concerted movement to end wars and establish permanent peace.

Let us turn to the record of the peace conference at Versailles and see what has been done to fulfill the pledges made during the war. Let us see who were there representing—I was going to say the respective Governments—but let us say, in order that the solemnity of the scene may be before us, the millions of dead heroes, the crippled soldiers, the widowed mothers, and the orphans, upon whose shoulders very largely rested the sacrifices and burdens of this war. We know who were the leaders there—the representatives of Great Britain, France, Italy, Japan, Belgium—men whose Governments have again and again clashed with one another! Men whose countries' ambitions rivaled each other for centuries in their efforts to gain territorial, commercial, and financial supremacy. Men whose lifelong training in European politics and diplomacy prevented them from harmonizing their views on any single subject before the peace conference, except the necessity of making with their common enemy a treaty based on common interests.

What was in the minds of these men as they gathered around the peace table? Reparation? Yes. Indemnities? Yes. Punitive damages? Yes. But what was in their minds in regard to the redemption of the promise to end wars, to establish an enduring peace? What does the record of their deliberations show was in their minds, so far as that record has been disclosed?

Does it not show that with the exception of our own country, the allied countries applied the right of self-determination to their enemies only, whilst reserving to themselves the privilege of repression, subjugation, and exploitation as it suited their convenience or inured to their profit?

Is this language too severe? Not when you consider that they had not merely undertaken to make a treaty with the enemy, but were there to fulfill a promise made to their people that they would make a resurvey of the map of the world with the idea of removing all those evil influences and injustices that had promoted war in the past and would continue to pro-

mote it in the future. They did resurvey that part of the world over which their enemies had dominated, but they refused, as I shall point out later, to set up any machinery to provide for a resurvey of the rest of the world, and for the application among themselves of those principles of justice that make for lasting peace.

How much of altruism, how much justice, how much of the true spirit that must underlie an honorable league of nations was in their hearts?

Was it not the old order with its evil diplomacy, its accursed materialism, and its cynical disregard of human rights?

Into this peace conference, dominated in its majority by secret diplomacy, intrigues, jealousies, and national rivalries, entered the representatives of the United States, refusing to claim for ourselves one inch of territory or one dollar of reparation. Thank God, America refused to profit by the agony of the world! There was nothing that America desired that our allies had in their power to grant except cooperation in a world movement to end forever bloodshed, poverty, misery, famine, and all the unspeakable crimes and destruction that war entails.

For our sacrifices, for the financial obligations assumed for our allies, for the burdens of taxation that we must levy for years upon our people, for the heartaches and pains and suffering and the physically weakened manhood and womanhood of our Nation we asked only for the institution at that peace conference of a league of nations founded upon the principles of universal justice.

How has our altruism in this war been received by our allies? What is the character of the response they have made to our high hopes of a new world order?

America's great democratic leader, President Wilson, presented to the peace conference the ideals and purposes which should have formed the basis of a just settlement and the organization of world peace. However men here or elsewhere may criticize the details of this treaty and covenant, they can never take from him the credit that history will award for his vision, his singleness of purpose, and his persevering efforts to further at that conference the great movement for world peace through a league of nations.

No man has more clearly put into language the dreams of world democracy which the human race has longed to see come true. His words have awakened and lifted up the hopes of all the struggling of the earth and have brought hope to hearts and hearths where hope was dead. To try to perfect his work, to endeavor to strike out injustices contained in this momentous document, is not to rob him of one iota of the glory that is his for having represented the aspirations of liberty-loving masses of men everywhere.

I am irrevocably committed to the principle of a league of nations. Had the conference at Versailles really carried out the principles our President had clearly and courageously proclaimed to the world during the war, no Senator, I believe, would have dared to vote against such a new and healthy method of settling international disputes and preventing future wars. It is the complete absence of the high-minded sentiments we proclaimed during the war that has provoked the great opposition to this covenant and crushed the hopes of progressive, forward-looking men throughout the world.

I believe, however, that there is something here given us containing the framework of an international tribunal that may be made useful. I believe it to be our duty to approach this great question in a constructive rather than in a destructive state of mind. Let us find out what there is that is good—and there is much that is good in it—and let us retain and safeguard that in this covenant; let us find out what there is that is unjust and what it may be necessary to remove, just as a surgeon removes a malignant growth from the human body. Let us see what injustices are sanctioned. Let us see if it be possible for this Senate to make this a league founded upon principles of honor and fair dealing.

Surely, to object to this attitude is to deny Senators their constitutional rights. As a Member of this body, I consider it my duty to review this document to see whether it contains clauses dangerous to the existence and perpetuity of this Republic and seek to eliminate them.

But it is said, and forcibly, by many that this league is and of necessity must be a compromise—that the President was surrounded by circumstances and in an environment that made it necessary for him to "give and take." Whatever justification the President may have had for that position, and I do not claim that he pursued such a course, certainly the Senate, whose duty it is "to advise and consent" to treaties, must carefully determine whether what America is asked to surrender in this treaty may not be destructive of most valuable American rights. There are some things that can not be compromised, as, for instance, the violation of the fundamental conceptions of justice; the denial of the right to existence of small nationalities; the interference with the legitimate national aspirations of any people; and the perpetuation of oppression.

Future war is a terrible thought to contemplate. The loss and suffering to the human family of another war might even be more appalling than what we have just witnessed. But there are still more terrible things to contemplate than war, and a continued and permanent state of serfdom and oppression is one of them. If this be not true, then our forefathers were not justified in going to war to establish this Republic. If in the future submerged peoples are driven to the extremity of rebellion to obtain their freedom and to preserve their political liberty, it will be because this treaty of peace failed to provide for a real league of nations, which could and would apply the principle of self-determination to all peoples.

If this league is founded upon the theory that war can best be averted by each nation guaranteeing to the other members of the league their territorial integrity, it will fail to serve the world's purposes. To surrender the principle of justice in the hope to obtain peace is to be forgetful of the fact that to barter justice is to sell the soul of the nations of the world. With these fundamentals in mind let us proceed to discuss certain phases of the treaty and covenant which I believe contain provisions which should be modified or removed.

SHANTUNG.

The Shantung provision of this treaty is indefensible. To consent to and advise the ratification of this provision in its present form would be, as I view it, an act of national dishonor.

The Chinese, who were our allies in the recent war, had the right to have their interests fully and impartially considered at the peace conference. To sanction the secret agreements, entered into by nations which were assumed to be believers in the principle of self-determination, designing to despoil China of her control of an important part of her territory and population situated as strategically as Shantung is, can not be defended on any basis of justice or international honesty. Its inclusion in the treaty has resulted in casting distrust and discredit upon the whole plan of the league of nations proposed by the representatives of Governments who consented to this flagrant violation of the fundamental principles that make for universal peace. The only argument suggested to justify America's agreeing to this Shantung deal is that it will tend to smooth the delicate relations between Japan and ourselves and get her signature to the covenant for a league.

Compromise principle, accept dishonor, ratify robbery to cultivate the friendship of any nation—to secure the signature of any nation to a compact which undertakes to abolish wars! Could absurdity go further? When has America heretofore preached or practiced such unethical principles? Did we not go into the war for the purpose of preventing any people anywhere of their own arbitrary will endangering the peace of the world? If we are content to conclude a peace which, while preventing Germany from imposing its will by force upon Belgium or France, allows Japan to impose its will upon China, a friendly ally; and if, while we were waging war against Germany for this principle, we for any reason fail to maintain it against all the world, Japan included; we may confess to ourselves that we have lost the war.

If this was our battle, if these were our ends,
Which were our enemies, which were our friends?

Mr. President, I will lend my influence and cast my vote for every effort made to prevent the United States from sealing such a compact burdened with so much of national dishonor and of national perfidy. I can not subscribe to the casuistry, however plausible, that peace can be maintained by a provision which sanctions and legalizes the crime of Shantung, a compact which has a proper place only in secret treaties and under-the-table diplomacy. It smacks of spoils, land-grabbing, and sows the seed of tyranny and future wars.

ARTICLE 10.

The keynote of the doctrine incorporated in article 10 of the covenant is an open and complete reversal of the traditions of this Republic. It means, in my opinion, a departure from the major principle upon which America was founded and which the American people have long and tenaciously cherished. It means that our Republic would in all probability be to-day a colony of Great Britain had this league of nations, with article 10 inserted, existed previous to our Revolution.

Let us examine the wording of this article. It provides in the first clause:

The members of the league undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and the existing political independence of all members of the league.

This dangerous provision may completely do away with the right of asylum in this country for persons charged with political offenses, for it may be held to be an act of external aggression to harbor a political refugee. This right of asylum to such persons has been the pride of all liberty-loving Americans since the Republic was founded. This provision, however, would make it impossible for the United States to offer a place of refuge to those whom any of the allied governments would be hounding for political reasons. This country might be obliged under this covenant to refuse admission to such men as were Carl Schurz, Dr. Jacobi, John Boyle O'Reilly, John Mitchel, and thousands of others who fortunately managed to escape the clutches of oppression. Under this covenant America might have been called upon to turn a cold shoulder to Kosciusko after he had fought for our independence if he had returned to America to plead for the freedom of the Poles, because he could have been charged with pleading for aid that might lead to external aggression or "threat or danger of such aggression." Men like Kossuth, who was received with acclaim by our people when he came here, would have to be excluded, or at least our right to receive them might be conditioned upon possible action by the league of nations.

To be sure, article 10 has "external aggression" provided for as a condition for the guaranty, but who is to decide what "external aggression" means? Who is to tell what are the limitations of this phraseology? What is involved in the phrase, "its existing political independence"? Is hatred of a king, a czar, a tyrant; is a desire to obtain a government based upon the consent of the governed, an interference with "existing political independence"? If the present attitude of certain of our allies toward subject peoples is any criterion, I fear it would be so considered.

It is provided that the jurisdiction of the league shall not extend to a matter which, according to the contention of one of the parties, is found by the council on settled principles of international law to be a matter of purely domestic concern. It should be noted that the council has jurisdiction not merely to decide the *ultimate* question, but also the *preliminary* question whether the question before the council is one that falls within its jurisdiction. Again, even assuming that such a visit as Kossuth's, De Valera's, and representatives of the Hindus and Boers who have visited this country soliciting the aid of our people—even, I say, if these visits could not be considered acts of "external aggression," it is still true that we could not exercise our right to admit them if any member of the league to whom such visits would be displeasing brought up the question, as under the provisions of article 11 it is possible to do by claiming that the United States in receiving these representatives would thereby be a party to "a circumstance which threatens to disturb the good understanding between nations."

There is no principle of international law laid down in the covenant to enable us to decide a question of fact such as what is and what is not a matter of domestic concern. In the very nature of things it is a question for the council in a particular case to determine whether or not a disputed question is one of purely domestic concern.

In the case of agitation, say, in the United States, against the alleged oppression and massacres of the Jews by the Poles and by the Roumanians, the repression and subjection of the Egyptians and Hindus by the English, the Koreans and Chinese by the Japanese, the Lithuanians by the Russians, it would seem to be a matter of domestic concern, but from the point of view of the Governments whose "existing political independence" is attacked, with the possibility of external aid, it is an international matter of great importance. Such activities as I have referred to might be construed to violate distinctly and specifically the provisions of article 10 and article 11, and the United States might then be obliged to suppress such agitation and expel such persons who sought aid for their weak and enslaved countrymen.

Have we forgotten the history of our own country's struggle for independence? Do we imagine that never again will an oppressed people be inspired to do what we did when the Continental Congress dispatched Franklin to France to obtain aid, which was given whole-heartedly, France sending La Fayette and Rochambeau with men and money? What was this but external aggression against the territorial integrity of Great Britain? Had this league, with article 10, been in force it might have been the solemn obligation of France to seize our philosopher-diplomat, Franklin, and deliver him in chains to England. Surely the United States should not take a position which would prevent our receiving from oppressed people missions such as Franklin carried to Europe. To accept article 10 as it stands is to do violence to our own history and to give the lie to our traditional policy of helpfulness to the downtrodden and the oppressed.

We can not rely on arguments that are Utopian or construe every interpretation of article 10 from the viewpoint of Americanism; we can not expect that peace and good will will be universal among human beings as soon as this covenant goes into effect. The provision of article 10, in my opinion, makes permanent the rule of force in every part of the world, and this, if we accept it, under the solemn sanction and guaranty of the United States Government.

The peace provisions, following upon the creation of the league in Part I of the treaty, constitute, as it were, an example of what might be expected from the league, and, what was far more serious, represent the status quo which the league, by article 10 of its covenant, is pledged to maintain. It is one thing for the United States to depart from its traditions of avoiding alliances with European powers where the interests of justice and world peace are closely involved, but it is quite another thing for the United States to pledge its economic policies and possibly its military forces to maintain a settlement which does violence to all accepted standards of public and private right.

The second sentence of article 10 provides:

> In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression the council shall advise upon means by which this obligation shall be fulfilled.

Who dares to predict the limitation of interpretations which may be placed by the council upon the words "any threat or danger of aggression"?

Who dares to assert that the council could not hold that the harboring of political refugees, the legitimate agitation in America or any other country of the just claims of oppressed peoples for freedom, or the protests in this country of minority peoples who have been persecuted by their Governments through racial or religious prejudices, may not be held to be a "threat or danger of external aggression" to a member of the league, and therefore a case for the council to advise as to the obligations of the alleged offending member of the league?

Who dares to place any limitations—political, military, or financial—upon the words "advise upon means"? These phrases clearly compel America to either consult the council or to be in constant fear of advice or action by the council upon her right to extend hospitality, comfort, and aid to that class of people the world over who have looked to us for sympathy and support.

This power of the council to "advise upon" the means to be employed in such contingencies imports the power to act. To be sure, it is not specifically stated. To me it seems that the explicit recital of such power was intentionally avoided, but any sound interpretation of this league provision and of its language and context must import such power to act.

President Wilson interpreted the second sentence of article 10—in his message transmitting the Franco-American alliance treaty—as follows: "After the league council's advice has been duly given, the league members will do precisely as they please about following it." The difficulty that arises is this: In the first sentence the members of the league solemnly agree to respect and protect each other as against external aggression. In the second sentence—according to the President's interpretation—a league member will act upon the league council's advice in a given case of aggression "only if its judgment justifies such action." Mr. Hughes said of article 10 that it was an "illusory engagement." The President actually says that it is no engagement at all. He says that the league council may advise, but that the league members may go in their respective ways without giving the slightest heed to the advice. If article 10 be interpreted to mean anything, it surely means that the United States engages to send armed forces whenever and wherever the league council orders them to be sent. If it be interpreted as the President interprets it, the United States agrees to follow or ignore the advice at the pleasure of the United States. One interpretation involves the ordering about of American troops by a supergovernment; the other interpretation practically eliminates the value of article 10 from the treaty.

In concluding for the present my analysis of article 10, may I not fairly argue that it is capable of so many interpretations, vague and visionary, that as it stands it is pregnant with the germs of disputes, misunderstandings, and possible wars for the United States?

The only solution, therefore, is to remove any possible doubt as to its application to the United States by a reservation specifically stating the position of our Government.

RIGHTS OF SUBJECT PEOPLES.

In approaching the question of the effect of this covenant upon the rights of submerged peoples seeking independence, such as

the people of Ireland, I wish to emphasize that I am not actuated by any feeling of animosity or racial antipathy. I breathe no hate. I seek no vengeance. I voice no retribution. I am an American. I was born on soil made sacred by the blood of the heroes of the Revolution. America is my country and to her alone I owe my allegiance. I address you to-day, Mr. President, with a feeling of anxious concern for the safety of my country, for the perpetuity of her institutions, and for the preservation of constitutional liberty, of that ordered justice and freedom based on law which has secured for us nearly a century and a half of progress—industrial, political, and spiritual—such as has never before been witnessed in the history of mankind.

Surely no real American will deny to any element of our population which has kindred relationship to races in Europe still submerged the right to express its views as to the manner in which it believes this covenant may affect the future of subject races. The very fact that Senator after Senator, many of whom have no kinship with any of the subject peoples most affected, has dealt with the effect which this covenant might have upon the Irish problem is indicative of the desire on the part of all Americans that no step should be taken here that will make it more difficult for oppressed peoples anywhere to obtain their liberty in the very same manner, if need be, and with all the opportunities for outside aid which our forefathers possessed.

Mr. President, before attempting to discuss this subject to which so many of my able associates in this Chamber have repeatedly referred, I want to tell you, and I am confident I speak the innermost conviction of the people of Irish blood in this country—of the more than 500,000 soldiers of Irish extraction who enlisted in this Great War—that much as they yearn to see their kindred free, much as their hearts are torn by events in Ireland, by the harassing, dragooning, and repression of the people of that sad little island, as citizens of this Republic their first concern is for the safety, honor, and preservation of this country, the land of their birth or adoption.

Some wonder at the intensity of feeling on the part of the people in America of Irish blood to secure the application of the principle of self-determination to the land of their forbears. What, think you, must be the feeling of disappointment and of sadness experienced by the hundreds of thousands of American soldier boys of Celtic blood, justly proud of their work in liberating the enslaved peoples of Europe, when they hear a still voice in the depths of their heart saying, "I have helped to bring independence and freedom to many enslaved peoples; I have helped to remove the shackles of political oppression from many races; but the race from which I have sprung is still left, the only English-speaking race in the world to-day in political subjection"? Indeed, may he not also add, "Can it be that my Government, which I have had the honor to serve in liberating other races, is now negotiating, unconsciously perhaps, to make it more difficult for my kindred in Europe to obtain their long hoped and prayed for freedom?"

What think you must be the thoughts of American parents of Celtic blood, whose sons' bodies lie in Flanders Fields, when they learn that while their supreme sacrifice helped to bring independence and freedom to many races and peoples of whose existence they had never known, the Empire with whose soldiers their sons fought side by side continues to deny to their kindred across the sea the same measure of independence that America and her allies have bestowed upon the races who were our enemies in this war?

Words can not express the depths of anxiety of these people when they contemplate the possibility that this country—this country which welcomed their exiled forefathers and gave them their first realization of equality of opportunity and enjoyment of liberty as they fled from tyranny and oppression in Europe—may be about to join the country which has been their ancient enemy in a covenant which they believe may result in crushing out future means and opportunities of obtaining freedom for the land of their ancestors.

Just what is the attitude of Americans of Celtic blood and their sympathizers in regard to this covenant? As I understand it, and as I have been fully informed, they are not opposed to a just league of nations. Neither do they seek in any way to involve the United States of America in any controversy with Great Britain.

In a word, they ask—and they have a right to ask—the United States Senate not to ratify that part of this covenant which many sincerely believe puts an end once and for all time to America's ancient and historic attitude toward oppressed peoples. To accuse them of opposing this league merely for the purpose of humiliating or embarrassing England would be a grave injustice to the great rank and file of Americans of Celtic blood. It is, indeed, amazing to find intelligent men who, in discussing the Irish problem, allege that this element in America's population seeks to involve America in a war against Great Britain in order to bring about the freedom of Ireland. The man who makes such an accusation is grossly ignorant of the facts, or makes such contention in an effort on his part to justify opposition to their legitimate demands. It is adding insult to injury.

No section or element of our population has a right to ask America to incur the enmity of any nation because of prejudices resulting from grievances in other parts of the world; but it certainly has a right to ask America not to join with oppressors of its kin in Europe in restricting the opportunities to obtain their independence, or assist, directly or indirectly, in crushing out the legitimate aspirations of any people. As I understand the position of the people of Irish blood in America, they, as American citizens, ask the United States not to join in any league or make any agreement with other nations which may hinder or forever bar oppressed peoples from obtaining independence.

Millions of American men, women, and children who have sprung from races held for years, and in some cases centuries, in bondage and oppression, are now turning for help with outstretched hands to the Government of the United States—a Government which they love and to which they have always been loyal and faithful; a Government for which they have made every sacrifice and to the prosperity and progress of which they have contributed most substantially. It is this Government, the hope of the downtrodden and oppressed peoples of the world, that they hopefully petition and implore not to raise a single barrier against their kith and kin on the other side of the Atlantic, and ask it not to take any action which might prevent them, in their own way and in their own time, from obtaining liberty and freedom. They are simply asking us to keep "hands off." They implore us not to agree to join a league with other nations which will make it more difficult, if not impossible, for freedom to come to the country of their birth or descent. Could a request be more simple? Could such a prayer be more American?

I confess I have tried to find in the covenant—and I have studied it all the more carefully and intently because I realized the intensity and depth of feeling of these people—I have tried to discover on the basis of all information available to me whether they were not mistaken, whether they were not misinformed, whether they were not misled as to just what effect this covenant would have in the future handling of the problems of subject nations. I regret to say that I am convinced that there is no agency created or provision made in the covenant which gives the slightest hope of the league of nations ever amicably adjusting the problems of submerged peoples. I refuse to mislead them by suggesting possible opportunities for hearings or adjustments when no such provisions are contained in the document before us.

This covenant changes the present attitude of America toward peoples which have not as yet been fortunate enough to obtain an independent existence, at least in two very vital particulars. First, it prevents, through article 10, this Nation or any other nation from going to the assistance or aid of any oppressed race seeking independence; indeed, it has been again and again admitted in this Chamber that if an outside nation went to the assistance of any oppressed race it would be the duty of the United States to join with the oppressor in waging war upon the government offering aid. Certainly it can not be said that this will tend to multiply possibilities and opportunities for assistance in such cases. Second, this covenant makes no provision whereby even a hearing for any subject nation could be obtained.

Let us not deceive ourselves. Let no Senator vote for this covenant and justify his vote upon the pretense that he is helping subject peoples by setting up a world tribunal where hearings can be had for the application of the principle of self-determination. No Senator can point to any language that justifies the assertion that there ever can be a hearing given these peoples if the nation charged with oppression objects.

Article 11 apparently provides for such a hearing. There the following language is used: "Any war or threat of war is hereby declared a matter of concern to the whole league, and the league shall take any action," and so forth; and, further, "Any circumstance whatever affecting international relations which threatens to disturb either the peace or the good understanding between nations upon which peace depends" any member of the league may bring to the attention of the council. But everybody agrees that there are questions or situations which can never be considered by the league, namely, domestic questions and internal disturbances of a revolutionary character. That the relationship, for instance, of Ireland to England is a domestic question has been repeatedly stated by British statesmen.

If the question of giving independence or self-government to Ireland may be heard by this league of nations, then it could be logically contended that the question of Japanese immigration into this country, considered by everybody a domestic question, could be heard by the league. If we have a right, and America demands that right, to define and decide for ourselves what questions properly come within the designation of domestic questions, Great Britain will and should have the same right; and certainly no Member here is so optimistic as to think that Great Britain will not avail herself of the claim that the Persian, the Hindu, the Egyptian, the Irish, and the South African questions are of a domestic character.

There are two ways by which a subject nation might have its case laid or presented before a league of nations: First, by having the subject nation itself present its case and, second, through a member of the league. Opportunity is not given in this covenant to subject nations or oppressed nationalities to present their own cases, not being members of the league itself, and not even prospective members of the league in view of the limitations of admission. Even if a subject people should succeed in getting a member of the league to present its case, all that the offending member holding that particular race in subjection needs to do is to say that the question is of domestic concern and the case would immediately be dropped.

The members of this body need not be told the elastic and varied meanings that can be given to the term "domestic concern," nor is it necessary to call to their attention the innumerable acts of injustice that have been perpetrated in the course of history, the slaughter of innocent men, women, and children, that have been committed against the laws of God and man without interference by any outside nation, merely because of the plea that the questions were of domestic concern. This plea has prevented many nations from interfering in behalf of subjected peoples. The words "domestic concern" undefined in this league of nations perpetuate and make permanent the oppressor's right to shield himself by submitting the plea of lack of jurisdiction because the question is of domestic concern. Indeed this league, in providing that the council must act unanimously, makes the oppressor sole judge and jury of any plea or objection which the oppressed may advance. It would be unnatural indeed for England not to resort to a defense so well provided for her in the covenant when the Irish question, for instance, is raised. The presentation of such a question is precluded by the very terms of the covenant itself.

But let us see if the case of a subject nation seeking self-determination could come up in any other way. Suppose there is armed resistance and a state of war exists; it is no concern of this league, and not a problem that this league can deliberate upon, because it is either a domestic question—a resistance by a people against a government imposed upon them—or a revolution. You can not take one clause out of this covenant and say that it provides thus and thus without considering the relationship of that clause to every other clause in the covenant. So when the words "any circumstance whatever affecting international relations" are used it means any circumstance except disputes within the domestic jurisdiction of any member of the league. No other interpretation of the context is possible.

Not merely does this covenant contain no provision whereby cases involving the principle of self-determination could peaceably be presented for consideration, but I also emphatically assert that provisions to give hearings and deal with problems affecting the rights of subject nations were intentionally and deliberately excluded from this covenant. Let me quote article 10 in its original form:

> The contracting powers unite in guaranteeing to each other political independence and territorial integrity against external aggression. But it is understood between them that such territorial readjustments, if any, as may in the future become necessary by reason of changes in present racial conditions and aspirations or present social and political relationships, pursuant to the principle of self-determination, and also such territorial readjustments as may in the judgment of three-fourths of the delegates be demanded by the welfare and manifest interests of the people concerned, may be effected, if agreeable to those people and to the States from which the territory is separated, or to which it is added, and that territorial changes may in equity involve material compensation. The contracting powers accept without reservation the principle that the peace of the world is superior in importance to every question whatever of political jurisdiction or boundary.

And now let us quote article 10 as it emerged from the peace conference at Versailles, and is laid before us for our ratification—

> The members of the league undertake to respect and preserve as against external aggression the territorial integrity and existing political independence of all members of the league. In case of any such aggression or in case of any threat or danger of such aggression, the council shall advise upon the means by which the obligation shall be fulfilled.

The sentences omitted from the original draft, and particularly the last clause, "the contracting parties accept without reservation the principle that the peace of the world is superior in importance to every question of political jurisdiction or boundary," contained the declaration of principles which would have provided for the readjustment of boundaries and the application of the principle of self-determination. The present form of article 10 makes it impossible for any man standing for American ideals, as outlined in President Wilson's 14 points, to support that article. Why were these sentences, which provide the machinery for the submission of questions involving political jurisdiction or boundary for the possible evolution and development of small nations, struck from the original article 10? It is not difficult to answer. These sentences, which enunciated the most important principles embodied in the President's program of America's aims in the war, constituted a provision which would have given hope and new life to every people striving to obtain liberty. They were omitted either because the same principle was elsewhere expressed in this covenant—which no one for a moment contends—or because the representatives of some of the allied Governments at that peace conference refused to subscribe to them. The omission of these laudable provisions indicates that it was not the purpose of the framers of this covenant to provide for a peaceful revision of boundaries in the future or to permit the league to take political jurisdiction of any question involving the application of the principle of self-determination.

In brief, the original article 10 provided for revision and readjustment in the future. Article 10, before as now, obstructs revision, denies readjustment, and makes this a status quo league. It is a league of nations which seeks to preserve peace by maintaining the status quo of existing boundary lines. It is a scheme to autocratically preserve and maintain the political independence and the territorial integrity of existing nations. It is un-American. Most reluctantly am I forced to the conclusion that this article has not as its basic principle the idea so well expressed by Horace Greeley when he wrote in an autograph album now in the possession of a page in this Senate, the words "With faith that universal justice alone makes for universal peace."

INEQUALITY OF REPRESENTATION.

I can not subscribe to any provision in this covenant which will permit any government to have more votes or more influence in this league than the United States of America. The least that any American can accept is equal representation for our country with that of any other. I do not desire to deprive the self-governing dominions of Great Britain of representation in this assembly provided for in this covenant, but I do most strongly object to Great Britain, which includes England and its dominions, having 6 votes to our 1 vote. If, as has been claimed, the assembly is merely a "debating society," I would not, without a protest, consent to permit any government having six debaters to present its case against the one debater which the United States would have.

But this inequality of representation has a very serious possible consequence when we consider in this connection the provisions of article 4. Under that article it is very clear that the 6 votes of Great Britain in the assembly might be a very potent factor in selecting the four nonpermanent members of the council. It is not at all improbable that the 6 votes of Great Britain in the assembly, with such outside support as she could muster, would permit her to name and control at all times a majority in the council. Though unanimity of action is required in the council the present method of arrangement offers means of manipulation whereby the block of 4 votes thus secured would tend to increase the chances of obtaining a unanimous and favorable decision.

In connection with the statement that the assembly is little more than a debating society, it should be borne in mind that the assembly, in addition to all its other duties, elects new members to the league by a two-thirds majority of votes and also advises the council upon the reconsideration of inapplicable treaties. Further, the assembly can advise on international conditions dangerous to peace and can inquire into disputes referred to it by the council or the parties in dispute, and by a majority vote make recommendations which will be binding if concurred in by the votes of all the States represented in the council, exclusive of the parties to the dispute. Who will say that six votes to any one government will not prove to be a powerful influence in registering final judgment in all matters coming up for consideration before the assembly?

To say that this league is to be free of all political influences, prejudices, and jealousies is to ascribe attributes to human nature which heretofore have not existed.

TRUSTED BY THE WORLD.

I think one of the most inspiring sentences that has ever fallen from the lips of our President was that uttered by him in his speech in Boston on February 24 last, within a few hours after

he had returned to American soil from a three months' absence at the peace conference. "The proudest thing I have to report," said he, "is that this great country of ours is trusted throughout the world." Trusted throughout the world? Surely not by the representatives of the British Empire! In all history I do not believe there is a more transparent act of diplomatic treachery and deception practiced by one nation upon another than that of Mr. Balfour in coming to America, after we had declared war and agreed to join with his country and the Allies in waging war upon Germany, and withholding all information about the secret treaties which he held concealed in his pocket—the secret treaties made with Japan and with other countries who were our cobelligerents as well as England's. Trusted by the world? Surely not by Great Britain, when she refused to accept during the war the principle enunciated by our President and later suppressed at the peace conference at her instance, namely, the question of the freedom of the seas. What motive could she have possibly had for this action except that she refused to trust us impartially to recognize and protect the legitimate right of every power to ply its commerce on the high seas without restraint?

Trusted by Japan? Surely not when she refused to yield to the importunities of our President and stubbornly insisted that the price of her assent to membership in the league of nations was to be our acquiescence in her subjection of the 30,000,000 helpless people of Shantung, whose only offense is that they are weak and defenseless.

Our President is quoted on another occasion as saying "that whenever it was desired that a small force of soldiers should be sent to occupy a piece of territory where it was thought nobody else would be welcome, they asked for American soldiers, and that where other soldiers would be looked upon with suspicion and perhaps be met with resistance the American soldier would be welcomed with acclaim." Does not this imply that we have been, and let us hope will continue to be, trusted by small, weak nations and to use the President's phrase by "downtrodden and fearful people"? What a wonderful tribute to our country! Mr. President, why have we won this tribute from the peoples of the world? We have won it because right rather than might has been our guiding influence in our relations with other nations, because we have refused to enter into partnerships or form alliances with nations which have lost the confidence and merited the distrust of their neighbors. For my part I greatly prefer that America should remain forever outside the league of nations if to enter it means that the peoples who heretofore have trusted us shall trust us no more. Our sacrifices, our moral and financial support, and every resource that we possess, must continue to be given without restraint to all nations of the earth who need a friend.

Can it be possible that, after all, we have reason to doubt whether we are trusted by the powerful and great nations with whom we were allied in the war? Before we enter into this solemn obligation, this binding partnership with these great nations whose sons have lived and fought and died with our sons in the trenches of France, we would do well to stop and consider just how much they do trust us. To argue that they will refuse to accept suggestions made to strengthen and protect this league by the representatives of the American people in their Congress is to give the lie to the claim that they do trust us.

DIFFERING WITH DEMOCRATIC ASSOCIATES.

It is not pleasant to differ from my colleagues on this side of the Chamber. Because of my high regard for their views I have steadily fought against the constantly growing conviction that I could not, without violence to my conscience, by voice or vote support some of the features of this covenant. In parting from them by supporting some reservations which I deem necessary, I believe I am not departing from my party principles. As I have understood its traditional policies, domestic and foreign, the Democratic Party has consistently stood for the redress of the grievances of the weak and oppressed. To vote for this covenant without protecting reservations is, in my opinion, to legalize international wrongs, to endanger the sovereignty of America, to deny the downtrodden and submerged races of the world the right to enjoy some day the blessing of liberty, the love of which the Almighty has planted in every human breast.

I love the Democratic Party. I have served it for 25 years. It has honored me beyond my humble deserts. But I am an American first, and I am not unmindful of the fact that I have taken a solemn oath to preserve the Constitution of my country. If choice must be made between a league of nations and the Constitution of the United States, I am first and last with the Constitution.

Mr. President, out of the far-reaching and exhaustive discussions in this Chamber on this most important question—perhaps the most important the United States Senate has ever passed upon—I have been striving to grasp the basic American ideals and principles by which I must be guided. The conclusion which I have reached is that he who is called to serve in such a crisis best serves America by responding to the unmistakable call of her people, at all hazards, to safeguard American institutions, preserve our self-government, respect and maintain our best traditions. This does not mean, however, that we should selfishly sit apart, secure in the possession of liberty and other bounteous gifts of nature and of nature's God, and watch without interest the struggles of less favored humanity nor offer a helping hand to calm, steady, and save a weak—yes, sick if you will—yet at heart a sound and virile civilization.

In so far as I believe the text of the treaty and covenant before us conflicts with these principles, I have raised, and shall continue to raise, my voice of protest. I may be misjudged, my motives may be questioned, as has been the lot of many Members of the Senate who have taken sides on this question; but whatever may be the judgment of my fellow men, I at least shall have the satisfaction of knowing that by protesting against the injustice of the Shantung provision and the dangers lurking in article 10 for America and the world I have not consciously done anything to make it difficult for any American or any citizen of the world to say as did Kossuth, when he turned to the American flag in Fanueil Hall, "A flag without a stain; a country without a crime." [Applause in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The officers of the Senate will remove from the galleries those who have violated the rules of the Senate. Let us see whether the Sergeant at Arms can carry out the order of the Senate. [After a pause.] Do not stand there scratching your heads. Take those out who violate the rules of the Senate.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr. President——

The VICE PRESIDENT. I want to see first whether the rules are going to be obeyed or not. [A pause.] The Senator from Colorado.

Mr. PHIPPS. Mr President, it had been my intention to submit a few remarks to-day on the subject of the league of nations and ask leave to have printed in the RECORD a letter which I received from the governor of Colorado and 19 other leading citizens, together with a copy of my reply thereto. However, on account of the lateness of the hour and the fact that we have just listened to a most eloquent speech from the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH], I shall content myself with asking for unanimous consent for the printing of the letters in the RECORD.

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

The letters are as follows:

DENVER, COLO., *October 4, 1919.*

Hon. LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS,
Senate Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned Republicans of Colorado, knowing that you will be interested in the attitude taken by many of your constituents toward the peace treaty with Germany now before the Senate, and especially toward that part of it containing a covenant for a league of nations, respectfully urge that you vote for the ratification of the treaty without further delay, but with the reservations suggested below.

It is too obvious for comment that the only hope of averting international war, with its train of blood, destruction, costly armament, and taxation, is by organizing the nations for peace. Experience has proven all other methods to be failures. Our own national security, our business and industrial interests, the very security of civilization itself, require the prompt ratification of the treaty, including the covenant for the league of nations. That covenant may not be what all of us would have it, but as the foundation for a better international order it contains the great principles of mutual reduction of armament, of enforced investigation, and arbitration as a condition precedent to war, of what for many years at least will be much needed—a world of stabilized national boundaries, and, further, the machinery for the establishment of a great international court and for the development, codification, and enforcement of international law.

It remains, however, to make clear beyond all doubt or cavil the sense in which the United States understands and, therefore, assumes the obligations imposed by the treaty. Simple clarification of this kind will not require, as would amendments, the resubmission to and renegotiation with the many nations represented in the drafting of the covenant.

In the resolution of ratification, or in a separate resolution, we believe that the interpretation of the obligations assumed by the United States should be made clear to the following effect:

First. That where the covenant provides that a member may withdraw upon two years' notice, provided its obligations have

been fulfilled, the provision should be construed as giving to every member of the league and, therefore, to the United States as one of the members, the exclusive right to determine whether its own obligations have been fulfilled.

Second. That where the covenant provides that nothing therein is to be considered as affecting the Monroe doctrine as defined by the United States is exempted from the jurisdiction of and consideration by the league.

Third. That where the covenant provides that the league shall not retain jurisdiction of the domestic questions of its various members, and, therefore, of the United States, the interpretation should be to the effect that the domestic questions are excepted from submission to and consideration by the league and that immigration, citizenship, coastwise trade, and the tariff are examples of what the United States considers domestic questions.

Fourth. Where the covenant contemplates that economic boycott or war may be declared by the members of the league against one of their number who has offended by violating the obligations imposed by the league the interpretation should be to the effect that, under our Constitution, Congress shall be the sole judge, when the occasion arises, as to whether the provisions of the covenant, according to their intent and meaning, as applied to the circumstances of the occasion, require or do not require the United States to declare or participate either in an economic boycott or in war.

We further assert that it is our emphatic belief that the majority of the Republicans of this State are in accord with the views as herein expressed.

Very truly, yours,

Oliver H. Shoup, Henry A. Buchtel, Herbert S. Hadley, James H. Pershing, L. Ward Bannister, J. W. Kelly, Halsted L. Ritter, George P. Steele, W. S. Iliff, C. C. Parks, Albert A. Reed, Rush Holland, J. J. Vick Roy, A. A. Lee, Carlos M. Cole, C. A. Kendrick, I. I. Boak, E. H. McLennahann, Henry McAllister, jr., John D. Fleming, Melancthon F. Libby.

—

OCTOBER 9, 1919.

Messrs. Oliver H. Shoup, Henry A. Buchtel, Herbert S. Hadley, James H. Pershing, L. Ward Bannister, J. W. Kelly, Halsted L. Ritter, George P. Steele, W. S. Iliff, C. C. Parks, Albert A. Reed, Rush Holland, J. J. Vick Roy, A. A. Lee, Carlos M. Cole, C. A. Kendrick, I. I. Boak, E. H. McLennahann, Henry McAllister, jr., John D. Fleming, Melancthon F. Libby.

DEAR SIRS: Your communication of October 1, which I understand has had wide circulation in the newspapers of Colorado, and which sets forth briefly your views as to proposed reservations to the league of nations contained in the draft of the pending treaty of peace with Germany, has had my attention. Permit me to thank you for this communication, as I am very anxious to have the opinion of citizens of Colorado on this vastly important question, especially when, as in this case, such opinion is presumably the result of careful study and deliberation.

You urge me to vote for ratification of the treaty without further delay, but with the reservations you suggest, thus implying that there has been unnecessary delay and possibly that my attitude is partly the cause. Allow me to call attention to the fact that the league included in the treaty, with which it has been entwined, did not officially reach the Committee on Foreign Relations until the 14th day of July, eight months after the signing of the armistice, and was reported out by that committee on September 4, notwithstanding the fact that it had not, nor has it yet, received the official copy of the treaty with Austria, which was signed by the peace commissioners on or before September 2, and which treaty has direct bearing on the treaty with Germany; and, further, that the committee was very much hampered by its inability to obtain official information relating to important features of the treaty in response to its numerous requests for such data.

As a matter of fact, the situation in regard to the ratification of the treaty of peace with Germany is accurately stated by the New York Tribune in its issue of to-day, from which I quote:

"The peace treaty in the last article provides that it shall go into effect when ratified by Germany and any three of the principal allied and associated powers.

"The King of Italy yesterday ratified the treaty, but this is not ratification as Americans understand the word. It appears that the decree must be submitted to the Italian Parliament for approval. The British Empire is commonly rated as having ratified. It has, so far as Great Britain proper is concerned, but Australia has not yet acted, and so no instrument of ratification, it would seem, has been filed at Paris. France, Japan, and the United States not having yet acted, it follows that so far Germany is the only country which has completed ratification.

"Complaint has been made of the Senate for 'holding up' the peace. But it may turn out, if there is action, which now seems probable, and the ratification is accepted by the executive department in the form it is to have, that this country will be the first of the Allies to ratify. So far the Senate has not delayed the peace."

It should be generally conceded that the document now before the Senate, embracing the treaty and the league, is the most important one which any Senate of the United States has ever been called upon to consider, the questions involved being of vital importance to the welfare of our country. Members of the Senate have devoted much of their time since the present session opened, on May 19 last, to a careful study of all questions involved, many of them having read the treaty through from cover to cover at least a half dozen times and that part covering the proposed league of nations many times more; and those of you who have merely read through the entire treaty once will appreciate the task involved in not merely the reading but also an analysis of the points covered in the treaty.

You state that our business and industrial interests, together with our own national security and the very security of civilization, require the prompt ratification of the treaty, including the covenant. The record of exports and importations does not appear to give basis for these assertions. Even did such conditions as indicated by you exist, it is my opinion that Senators would still demand the much greater importance of modifying the treaty into such form as to properly protect and preserve the full sovereignty of the United States and the inherent rights of our people.

While it is true that the league covenant does provide for the formation of an international court, I fail to find any direct provision in either the league covenant or any other portion of the treaty that specifically provides for the development and codification of international law, although I have read through the former at least a dozen times and the latter three separate times. It seems to me that the machinery of The Hague tribunal could have been used, at least, as a foundation for the carrying on of this work, but it has not been made available.

There has been much propaganda spread broadcast over the country in which the supposed danger of making amendments that would require the treaty to be resubmitted to the signatories has been placed before our people at a great expense and with a view to influencing the action of the Senate. Such effort has apparently availed nothing, as Senators well know that the necessary amendments can be readily passed upon by the peace commissioners representing the signatories, who are still in session in Paris, including our own representatives who have been formulating the proposed treaties with Bulgaria and Turkey, against which countries the United States has never declared war, or by separate letters of acceptance exchanged between the powers interested.

You speak of a resolution of ratification or a separate resolution in order that the interpretation of the obligations we would assume be made clear, and in this connection I desire to state that my following of the debates which have occurred in the Senate Chamber has convinced me beyond question that mere interpretations or separate resolutions would be unavailing and of no force or effect whatever in case of a dispute arising between the parties to the treaty at some future time. Therefore, reservations included in the act of ratification or amendments to the treaty are the only effectual means of securing necessary changes in the language of the treaty.

1. Your first suggestion for a reservation would involve a direct amendment, as it would apply to all parties signatory to the league, whereas the reservation proposed by the Foreign Relations Committee would secure to the United States the unconditional right to withdraw upon the notice provided for, leaving it the sole judge as to whether or not its international obligations have been fulfilled. I do not believe that any one of the principal allied powers or any other signatory would object to this reservation.

2. I do not understand you to put forward the language of your paragraph marked "Second" as a substitute for that proposed by the Foreign Relations Committee, which I believe covers the situation properly as to the Monroe doctrine. As the suggestions made by that committee properly cover the reservation in question, I shall support that reservation.

3. A comparison of the language used by you and that suggested by the Committee on Foreign Relations discloses the fact that you have omitted the word "commerce." While it is true that commerce has international as well as domestic

phases, the same may be said of both the tariff and immigration; and, in my opinion, it is quite as essential to reserve for our own determination the questions which relate to commerce as it is to take care of any other of our domestic affairs. Disputes growing out of commerce, tariff, and immigration have in the past been most fruitful causes of war. However, citizenship, which you suggest should be specifically named, can not be other than a domestic question at any time, and for that reason the language as suggested by the committee to the effect, "all domestic and political questions relating to its affairs," necessarily includes citizenship.

4. Your suggestion, as I understand it, is intended to apply not only to article 10 of the covenant but also to any other of the articles contained therein which import an obligation of the United States to join in measures of economic boycott or declaration of war. Under the provisions of the Constitution of the United States, the only department of our Government authorized to act in either matter is the Congress of the United States, and its power to decide can not be delegated. The reservation proposed by the committee would retain in the Congress this full power and, as stated in the committee's report, "under no circumstances must there by any legal or moral obligation upon the United States to enter into war or to send its Army and Navy abroad or without the unfettered action of Congress to impose economic boycotts on other countries. * * * These constitutional rights of Congress must not be impaired by any agreements such as are presented in this treaty, nor can any opportunity of charging the United States with bad faith be permitted. No American soldiers or sailors must be sent to fight in other lands at the bidding of a league of nations. American lives must not be sacrificed except by the will and command of the American people, acting through their constitutional representatives in Congress." We should not lose sight of the fact that under our Constitution it is not possible to authorize our member of the council or members of the assembly to decide matters that would result in economic boycotts or acts of war on the part of the United States; nor do I believe it possible that the people of this Nation will at any time be willing to transfer those powers now vested in Congress to their representatives on either the council or the assembly created under the proposed covenant.

Repeating what I have said in reference to the first point raised by you, it does not seem possible that any one of the principal allied nations or any other signatory to the league will object to the reservations as proposed by the Foreign Relations Committee; in fact, the proponents of the league, who in the Senate have been arguing for the acceptance of the covenant without change, have tried to assure those who have been demanding reservations that the powers of the Congress are clearly understood by the representatives of the foreign countries, and that action in no case can be taken except with its approval.

Your communication is limited to four phases of the league of nations and you express no opinion as to important features of the treaty of peace, which has been tied with the covenant for the express purpose of making the two inseparable.

Allow me to direct your attention to the important matter of the proposed transfer of the Shantung Province to Japan and to express my opinion thereon, which is that it has not and can not be justified and that China should not be asked to assent to this despoliation merely because Japan has verbally expressed her intention to restore the territory at some indefinite future date, which intention she declines to formulate as a written promise. Nor should the United States permit itself to be placed in the position of condoning this act of oppression, which is nothing less than unwarranted robbery of a vast territory, comprising approximately 40,000,000 inhabitants. I shall not hesitate to vote for any reservation or amendment that will voice the protest of the United States against this transfer of territory, which in reality involves the transfer of property belonging to one of our allies to another ally in pursuance of secret agreements entered into between other powers at the time we were preparing to enter into the Great War.

Another important feature of the treaty is the matter of our voting power in the assembly, and on this issue I shall vote for the reservation or amendment providing that the United States shall have in the assembly at all times the same number of votes as that accorded to any other power.

There are other features of the treaty which have not as yet been fully discussed on the flor of the Senate, among them the clauses relating to the International Labor Bureau, which I believe are not acceptable to the United States in their present form; and I shall devote time and careful study to these questions.

With a view to relieving the United States of what is thought to be unnecessary activity through memberships on boundary commissions, for the taking of plebescites, which would involve the sending of United States troops to Europe, the government and control of the Saar Basin, and other matters in which the United States has no interest, certain amendments known as the Fall amendments were considered by the Senate. I voted for these amendments, and, while they were not adopted, these same subjects undoubtedly will be covered by reservations for which I shall vote and which I believe will be adopted.

While I do not believe we are very far apart on the four questions you have raised and do not understand that you would seriously oppose the adoption of the four reservations as presented by the Foreign Relations Committee, you have not stated what you would favor in case the reservations as suggested by you or those now before the Senate are defeated. Would you in such event favor the acceptance of the league in its present form or would you prefer to see the league defeated, thus involving rejection of the treaty and the negotiation of an independent treaty between the United States and Germany? I do not hesitate to state my attitude after months of conscientious study of this subject, which would be a vote against the ratification of the treaty.

Referring to the last paragraph of your communication, I beg to inquire as to the facts upon which you base your statement to the effect that the great majority of the Republican voters of Colorado are in favor of the reservations suggested by you. May I inquire if a canvass has been made? My chief source of communication with Colorado is, of course, through letters, telegrams, and personal interviews; and these indicate a strong sentiment in favor of proper modifications that will safeguard American interests. The estimates I have made show that over 80 per cent of our citizens are opposed to the acceptance of the league in its present form.

Very truly, yours, LAWRENCE C. PHIPPS.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate adjourn.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. On that motion I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and the Secretary proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. McCORMICK (when his name was called). I have a pair with the Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON]. I transfer that pair to the junior Senator from West Virginia [Mr. ELKINS] and vote "yea."

Mr. THOMAS (when his name was called). I have a general pair with the senior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. McCUMBER]. In his absence I transfer that pair to the senior Senator from Texas [Mr. CULBERSON] and vote "nay."

Mr. WOLCOTT (when his name was called). I ask if the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. WOLCOTT. I have a general pair with that Senator and therefore I am not at liberty to vote.

The roll call having been concluded,

Mr. JONES of Washington (after having voted in the affirmative). The junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is necessarily absent on account of illness in his family. I am paired with him during his absence. I transfer my pair to the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. SHERMAN] and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. FERNALD (after having voted in the affirmative). I have a pair with the junior Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON]. I observe that he has not voted. I transfer that pair to my colleague, the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. HALE], and allow my vote to stand.

Mr. OWEN (after having voted in the negative). I wish to know if the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. EDGE] has voted?

The VICE PRESIDENT. He has not.

Mr. OWEN. I have a pair with that Senator, and withdraw my vote.

Mr. MYERS. I have a general pair with the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. McLEAN], who is absent. I am unable to get a transfer of my pair. Therefore, I withhold my vote.

Mr. GERRY. The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON], and the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH] are detained from the Senate by illness in their families. If they were present, they would vote "nay" on this question. The Senator from Nevada [Mr. HENDERSON] is detained from the Senate on public business. If he were present, he would vote "nay." The Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS] is necessarily absent on official business, and if present and at liberty to vote, he would vote "nay."

Mr. CURTIS. I have been requested to announce the following pairs:

The Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON] with the Senator from Virginia [Mr. MARTIN];

The Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] with the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH]; and

The Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] with the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS].

The result was announced—yeas 38, nays 36, as follows:

YEAS—38.

Ball	Fernald	Lodge	Poindexter
Borah	France	McCormick	Reed
Brandegee	Frelinghuysen	Moses	Smoot
Calder	Gronna	Nelson	Spencer
Capper	Harding	New	Sutherland
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Townsend
Cummins	Keyes	Norris	Wadsworth
Curtis	Knox	Page	Warren
Dillingham	La Follette	Penrose	
Fall	Lenroot	Phipps	

NAYS—36.

Ashurst	Harris	Overman	Smith, Ga.
Bankhead	Harrison	Phelan	Smith, Md.
Beckham	Hitchcock	Pittman	Stanley
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Pomerene	Thomas
Dial	Kendrick	Ransdell	Trammell
Fletcher	King	Robinson	Underwood
Gay	Kirby	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
Gerry	McKellar	Shields	Walsh, Mont.
Gore	Nugent	Smith, Ariz.	Williams.

NOT VOTING—22.

Culberson	Johnson, S. Dak.	Martin	Sterling
Edge	Kellogg	Myers	Swanson
Elkins	Kenyon	Owen	Watson
Hale	McCumber	Sherman	Wolcott
Henderson	McLean	Simmons	
Johnson, Calif.	McNary	Smith, S. C.	

So the motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the Senate, as in legislative session, adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 10, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, *October 9, 1919.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

We bless Thee, Almighty God our heavenly Father, for the uplifting influences which bring us day by day in thought, word, and deed nearer to Thee.

Teach us, we beseech Thee, amid the trials, sorrows, afflictions, and temptations of life to lean more closely upon Thee, that Thy will is good will, that we should seek to know it and strive diligently to do it.

Hold us close to Thee through the remaining hours of this day and through all time. In the spirit of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

REREFERENCE OF A BILL.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I desire to ask unanimous consent to have the bill H. R. 6335, which was referred to the Committee on Claims, transferred to the Committee on the Judiciary of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent that H. R. 6335 be transferred from the Committee on Claims to the Committee on the Judiciary. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

Mr. GRAHAM of Pennsylvania. And, Mr. Speaker, I may add I have the written assent of the chairmen of the committees and of the majority and minority leaders of the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 6335) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to certify certain findings of facts, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Dudley, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 1. An act authorizing the cutting of timber for mining purposes by corporations organized in one State and conducting mining operations in another; and

S. 2999. An act to amend section 97 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED.

Under clause 2, Rule XXIV, Senate bills of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 1. An act authorizing the cutting of timber for mining purposes by corporations organized in one State and conducting mining operations in another; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

S. 2999. An act to amend section 97 of the act entitled "An act to codify, revise, and amend the laws relating to the judiciary," approved March 3, 1911; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. RAMSEY, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled a bill of the following title, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 7478. An act to amend sections 5200 and 5202 of the Revised Statutes of the United States as amended by acts of June 22, 1906, and September 24, 1918.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills of the following titles:

S. 9. An act to encourage the reclamation of certain arid lands in the State of Nevada, and for other purposes; and

S. 2100. An act authorizing the Union Pacific Railroad Co., or its successors, to convey for public-road purposes certain parts of its right of way.

REPEAL OF CANADIAN RECIPROCITY ACT.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7779, known as the Canadian reciprocity bill, and, pending that motion, Mr. Speaker, I want to see about arranging time. There is great pressure to procure consideration of bills, and we desire to limit this time to just as short a time as possible.

Mr. KITCHIN. How much time has been asked for on that side in general debate?

Mr. FORDNEY. I want to limit the time to an hour and a half on both sides; that is three-quarters of an hour on each side for general debate.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am perfectly willing to limit the time to an hour or an hour and a half or two hours to accommodate the gentleman.

Mr. FORDNEY. There is a gentleman on this side who wants to talk on a matter in which perhaps the whole House is interested, not relating to the bill. If the gentleman will yield a portion of his time, I will yield 15 minutes of our time.

Mr. KITCHIN. I have 40 minutes asked for by gentlemen on this side for general debate, but I am willing to confine debate to the bill and cut those gentlemen off on this side.

Mr. FORDNEY. This gentleman has been waiting a long time to talk and has been appealing for time to address the House.

Mr. KITCHIN. Well, whatever time the gentleman thinks they ought to have; what does the gentleman say? I am agreeable to any time.

Mr. GARNER. Fifty minutes upon a side.

Mr. FORDNEY. Will the gentleman yield 15 minutes of his time to this gentleman?

Mr. KITCHIN. If I have 40 minutes to yield to gentlemen on this side, which I have agreed, if we had any general debate not confined to the subject of the bill, I will only have 10 minutes left for myself. But I am willing to do anything to accommodate the gentleman.

Mr. FORDNEY. Make it an hour on each side, and I will yield 15 minutes to the gentleman, and the gentleman can yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will try to do that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan asks unanimous consent that general debate be limited to an hour on each side, one-half of that time to be controlled by himself and one-half by the gentleman from North Carolina. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The question is on the House resolving itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the Canadian reciprocity bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7779, with Mr. WALSH in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 7779, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 7779) to repeal the act entitled "An act to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes," approved July 26, 1911, and for other purposes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes," approved July 26, 1911, is repealed, to take effect on the day following the passage of this act. On and after such date there shall

be levied, collected, and paid upon the articles enumerated in such act, the growth, product, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, when imported therefrom into the United States or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the islands of Guam and Tutuila) in lieu of the duties levied, collected, and paid under such act, the duties levied, collected, and paid under existing law upon the same articles when imported from other countries.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Michigan is recognized for one hour.

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] 15 minutes, and I understand my colleague from North Carolina yields him 15 minutes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. FORDNEY. That make 30 minutes equally divided between the two sides.

Mr. MORGAN. On June 11, 1919, I introduced in the House H. R. 5545, entitled "A bill to provide homes for soldiers, seamen, and marines, and for other purposes." The bill proposes to create a corporation controlled by the Government with $100,000,000 capital, subscribed by the United States. It is authorized to make a loan up to $4,000 to any honorably discharged soldier, seamen, or marine to be used exclusively in the purchase of a home, either in the country or a town or city. The soldier makes his own choice as to the locality where the home is to be purchased. The loan may run for a period not exceeding 60 years. Borrowers will pay annually on the face of their loans 4½ per cent, which includes 3½ per cent interest, one-half of 1 per cent amortization payment on the principal and one-half of 1 per cent into the guaranty fund. Loans are made in an amount equal to 100 per cent of the appraised value of the home purchased. This principle must be accepted as fundamental, as it is the only way to avoid discrimination against the poor in favor of the rich and well-to-do.

The plan which I present is all-embracing. Any honorably discharged soldier, seaman, or marine may take advantage of it. It is within the reach of all. It is just and fair to all the soldiers, regardless of whether they reside in the country or in the towns and cities. It offers the same advantages to those who toil on the farm and to those who labor in factories, mills, workshops, and other enterprises of our towns and cities. It can be utilized by the poor as well as by the rich and well-to-do. Its object is to reward honorable military service, and honorable military service is the only qualification required. There are no restrictions, limitations, or discriminations. No public officer will have authority to "approve applicants" before they are entitled to the benefits of the act. There will be practically no delay in putting the plan in operation. Soldiers will not have to wait three years while some great reclamation project is being completed. They will not have to break home ties, leave their friends, give up their present employment and businesses and go to a distant State to obtain the benefits of the act. They will not need to go from one section of a State to another to get a home. The benefits of the act will be equitably distributed to every State and community in the land. Whatever money the Government furnishes at the expense of taxpayers will go back to every State, section, and community. It proposes to take only $100,000,000 out of the Treasury to finance the whole proposition. The balance of the funds will be raised by the sale of bonds, issued not by the Government, but by the loan corporation. To insure the sale of these bonds at a low rate of interest, and in large quantities, the Government guarantees the payment of both the principal and interest of the bonds. The annual payments made by the soldiers will pay both the interest and principal of these bonds. Practically all the Government will do is to give the soldiers a suitable instrument—the corporation—and to supervise, direct, and administer this corporate instrument for the use and benefit of the soldier and for the glory of the country.

Mr. HERSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I will yield.

Mr. HERSEY. I would like to inquire whether this is the same bill upon which the gentleman made some remarks some weeks ago?

Mr. MORGAN. It is the same bill.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I will.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Has the gentleman introduced a bill upon this subject?

Mr. MORGAN. I have.

Mr. HUDSPETH. What is the status of it?

Mr. MORGAN. The status of it is that it is pending before the Committee on the Public Lands.

Mr. HUDSPETH. But it has not been reported?

Mr. MORGAN. It has not.

Mr. HUDSPETH. Has it been discussed, or have there been hearings on the bill?

Mr. MORGAN. There have not been any hearings except I might say in a general way. I made one speech before the Committee on the Public Lands.

Mr HUDSPETH I would like to ask the gentleman why there has not been a hearing on the bill?

Mr. MORGAN. I can not answer that question. The Public Lands Committee has reported a bill. It has done its duty. It supported a bill which is pending before the House and did not report my bill. As I understand, the committee has not passed on the merits of my bill.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I will.

Mr. LINTHICUM. What is the number of your bill?

Mr. MORGAN. It is H. R. 5545.

Mr. HULINGS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MORGAN. For a brief question.

Mr. HULINGS. Will the gentleman state what is the substantial difference between his bill and the Lane-Mondell bill?

Mr. MORGAN. They are altogether different. The gentleman, I think, has read both bills. My bill proposes to make loans for the purpose of purchasing homes. The home may be purchased in any village, town, or city, or in the country. It is a distinctly home-founding proposition.

Mr. HULINGS. It is something after the order of a building and loan association, to be carried on by the Government?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; by a corporation under the control of the Government.

Mr. HULINGS. What interest does your bill require the soldier to pay?

Mr. MORGAN. I just stated that a moment ago. It provides for an annuity of 4½ per cent; 3½ goes to interest, one-half of 1 per cent to amortization on the principal, and one-half of 1 per cent in the guaranty fund.

Mr. HULINGS. Does it include only the soldiers of the World War, or does it also include the Spanish War veterans?

Mr. MORGAN. It includes Spanish War veterans.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I have so much I wish to say—but I will yield.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask one question.

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Does this institution loan on the full value of the property, or does it loan on a mortgage?

Mr. MORGAN. This institution loans up to 100 per cent of the appraised value of the home purchased.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. If the property is valued at $5,000, then the soldier can borrow $5,000?

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, no. Every loan is limited to $4,000.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. Of what value is it over a trust company?

Mr. MORGAN. I am not discussing trust companies.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. You are discussing a subject similar to that of a trust company. If it has value, we want to know the value of it before we can vote on it.

Mr. MORGAN. A trust company would not loan 100 per cent of the value of the property. A trust company does not ordinarily do that.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. I thought you said that on a $5,000 property they would only loan $4,000.

Mr. MORGAN. Oh, no. No loan is made in excess of $4,000. If a man buys a $3,000 home, he gets only $3,000. If he buys a $4,000 home, he can borrow $4,000. If he buys a $5,000 home, he must get the other $1,000 at some other place.

Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania. What is the limit of the value of the home that the soldier can buy?

Mr. MORGAN. He may buy property of any value, but he can get only $4,000 as a loan from this corporation.

Mr. QUIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. QUIN. Did you go before the committee and try to get your bill reported?

Mr. MORGAN. I said I went before the committee and presented my bill.

Mr. QUIN. They did not report it. They reported the Mondell bill out?

Mr. MORGAN. I hope the gentleman will not take my time with those questions. I told him the bill had not been reported.

THE BUSINESS OF THE CORPORATION.

It will be the business of the soldiers' and seamen's Federal home founding corporation to finance our soldiers, sailors, and marines in the acquirement of homes. It will act the part of middleman between the soldiers and investors. It will not be its business to make money. It will charge nothing for its services.

It will exact no profits; it will pay no dividends to stockholders; it will have no mercenary motives; it will have no selfish purposes. It will be a great, efficient, impartial, unselfish, patriotic intermediary between our service men who want homes and investors who have money to loan.

The outstanding bonds of the corporation will be its liabilities; its mortgages, capital, surplus, and guaranty fund will represent its assets. The amount due on its mortgages will always be greater than what it owes on its bonds. The annual payments on its loans will always exceed its annual liabilities on its bonds. It will collect annually from its debtors more than it will be necessary to pay to its creditors. It will thus be able, at all times, to meet its financial obligations, pay 100 cents on the dollar, and annually add to its reserve funds.

THE FINANCIAL PROBLEM.

The soldiers' and seamen's Federal home founding corporation to be created by H. R. 5545 will be a sound financial institution. It will be engaged in a safe, legitimate, nonspeculative business. It is not a get-rich-quick concern, nor a wild-cat, visionary, unattainable financial scheme.

It will not be a financial experiment. Congress will take no chances in creating it and authorizing it to do business. The investing public will be safe in purchasing its bonds. At all times it will be able to meet its financial obligations and pay its debts in full. Neither the Federal Government nor the public generally will ever suffer any losses through its business transactions. It will do the business for which it will be created and accomplish the great purposes and objects for which it was designed. In time it will become the greatest land-credit institution in the world. It will outrank all other such institutions in the amount of business it will transact. In a like manner, it will excel them in the good it will do and in the benefits it will bestow.

MODELED AFTER SAFE INSTITUTIONS.

The soldiers' and seamen's Federal home founding corporation is modeled after the long-time land-credit institutions of Europe which have demonstrated their soundness and solvency. These institutions have been operating in Europe for more than 150 years. They have met with universal success. Practically none of them has failed. They differ in some respects but are alike in all essential features. They vary in type, but the underlying principles of all of them are the same. In constructing the soldiers' and seamen's Federal home founding corporation these institutions have been copied. No new feature has been introduced; no untried principle has been employed; no new method has been authorized; no essential feature has been omitted, and no safeguard has been overlooked. Every care has been exercised to build an institution that will be an exact counterpart of the European institutions which have met every emergency, stood every test, and demonstrated their permanency, soundness, and solvency.

CAPITAL EVIDENCE OF SOUNDNESS.

The capital of any financial institution is both an element and evidence of its soundness. The soldiers' and seamen's Federal home founding corporation will start out with a capital of $100,000,000, subscribed by the United States. For more than a century European nations have been contributing capital to aid in founding long-time land-credit institutions, but no amount like this has heretofore been given to any such institution. The Credit Foncier of France was organized 67 years ago with a capital of $5,000,000, $2,000,000 of which was given by the French Government. It is now the largest land-credit institution of its kind in the world. The Prussian Central Land-Credit Co. of Germany, one of the great institutions of its kind, has a capital of only $10,656,000. The largest banking institution of New York City has a capital of only $25,000,000. The 12 Federal land banks started in business with a combined capital of only $9,000,000. The 12 Federal reserve banks at the close of the year 1918 had a combined capital of only $75,858,000. The soldiers' and seamen's Federal home founding corporation will start out with a capital larger than the combined capital of our 12 Federal land banks and 12 Federal reserve banks. The large capital with which the corporation will begin business will enable it to conduct a business of immense proportions without danger of financial difficulties; it will give it prestige with financial institutions; it will secure for it the confidence of investors of all classes; it will give it influence with the public generally, and will equip it to perform successfully the sacred mission committed to its care.

AN ENDOWED INSTITUTION.

The soldiers' and seamen's Federal home founding corporation will be an endowed institution. It will have an immense financial advantage over institutions which must use the earnings of their capital in the payment of dividends to its shareholders. It will have not only $100,000,000 in capital on which to operate its business, but it will have an endowment of $100,000,000. This will mean at the first an annual income of four or five millions of dollars, which may be used to meet any financial losses sustained without in any way impairing its original capital or endangering its solvency. Any part of the income from its capital which may not be needed to pay losses will be added to the capital of the institution. The endowment will thus multiply itself through its own earning power, and the net income therefrom will increase annually. Through its endowment, the capital of the corporation will grow from year to year, its financial position will improve annually, and it will be always in a condition to meet unusual, exceptional, and extraordinary losses, and still close every business year with an ever-increasing surplus and reserve.

CHARACTER CREDIT.

The corporation will be strengthened financially by what may be termed character credit. It will make loans exclusively to the men who constituted our Army and Navy in the Great World War. They were men of the highest type of manhood. Physically, mentally, and morally they were the best America had. They were selected because of their fitness to perform a most difficult, exacting, and dangerous service to their country. They came from every State and community. Every locality sent the flower of its citizenship. They are the choice spirits of the Nation. The losses of the corporation will be insignificantly small by reason of the fact that the men whose obligations it holds represent the best manhood and citizenship of the Nation. These men did not fail to do their duty in time of war; neither will they fail to meet their financial obligations in time of peace.

LOANS EQUAL TO APPRAISED VALUE.

There is but one unusual provision in the plan proposed. That is the provision which authorizes loans to be made in an amount equal to the appraised value of the homestead purchased. This does not in any way imperil the financial soundness of the institution. The making of loans to the full appraised value of the mortgaged premises, or approximately thereto, is not without precedent. Europe has had such institutions for years. Denmark has a long-time land-credit institution which loans up to 90 per cent of the appraised value of the mortgaged property. The Norwegian Bank for Laborers' Holdings and Dwellings loans up to the appraised value of the mortgaged homestead. In 1900 France created an institution and endowed it with $25,000,000 of capital to enable farm laborers to purchase homes, and authorized it to make loans up to the full appraised value of the homestead purchased. Under the small-holdings and allotment act of 1900, England authorized loans to be made up to 90 per cent of the appraised value of the homestead mortgaged. Similar institutions are found in other countries. The success of these institutions prove that long-time loans equal to 100 per cent of the appraised value of the mortgaged property may be made and the institution still remain perfectly sound and solvent, able to meet every obligation, and accumulate a substantial and ever-growing surplus.

Any long-time land-credit institution may be made absolutely safe and sound financially even though it loans up to 100 per cent of the appraised value of the land mortgaged. There are three ways this may be done. These are: First, through the income from endowment capital; second, through annual contributions from all borrowers into a guaranty or insurance fund; or, third, through a combination of these two methods. I have chosen the third method. I have combined the income from an endowment capital with annual contributions from borrowers. The borrowers and the Federal Government thus become joint guarantors of the institution. The Government does its part in the $100,000,000 endowment fund and the soldiers, seamen, and marines do their part by annual contributions taken from their yearly earnings in whatever calling or business they may be engaged. The Government is following the correct policy of helping the soldiers to help themselves. But the soldiers are doing by far the greater portion. Their annual contributions to the guaranty fund will far exceed the annual interest on the $100,000,000 endowment capital.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The original capital that the institution starts out with is $100,000,000. That would provide 25,000 loans of $4,000 each. You provide for future operations to float bonds at a net return of only 3½ per cent?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; a nontaxable bond guaranteed by the Government is as good as a Government bond, and our 8½ per cent Government bonds have been selling at par.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The Federal farm loan bonds are selling at a higher rate of interest, are they not?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. They are selling at a higher rate of interest and are selling at 104 and 105 on the dollar, as I noticed a few months ago. I noticed yesterday evening in the paper that our Secretary of the Interior says he has been assured that the Government can sell $500,000,000 of nontaxable bonds at 3¾ per cent at par.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Suppose a man takes out a loan of $4,000. What would his payments be?

Mr. MORGAN. Four and one-half per cent annually.

Mr. LINTHICUM. How long would it take him to pay all?

Mr. MORGAN. Fifty-five years. By increasing the amortization payment to three-fourths of 1 per cent annually it will pay out in about 36 years. The borrower has the privilege of paying as rapidly as he desires.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Does the gentleman think that the payments per year will be equal to the depreciation in the value of the property, the wear and tear, and so on?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes. Instead of property depreciating in value, as a rule, real estate in this country goes higher every year. It will be true as long as our population and business increases.

Mr. LINTHICUM. It is very much higher at the present time, perhaps 100 per cent higher than it was. Has the gentleman thought of that situation?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes; I have thought about that situation. I dislike to decline interruptions, but I should like to continue my discussion.

PROBABLE LOSSES.

Logically the next question is what will be the probable annual losses of the corporation through the failure of the borrowers to pay the amounts due annually on their loans. We can not answer this question exactly or definitely, but we can in our calculations make the allowance for losses so large that every reasonable man will say it is large enough. This is what I propose to do. The amount of losses is not entirely a matter of guesswork. Experience is generally a safe guide. The operations of long-time credit institutions in different countries and covering more than a century in time show their losses have been exceedingly light. It is reasonable to assume the soldiers' and seamen's Federal home founding corporation will have the same experience.

The ordinary real estate mortgage companies of this and other countries, on loans running on the 5 and 10 year system, seldom lose any money, and the percentage of foreclosures compared with the total number of loans made is very small. But on account of the short time on which these loans are made and the high interest rates charged it is more difficult to meet the payment on these loans than it is to meet the payments on long-time loans with the interest rates lower. The experience of the building and loan associations of this country shows their losses have been light and that remarkably few men fail to meet the payments due on the mortgages covering their homes.

The soldiers' and seamen's Federal home founding corporation can make loans on such terms, at such interest rates, and on such conditions as will be within the ability of the borrowers to meet.

The average man generally meets his financial obligations, if he is able to do so. A soldier who is able to pay rent on a suitable house in which to live will be able to meet the annual payments due on a $4,000 loan under the terms prescribed in this bill.

The possibility of loss will grow less every year the loan runs. This is true for two reasons—the amount due on the loan grows less annually and, on the average, the real estate will grow in value every year. The increase in population, the expansion of commerce, trade, and business, and the growth in our towns and cities will inevitably enhance the price of both rural and urban real estate. There will be exceptions, of course, but the rule will nevertheless obtain.

The experience of our Federal land banks throws light upon the qustion of losses. According to an official statement, after these banks had been operating three years only 1.5 per cent of their borrowers were in arrears. Probably all of these will be paid within a reasonable time. There is another thing to which I have already referred. The losses of the soldiers' and seamen's Federal home founding corporation will be comparatively light by reason of the character of its borrowers. They will be good financial risks. Most of them are young, physically strong, intellectually alert and active, industrious, honest, and ambitious. They are the kind of men who will pay their debts and achieve success in their undertakings. All things considered, it is safe to say that the losses will not equal 2½ per cent of the annual payments due the corporation. This amount would be far greater than the losses sustained on an average by the long-time credit institutions of Europe.

But for the purpose of demonstrating that the corporation will be an absolutely sound financial institution and that the Government may safely guarantee the payment of its bonds and the interest thereon, I propose to make an allowance for losses equal to 10 per cent of the annual payments due the corporation from borrowers on both principal and interest. This is equivalent to assuming that the corporation will collect only 90 per cent of the amount due from year to year on the principal and interest of its loans, or that 10 per cent of its borrowers will never pay any part of the amount due on the principal and interest of their loans, or that 20 per cent of its borrowers will pay only 50 per cent of the amount due on their loans, or that 40 per cent of the borrowers will pay only 75 per cent of the amount due on their loans. No such losses will ever be incurred. No such number of soldiers will ever fail to pay for their homes. But for the sake of the argument we will so assume.

THE ENDOWMENT CAPITAL AND THE GUARANTY FUND.

It is the business of the corporation to loan money to soldiers. To enable it to make these loans, it borrows money through the sale of its bonds. It is not an institution conducted for profit. The corporation pays the same interest rate on its bonds that the soldiers pay on their loans. The interest paid on its loans, if collected in full, will liquidate the interest due on its bonds. The borrowers make an annual or semiannual payment on the principal of their loans. The corporation must make a like payment on the principal of its bonds. This it does by retiring a portion of its bonds annually, or by creating a sinking fund to provide for their payment. The annual amortization payments due from borrowers on the principal of their loans, if paid in full, will liquidate the outstanding bonds of the corporation. Under the terms of the bill, the corporation borrows money at 3½ per cent and loans it at the same rate. It requires borrowers to pay one-half of 1 per cent annually on the principal of their loans, and applies the same amount annually on the principal of its bonds. But borrowers are required to pay an additional one-half of 1 per cent annually on the face of their loans. The proceeds derived therefrom constitute a guaranty fund. If every borrower paid in full the annual payments due on their loans, the corporation would have no need of the guaranty fund. But every financial institution and every business concern has its losses. The soldiers' and seamen's Federal home founding corporation will have its losses. It must accumulate a surplus. It must have its reserve. It must be able to meet emergencies. That is the object of the guaranty fund. Every borrower having a $4,000 loan will pay $20 annually into the guaranty fund. In 10 years he will have paid into the guaranty fund $200. In 20 years he will have paid $400. In 40 years he will have paid $800 into this fund, an amount equal to one-fifth of his original loan. When the corporation has $2,000,000,000 of loans outstanding, the annual payment into the guaranty fund will be $10,000,000. When the loans have increased to $4,000,000,000, the annual payment into the guaranty fund will be $20,000,000. When the outstanding loans are $8,000,000,000, the annual payment into the guaranty fund will be $40,000,000. Any portion of the guaranty fund not used in payment of losses, in effect becomes a part of the reserve capital of the institution. It is invested, and thus multiplies itself. The guaranty fund in itself will more than meet all losses that will be sustained by the corporation. So certain was I of this that I placed in the bill a provision authorizing the corporation, at the expiration of a period of five years, to reduce the amount to be paid into the guaranty fund. But the corporation has more than the guaranty fund. It has an endowment capital of $100,000,000, the entire income from which will be available to make good any losses sustained by the corporation.

To begin with, the interest on its capital will provide an annual income of $4,500,000. As the reserve capital of the corporation grows the income therefrom will increase. It is a fund that will grow from year to year. It gives the corporation a large independent income which fortifies it against all emergencies and prepares it, if necessary, to meet extraordinary losses, without the least financial embarrassment. But with the income from these two funds—the guaranty fund and the endowment capital—combined, the corporation is twice insured against any possible losses it may sustain.

DEMONSTRATION.

Having decided to assume that the corporation will lose 10 per cent annually on the amount due from borrowers, we can proceed to work out the actual business of the corporation, assuming that the corporation in the first year of its history and at each subsequent year will make 100,000 loans of $4,000

each; that the borrowers, according to the terms of the bill, will pay an annual charge on the face of their loans of 4½ per cent, which will include interest at 3½ per cent, amortization payment of one-half of 1 per cent, and a payment into the guaranty fund of one-half of 1 per cent; that the corporation will pay out annually 4 per cent on its bonds, which will include 3½ per cent interest thereon and one-half of 1 per cent amortization payment on the bonds, which will be used to redeem bonds or placed in a sinking fund for that purpose; that the annual losses of the corporation will be equal to 10 per cent of the annual payments due on its mortgages; and that the net annual surplus of the corporation, including the guaranty fund, will be added to the capital and loaned to borrowers.

Under these assumptions the income of the corporation the first year in annual payments from its borrowers will be $18,000,000. It will pay on the principal and interest due on its bonds $12,000,000. Its losses, estimated at 10 per cent of the amount due from its borrowers, will be $1,800,000. After paying the amount due on its bonds and charging off its losses, the corporation the first year will have a net surplus of $4,200,000. This will be added to its capital, and it will start in business the second year with a capital of $104,200,000.

The second year its losses, according to our estimate, will be $3,600,000. The corporation will charge off its losses, make the payments due on its bonds, and still have a net surplus for the year of $4,568,000. It will start the third year with a capital of $108,786,000. This year $5,400,000 will be charged off as losses, but the corporation will meet its regular obligations and still have a net annual surplus of $4,950,720. It will begin business the fourth year with $113,718,720 in capital. Its losses this year will be charged off at $7,200,000. The corporation this year will have a net annual surplus of $5,344,749.

The fifth year the corporation, after making allowance of $9,000,000 for losses, will have a net surplus of $5,758,539, and will close the year with a capital of $125,922,008. It will have made loans to 500,000 soldiers, sailors, and marines aggregating $2,000,000,000, and has had each year a net surplus averaging nearly $5,000,000.

Passing over the figures for the sixth, seventh, eighth, and ninth years, the corporation will begin business the tenth year with a capital of $152,335,185. It will have loaned $4,000,000,000 to 1,000,000 soldiers, sailors, and marines. Its losses for the tenth year will be $18,000,000, but it will have a net surplus for that year of $8,089,407. Its capital at the end of the tenth year will be $160,424,592.

Omitting the details of the business of the corporation for the eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth years, we find that the corporation will begin the fifteenth year with a capital of $198,401,469. It will have loaned $6,000,000,000 to 1,500,000 soldiers, sailors, and marines. Its annual losses this year will be charged off at $27,000,000. Its annual net surplus will be $10,972,060.

Passing over the details of the business for the sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth years, the corporation will begin business the twentieth year with a capital of $259,932,573. It will have made loans to 2,000,000 of our service men aggregating $8,000,000,000. Its losses the twentieth year will be $36,000,000 and its net surplus will be $14,433,303, and it will end the year with a capital of $274,365,876.

In Appendix A will be found a statement in detail of the business of the corporation for each year.

It will be observed that the capital of the corporation has increased from $100,000,000 to $274,365,876. The figures show that the corporation had an average annual increase in its capital of over $8,700,000. The net annual surplus of the corporation increased every year. It grew from $4,200,000 the first year to $14,433,303 the twentieth year. During the 20 years the corporation charged off as actual losses a total of $288,000,000. It is a significant fact, to which I desire to call attention, that the corporation in these 20 years has earned a net surplus of $174,365,000. It would be in a position, without impairing or using its original capital, to pay back the $100,000,000 capital contributed by the Government with 4 per cent annual interest thereon during these 20 years. This, I think, demonstrates to the satisfaction of any reasonable mind that the plan I have presented is absolutely sound financially; that it is a practical business proposition; that the corporation will accomplish the purposes and objects for which it is to be created; that under it and through it millions of our service men will acquire homes; and that the corporation at the end of its career will be able to return to the Government the original capital subscribed with a reasonable interest thereon; and that the Government will never lose anything through the business of the corporation and the taxpayers of the country will not have contributed anything for the support of the institution.

WITH CAPITAL OF $200,000,000.

If the corporation had an endowment capital of $200,000,000, and borrowers were required to pay into the guaranty fund annually three-fourths of 1 per cent on the face of their loans, it could make 100,000 loans of $4,000 each annually, stand a loss of 17 per cent on the amount annually due on the principal and interest of its loans, and at the end of the twentieth year would have a capital of $375,151,728. To assume that the corporation would have a loss of 17 per cent annually on the amount due from its borrowers is equivalent to assuming that 17 out of every 100 borrowers would never pay any part of the principal or interest on their loans; or that 34 out of every 100, or more than one-third of the borrowers, would never pay but 50 per cent of their loans; or that 68 per cent of the borrowers out of every 100, or more than two-thirds of the entire number, would never pay but 75 per cent of the amount due on their loans.

If the corporation were given $200,000,000 endowment capital, and the borrowers paid 1 per cent annually on the face of their loans into the guaranty fund, it could stand an annual loss of 20 per cent on the amount due each year on its loans in principal and interest; make 100,000 loans of $4,000 each annually, and its capital would increase in 20 years from $200,000,000 to $426,645,344. The fact is, there would be no such losses as these, and it is probable that the losses would not be 2½ per cent of the amount annually due the corporation from its borrowers. An allowance of 5 per cent losses on annual payments due would be liberal. But whether the losses will be 5 per cent or 10 per cent, or even more, provision can be made to meet these losses. It is all a question of giving the corporation the proper endowment, and requiring borrowers to make sufficient contribution to the guaranty fund. I have asked that the corporation be given only $100,000,000 endowment capital. I have asked that borrowers contribute one-half of 1 per cent annually to the guaranty fund. In both cases, I believe I have asked all that is necessary. But if the endowment were made $200,000,000, it would not be excessive or burdensome. The amount would still be $300,000,000 less than the Mondel-Lane proposition authorizes to be appropriated, and $2,000,000,000 less than it would cost in principal and interest to pay a cash or bond bonus of $250 to each of our 4,000,000 soldiers, seamen, and marines.

EFFECT ON REAL ESTATE VALUES.

There has been some fear expressed that the inauguration of the loan policy proposed in H. R. 5545 would cause an era of speculation in farms and in urban real estate and an undue enhancement of prices. This fear is not well founded. The corporation can not and will not make 4,000,000 loans in one year. This would be impossible for many reasons. It will necessarily require a series of years to make these loans. All soldiers, seamen, and marines can not be served immediately. They were not all brought into the service at the same time and were not all discharged at once. Some method which will be fair to all must be adopted to determine the order in which applicants will obtain their loans. We found a method to determine the order in which they were called to service, and a method must be provided to determine the order in which applicants will secure loans. Loans must be distributed equitably among the soldiers of the various States. Each State must be treated fairly. This is a big country. We have over 3,000,000 square miles of land in continental United States. The loans will be equitably distributed throughout the Nation. It will not materially affect the price of real estate anywhere. The soldier will select the home he wishes to purchase. He will make his own bargain with the owner. He will then apply for the loan. The corporation will then carefully inspect the property, appraise it, and pass upon the application for the loan. If the loan be approved, the borrower will not get the money. The entire proceeds of the loan will go to the man who sells the home. The soldier gets possession of the home, he gets title to the property, he becomes the proprietor and owner, but the corporation will hold a mortgage thereon for the full amount of the loan.

We can not say how many loans the corporation will make on an average each year. The bill does not limit the number of loans that may be made annually, but the Congress might make a limitation. But 100,000 loans made annually would be a large business. It would mean 500,000 in 5 years and a million loans in 10 years. There are 2,782 counties in the United States. To make 100,000 annually would mean an average of 35 loans in each county in the United States. About one-half of this number would be in the country districts and one-half in the towns and cities. So that it would mean the purchase annually of about 17 farms and 17 town and city homes in each county. The purchase of this number of homes annually in the

average county would not materially affect the price of real estate or create any dangerous speculative era.

BONDS GUARANTEED BY THE GOVERNMENT.

Some objections have been made to the provisions of the bill which makes the United States Government guarantee the payment of both the principal and interest of the bonds issued by the corporation. The objection arises out of the erroneous idea that the Government is assuming a financial liability which might endanger its credit or interfere materially with its financial operations, or possibly impose an undue burden upon the taxpayers. In the first place, it must be clearly understood that the primary object of giving this Government guaranty is not to make the bonds good. The Government guarantees the payment of these bonds because they are good—not to make them good. The guaranty is given by the Government not with the idea that it will ever pay any part of the principal or interest on these bonds, but on the theory that it will not be required to do so. The Government is in a position to permit the issue of bonds only under such terms and conditions as will make them absolutely safe and secure. If the corporation is to command the funds or credit which will enable it to make loans as provided in the bill, it will be necessary that it shall sell bonds aggregating very large amounts. The bonds must also bear a very low rate of interest, because unless the corporation can sell bonds at a low rate of interest, it can not make loans at a low rate of interest. The object of having the Government guarantee the payment of the bonds is to insure the sale of these bonds in large quantities and at a low rate of interest. These two things are absolutely necessary. A Government bond or a bond guaranteed by the Government can be sold in larger quantities and at a lower rate of interest than a bond of any other kind or character. And as I regard these two things as absolutely essential, I insist that the Government should make this guaranty.

It has been asserted that these bonds, thus guaranteed by the Government, would be in substance and effect obligations of the United States. Such an assertion I do not believe is justified. The corporation will not be the United States. It is true it will be an agency of the United States. It will be an instrumentality of the Federal Government. It will be the creature and servant of the United States, carrying out the great purposes for which it was created. But the issuing of bonds by this corporation under a guaranty of the Federal Government will not be equivalent to issuing and selling bonds of the United States for the same purpose. When the United States issues a bond the Federal Government becomes directly responsible for its payment. Every cent of the funds necessary to pay the interest and principal of United States bonds must come exclusively through taxes paid by the people of the United States. But bonds issued by a corporation controlled by the United States, but provided with ample independent income with which to pay both the principal and interest of the bonds issued, does not require and will not require any contribution from the taxpayers of the country.

The bonds issued by the corporation will have back of them mortgages on real estate of equal value. The regular annual income of the corporation will be more than sufficient to pay the annual interest on its bonds and provide for their redemption and payment in full. In other words, the annual payments due from borrowers will be larger than the annual payments which the corporation will owe on the principal and interest of its bonds. The corporation will therefore have ample funds from its own resources to pay the interest and principal of its bonds. Then, in addition thereto, the corporation will have a large income from the interest on its endowment capital and the annual payments into its guaranty fund, which will be more than necessary to meet every emergency and pay any possible losses through the failure of borrowers to pay the amounts annually due on their loans. These bonds therefore will not be, in substance or effect, Government bonds. The liability of the United States will be only contingent and remote. The practice of Federal, provincial, and State governments in guaranteeing bonds issued by land-credit institutions is not new. It has been largely practiced in European countries for many years. Time and experience has shown that practically nothing has been lost in making such guaranties. There is another point that should be considered in this connection. The corporation makes long-time loans and issues and sells long-time bonds. The borrowers liquidate their long-time loans through annual payments on the face of the original loans. The corporation pays its bonds and the interest due thereon by the same process. It either redeems a portion of its bonds every year or sets aside a certain amount into a sinking fund to provide for the redemption thereof. The borrowers pay their loans through amortization payments and the corporation pays its bonds through amortization payments. The corporation will always be in a sound financial condition when it is able to make this annual payment on its bonds. These bonds will run for a long period of time. At the end of each year the corporation will know and the Government of the United States will know whether or not it is in a sound financial condition. The liability of the United States will be an annual liability. Whatever contributions the Government of the United States would be required to make on the interest and principal of the bonds issued by the corporation would therefore be distributed over a period running from 1 to 60 years. The annual liability would necessarily be comparatively small. The amount necessary for the United States to contribute annually could not possibly be such as would endanger the national credit, materially interfere with its financial operations, or place any serious burdens upon the taxpayers of the country.

COMPARED WITH OTHER PROPOSITIONS.

There are other propositions before Congress designed to give recognition to the soldiers. Among these is the one proposing to give every service man a cash bonus. This plan has strong points in its favor; it is preferred by some of the soldiers, and some Members of Congress are favorably inclined thereto. But this would be by far the most expensive proposition the Nation could undertake. Suppose we gave each service man a bonus of $250. To provide for 4,000,000 men would require $1,000,000,000. The Government must either raise this amount by issuing bonds or deliver to each man a bond of $250. The bonds will bear at least 4 per cent interest and will run at least 30 years. The Government will pay $40,000,000 annual interest on these bonds. In 30 years it will have paid in interest alone $1,200,000,000. Therefore to give each service man a bonus of $250 would require an expenditure in interest and principal of $2,200,000,000. To give each man a bonus of $500 would require an annual expenditure in interest of $80,000,000, and a total expenditure in interest in 30 years of $2,400,000,000. This added to the principal sum of $2,000,000,000 would make a total cost to the taxpayers of $4,400,000,000. Looking at it from the viewpoint of the national credit, the financial operations of the Government, and the interest of the taxpayers, everyone must admit that the plan which I present is far preferable to the bonus plan.

Some way I have been impressed with the idea that the authors and advocates of the Mondell-Lane plan have taken some pride in claiming that their proposition is sound financially and could be safely undertaken by the Government. But I must say in all candor that I have failed to discover any real financial plan to it. All that it does is to authorize the appropriation of $500,000,000 and give the Secretary of the Interior practically unlimited and certainly unparalleled power to spend this money. Vast areas of land are to be purchased. Millions of acres are to be cleared, improved, and laid out in farms. Vast irrigation projects are to be conceived, planned, and constructed. An army of men of all classes are to be employed. It is a simple process. Congress appropriates the money; the Secretary of the Interior spends it. No one can foretell what mistakes will be made. No one can predict what losses will be incurred. After the lands have been acquired, reclaimed, and improved, the Secretary of the Interior is required to sell these lands at cost, including the purchase price and the expense of reclamation and improvement. Who can say that the Government will be able to sell each tract, farm, or allotment at the estimated cost thereof? Who can say now that the Government will not have left on its hands millions of acres of land which it will be unable to sell at cost prices? Everywhere, at all times, all along the line, from beginning to end there will be great uncertainty about what the Government may lose in carrying out this proposition or how great an amount must in the end come out of the pockets of the taxpayers.

So far as I can see, there is no attempt in the provisions of the bill to safeguard the Government against losses.

The comparatively few men who may take advantage of the provisions of the act are not required to cooperate with each other in making the undertaking a sound financial proposition. There is to be no contribution among the beneficiaries of the act to aid and assist each other in meeting their financial obligations. Each borrower or each man who purchases a farm from the Government under the Mondell-Lane plan is responsible only for his own debt. If one of them fails to pay his obligations fully, the Government alone stands the loss. If 10 per cent of them fail to pay their loans, the Government will stand the whole loss. I am not saying that the Government can not afford to do this. I am not saying that it should not do it. I am calling attention to this matter to show that under the Mondell-Lane plan the Government losses may be heavy; that there is no provision made to meet these losses, and that

in the end the taxpayers of the country must make good whatever losses may be sustained.

Mr. Chairman, I think I have shown conclusively that the loan plan presented in H. R. 5545 is absolutely sound financially; that the Government may safely guarantee the payment of the bonds and interest thereon issued by the corporation without the slightest possibility of endangering the national credit; that the business operations of the corporation will not materially interfere with the financial operations of the Federal Government; and that by the method I have proposed in H. R. 5545 the Government may place homes within the reach of millions of our soldiers, seamen, and marines without placing any undue burdens upon the taxpayers of the country.

The plan which I have presented has been received with great favor by the soldiers, seamen, and marines. Executive committees of a number of State organizations of the American Legion have passed resolutions indorsing it. The State officers of a number of such organizations have written me letters indorsing it. A large number of local posts of the American Legion have passed resolutions in its favor. Letters from soldiers, seamen, and marines from all parts of the Union have come to me complimenting my bill in the very strongest terms. Many Senators and Representatives in Congress have received letters urging them to support my bill. Prominent officials, business men, professional men, and citizens in all walks of life have written me saying they approved the principles of my bill and expressed a hope that it would become a law. It will be generally conceded that my plan is popular with the soldiers and would be entirely satisfactory to them. I regard this as a high compliment. These letters, telegrams, and resolutions, coming from all sections of the country, from the New England States to the Pacific coast and from Florida and Texas to the States on the Canadian border, have been to me a source of great satisfaction, encouragement, and inspiration.

The bill H. R. 5545, of course, is not perfect. Some amendments may be necessary. It is, however, right in principle. Its object is to provide some appropriate recognition for the services rendered by our soldiers, sailors, and marines. For this purpose nothing more appropriate could be done than to place within the reach of these men a home, in which, throughout their lives, they must reside under the protection of the flag they honored and upheld. A home is the best pension a soldier can possess. It affords protection to the family; gives satisfaction, security, and contentment to the soldier; makes him a better citizen; and strengthens the very fabric of our Government. The best, wisest, and most practical way that a nation can show its gratitude to its soldiers is to provide them with homes. It is in line with the long-established policy of the Government. In every war since the American Revolution the United States has offered our soldiers homes on the public domain. Twenty-seven of the States of the Union have erected homes for their disabled soldiers. The Federal Government founded the National Home for Disabled Volunteers, and established branches thereof in 10 different States in the Union. In the District of Columbia the Government founded and supports the United States Soldiers' Home for Disabled Soldiers of the Regular Army. In the giving of public lands and the erection of these soldiers' homes and in providing for their maintenance the State and Federal Governments have expended vast sums of money. No one now questions the propriety of what has been done in the past. No one will assert that the money appropriated has been wasted or unwisely expended. The American people have never complained about the money expended in providing for the comfort, the well-being, and the happiness of the men who have fought their battles. For 142 years it has been the policy of the American Government to provide homes for its soldiers. This policy should not now be abandoned, when we have more wealth both in the aggregate and in proportion to our population than we have ever had before; when we have more homeless people in proportion to our population than we have ever had at any previous time; and when the difficulties of acquiring a home were never so great. There is no way now by which our soldiers, seamen, and marines may acquire homes except through the organization of proper and adequate credit facilities. Unless, therefore, my plan or something similar to it shall be adopted a large proportion of our soldiers, sailors, and marines must make up their minds to live in a country where it is impossible for them to acquire a small tract of land which they and their families may call their own.

The plan which I present is universal in its application. It can be utilized by all. Under it homes may be acquired in the towns and cities as well as in the country. It is the only plan which has been presented that is just and fair to the one-half of our soldiers who now reside and must continue to reside in our towns and cities.

Whatever we do for our service men should be something that will be permanently useful, helpful, and beneficial to them. In this respect a home is far preferable to a small bonus in money. As the years go by a home will grow more valuable and likewise more useful and helpful to the owner.

The plan which I present will distribute its benefits equitably throughout the country—to every State, county, city, town, village, and community. One great point in its favor is that it will serve at least three great national purposes. It will multiply the number of home owners and turn back the ever-growing menace of tenancy; it will encourage thrift and saving among both the soldiers who purchase homes and the citizens who will buy the gilt-edged securities of the corporation; and it will promote good citizenship, allay unrest, and stand as a mighty bulwark against I. W. W.ism, Bolshevism, and every other radical and revolutionary movement.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. NOLAN). The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. BEE. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman may have two minutes in order that I may ask him a question.

Mr. KITCHIN. I yield to the gentleman five minutes more, and in that time I want to ask him a question or two. When did the gentleman introduce his bill?

Mr. MORGAN. On the 15th of June, 1919, I believe.

Mr. KITCHIN. To what committee did it go?

Mr. MORGAN. To the Committee on the Public Lands.

Mr. KITCHIN. Has that committee reported it out?

Mr. MORGAN. It has not.

Mr. KITCHIN. You have had two or three caucuses of the Republican Party in the House since you introduced that bill, have you not?

Mr. MORGAN. I remember we had one, at least. I could not say as to the two or three.

Mr. KITCHIN. Did the caucus take any action on that bill?

Mr. MORGAN. It did not. It was not brought before it in any way.

Mr. KITCHIN. Did you attempt to get the Republican caucus to take any action on it?

Mr. MORGAN. I did not. I should have been glad to have them do so, but I did not ask them to do so. It was not before the conference.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am not saying anything for or against the bill. I want to find out its present status. Is the gentleman on the steering committee?

Mr. MORGAN. I am not.

Mr. KITCHIN. Has the gentleman been to the Republicans of the steering committee of the House and asked them to have this bill taken up in committee?

Mr. MORGAN. I have not been before the steering committee officially.

Mr. KITCHIN. Have you seen any members of the steering committee privately?

Mr. MORGAN. Some time ago I talked to a number of the members of the steering committee about the general proposition; yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. I want to see how diligent the gentleman has been in trying to get his bill reported out. The gentleman has not seen the steering committee?

Mr. MORGAN. I have not been before the steering committee officially, but I have talked to the majority of them about this bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. And that was some time ago. You just went to them one time, did you not? Have you been to them more than one time—just little informal meetings?

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. I object to the gentleman's questions as leading. [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. I want to know how to vote on the gentleman's bill, and I want to get some information. Has the gentleman studiously and diligently tried to get the steering committee to have this bill reported out and considered in the House or has he just done it informally?

Mr. MORGAN. I think I have done my whole and full duty. I have had much else to do, and so have others. I have no doubt in due time the proposition will be fully considered.

Mr. KITCHIN. Has the gentleman been before the Committee on the Public Lands and made a diligent effort to have his bill reported?

Mr. MORGAN. I went before the Public Lands Committee and talked, I think, about an hour about my bill and other bills on the same subject.

Mr. KITCHIN. Did the Public Lands Committee give any intimation that they were going to report it out?

Mr. MORGAN. Of course, I want to be liberal in answering the gentleman's questions. He was kind enough to yield time to me.

Mr. KITCHIN. I am going to yield some more time to the gentleman to see if I can get the facts.

Mr. MORGAN. All right. I am sure I have nothing to conceal about it and I would be glad, if I can, to give the gentleman more information.

Mr. KITCHIN. Did the committee or any members of the Public Lands Committee intimate to you that they would report that bill out?

Mr. MORGAN. I think there are a number of members of the Public Lands Committee who are favorably inclined to my bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. Most of those are Democrats, are they not?

Mr. MORGAN. I am sorry to say that they are not. [Laughter.] I think, however, that there are one or two Democrats who are favorably inclined to the bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. Does the gentleman know how many Republicans there are on the Public Lands Committee?

Mr. MORGAN. Nine or ten.

Mr. KITCHIN. There are about two Republicans to one Democrat on the Public Lands Committee, are there not?

Mr. MORGAN. I think not that proportion.

Mr. KITCHIN. The Republicans have quite a large majority on that committee, have they not?

Mr. MORGAN. It is quite a majority, sufficient for working purposes, of course.

Mr. KITCHIN. And the gentleman has introduced this bill——

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. I will extend the gentleman's time five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has five additional minutes, if he wishes to accept it.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. KITCHIN. I want to get at this. I will say to the gentleman from Nebraska that he does not want information on this bill. He has never read it. I have read this bill. I have talked with the gentleman from Oklahoma about it. I am interested in all these bills, and I want to find out about this one.

Mr. ANDREWS of Nebraska. In order that the gentleman from North Carolina may be educated, I will yield.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield to the gentleman from North Carolina?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. As I understand, the gentleman has been trying to get this Republican Committee on the Public Lands, ever since June, to report out this bill that, in his judgment, is fair and just to the soldiers, and that committee has not done it, has it?

Mr. MORGAN. I have said several times that the Committee on the Public Lands has not reported the bill.

Mr. KITCHIN. But the committee did report out another soldiers' bill, and not the gentlemen's, did they?

Mr. MORGAN. Yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. They reported out what is known as the Mondell land bill?

Mr. MORGAN. They did; yes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Do you know how many Republicans on the committee voted for your bill?

Mr. MORGAN. I do not.

Mr. KITCHIN. They have not even come to a vote on your bill yet, have they?

Mr. MORGAN. I think not. I will say to the gentleman, however——

Mr. KITCHIN. I want to know this fact, and then I will let you state the other fact.

Mr. MORGAN. I want to say a few words on my own account now. I decline to yield further just now.

The Public Lands Committee early took up hearings on the so-called Mondell-Lane bill and has held hearings on it for two or three weeks before my bill was introduced. I introduced my bill and went before the committee, but there has never been any real hearings on my bill. I have not asked the Public Lands Committee for any special hearings.

I want to convince, if possible, the Members of the House that my bill is right, and then I expect to ask the Public Lands Committee, or some other committee, to report it favorably or unfavorably.

I will say to the gentleman from North Carolina that I expect to see what the Republicans will do with the bill, and also expect to see what the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] and other Democrats will do with the proposition.

Mr. KITCHIN. Now, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MORGAN. For a question.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Do not let the gentleman from North Carolina take up all your time.

Mr. KITCHIN. But I yielded him the time.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. Do not take it back again. [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman's bill may be perfectly right and just.

Mr. MORGAN. It is right and just.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman from Oklahoma has studied it, but I doubt whether one man in a hundred in the House has read it.

Mr. MORGAN. I am sure that the gentleman is wrong about that.

Mr. KITCHIN. I may be wrong; I know two gentlemen in the House who have read it—the gentleman from Oklahoma and the gentleman from North Carolina. [Laughter.] But the gentleman from Oklahoma has been diligent and persistent with the steering committee—all Republicans—he has been diligent with the majority leader, who is a Republican; he has been diligently pursuing the Public Lands Committee, making argument after argument to them, and has failed to convince any of them. Does not the gentleman think that it will take somebody else to get that bill through? Does not the gentleman fear that the soldiers in his district might say, "MORGAN is a good man and the best fellow that could possibly be imagined, but even with such a good bill as his, and with all his diligence, after his labors month after month with the Republican steering committee, with the majority leader, and the Republican Public Lands Committee, he has failed, and we think somebody else ought to be sent to Congress to take charge of it." [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. I yield the gentleman five minutes more.

Mr. YATES. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. YATES. I would like to know if when the gentleman from North Carolina extends the time we are compelled to accept it? [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. That is not a parliamentary inquiry.

Mr. YATES. Another parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Oklahoma yield?

Mr. MORGAN. I do not yield.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. YATES. All I want to say is that I don't want the gentleman from North Carolina to yield me any time. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois is out of order. The gentleman from Oklahoma will proceed.

Mr. MORGAN. Now, gentlemen, I will admit that it is somewhat embarrassing to accept this time, but I asked for 30 minutes on my own side and could not get it, and the gentleman from North Carolina kindly yielded me 15 minutes out of the 30 minutes. I do not say this to reflect on the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee, for he was very much pressed for time. This was a very important matter, and it was right and proper that one-half of my time should be yielded by the Republican side and one-half by the Democratic side. I think that indicates that in due time the two sides of the House will unite on my bill and pass it. The gentleman from North Carolina even will agree to it, although he has endeavored to bring in a little cheap politics and give the impression that the Republicans are not doing their duty. I think the gentleman from North Carolina is a great man, and I regard him as a great statesman, but the course he has pursued is too small for such a great man as he is. [Laughter and applause.]

I have here a great proposition. Some man has said that it is too big. It is a big proposition. But we had a big Army and a big Navy in the great World War. They had a big job to perform and they performed it in a big way. The question is now whether or not Congress will authorize the undertaking of something which corresponds in dimension with our Army and Navy, and what they did for the glory of our country and the good of mankind. So I appeal to my friend from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] that he shall never hereafter, when we are considering a proposition which has to do with our duty to our soldiers, seamen, and marines, and with the welfare of the Nation at large, devote his valuable time and great talent in an effort to gain some small political advantage, which I consider not befitting a great statesman and leader of the American Congress, as is the gentleman from North Carolina. [Laughter and applause.]

APPENDIX A.

Table showing supposed business transactions of the corporation.

Annual charge on loans, 4½ per cent, which includes 3½ per cent interest, one-half of 1 per cent amortization payment, and one-half of 1 per cent guaranty fund.

Bonds bear 3½ per cent interest; annual amortization payment on bonds one-half of 1 per cent. Total payment on bonds 4 per cent. Net annual surplus becomes part of the capital.

The table is based upon the estimate that 100,000 loans of $4,000 each will be made the first year and a like number in each subsequent year.

It is assumed that the entire capital will be kept invested in loans and that the annual losses will equal 10 per cent of amount due from borrowers.

The bonds issued each year will be equal to the amount of loans for the year minus the net surplus for the preceding year.

FIRST YEAR.

Capital	$100,000,000
Bonds	300,000,000
Loans	400,000,000
Gross income	18,000,000
Loss on income, 10 per cent	1,800,000
Net income	16,200,000
Payment on bonds, 4 per cent	12,000,000
Net surplus	4,200,000
Capital, end of first year	104,200,000

SECOND YEAR.

Capital	104,200,000
Bonds	695,800,000
Loans	800,000,000
Gross income	36,000,000
Loss on income, 10 per cent	3,600,000
Net income	32,400,000
Payment on bonds, 4 per cent	27,832,000
Net surplus for second year	4,568,000
Capital, end of second year	108,768,000

THIRD YEAR.

Capital	108,768,000
Bonds	1,091,232,000
Loans	1,200,000,000
Gross income	54,000,000
Loss of income, 10 per cent	5,400,000
Net income	48,600,000
Payment on bonds, 4 per cent	43,649,280
Net surplus for third year	4,950,720
Capital, end of third year	113,718,720

FOURTH YEAR.

Capital	113,718,720
Bonds	1,486,381,280
Loans	1,600,000,000
Gross income	72,000,000
Loss on income, 10 per cent	7,200,000
Net income	64,800,000
Payment on bonds, 4 per cent	59,455,251
Net surplus for fourth year	5,344,749
Capital, end of fourth year	119,063,469

FIFTH YEAR.

Capital	119,063,469
Bonds	1,881,036,531
Loans	2,000,000,000
Gross income	90,000,000
Loss on income, 10 per cent	9,000,000
Net income	81,000,000
Payment on bonds, 4 per cent	75,241,461
Net surplus for fifth year	5,758,539
Capital, end of fifth year	124,922,008

SIXTH YEAR.

Capital	124,822,008
Bonds	2,275,277,992
Loans	2,400,000,000
Gross income	108,000,000
Loss on income, 10 per cent	10,800,000
Net income	97,200,000
Payment on bonds, 4 per cent	91,011,119
Net surplus for sixth year	6,188,880
Capital, end of sixth year	131,010,888

SEVENTH YEAR.

Capital	131,010,888
Bonds	2,669,089,112
Loans	2,800,000,000
Gross income	126,000,000
Loss on income, 10 per cent	12,600,000
Net income	113,400,000
Payment on bonds, 4 per cent	107,763,564
Net surplus for seventh year	6,636,435
Capital, end of seventh year	137,647,323

EIGHTH YEAR.

Capital	137,647,323
Bonds	3,062,452,677
Loans	3,200,000,000
Gross income	144,000,000
Loss on income, 10 per cent	14,400,000
Net income	129,600,000
Payment on bonds, 4 per cent	122,498,107
Net surplus for eighth year	7,101,893
Capital, end of eighth year	144,749,216

NINTH YEAR.

Capital	144,749,216
Bonds	3,455,350,784
Loans	3,600,000,000
Gross income	162,000,000
Loss on income, 10 per cent	16,200,000
Net income	145,800,000
Payment on bonds, 4 per cent	138,214,031
Net surplus for ninth year	7,585,969
Capital, end of ninth year	152,335,185

TENTH YEAR.

Capital	152,335,185
Bonds	3,847,764,815
Loans	4,000,000,000
Gross income	180,000,000
Loss on income, 10 per cent	18,000,000
Net income	162,000,000
Payment on bonds, 4 per cent	153,910,592
Net surplus for tenth year	8,089,407
Capital, end of tenth year	160,424,592

ELEVENTH YEAR.

Capital	$160,424,592
Bonds	4,238,675,408
Loans	4,400,000,000
Gross income	198,000,000
Loss on income, 10 per cent	19,800,000
Net income	178,200,000
Payment on bonds, 4 per cent	169,547,016
Net surplus for eleventh year	8,652,984
Capital, end of eleventh year	169,077,576

TWELFTH YEAR.

Capital	169,077,576
Bonds	4,630,022,424
Loans	4,800,000,000
Gross income	216,000,000
Loss on income, 10 per cent	21,600,000
Net income	194,400,000
Payment on bonds, 4 per cent	185,200,897
Net surplus for twelfth year	9,199,103
Capital, end of twelfth year	178,276,679

THIRTEENTH YEAR.

Capital	178,276,679
Bonds	5,020,823,321
Loans	5,200,000,000
Gross income	234,000,000
Loss on income, 10 per cent	23,400,000
Net income	210,600,000
Payment on bonds, 4 per cent	200,832,932
Net surplus for thirteenth year	9,767,067
Capital, end of thirteenth year	188,043,746

FOURTEENTH YEAR.

Capital	188,043,746
Bonds	5,411,056,254
Loans	5,600,000,000
Gross income	252,000,000
Loss on income, 10 per cent	25,200,000
Net income	224,800,000
Payment on bonds, 4 per cent	216,442,250
Net surplus for fourteenth year	10,357,750
Capital, end of fourteenth year	198,401,496

FIFTEENTH YEAR.

Capital	198,401,496
Bonds	5,800,698,504
Loans	6,000,000,000
Gross income	270,000,000
Loss on income, 10 per cent	27,000,000
Net income	243,000,000
Payment on bonds, 4 per cent	232,027,940
Net surplus for fifteenth year	10,972,060
Capital, end of fifteenth year	209,373,556

SIXTEENTH YEAR.

Capital	209,373,556
Bonds	6,189,726,444
Loans	6,400,000,000
Gross income	288,000,000
Loss on income, 10 per cent	28,800,000
Net income	259,200,000
Payment on bonds, 4 per cent	247,579,058
Net surplus for sixteenth year	11,620,942
Capital, end of sixteenth year	220,994,498

SEVENTEENTH YEAR.

Capital	220,994,498
Bonds	6,578,105,502
Loans	6,800,000,000
Gross income	306,000,000
Loss on income, 10 per cent	30,600,000
Net income	275,400,000
Payment on bonds, 4 per cent	263,124,220
Net surplus for seventeenth year	12,275,780
Capital, end of seventeenth year	233,270,278

EIGHTEENTH YEAR.

Capital	233,270,278
Bonds	6,965,829,722
Loans	7,200,000,000
Gross income	324,000,000
Loss on income, 10 per cent	32,400,000
Net income	291,600,000
Payment on bonds, 4 per cent	278,633,189
Net surplus for eighteenth year	12,966,811
Capital, end of eighteenth year	246,237,089

NINETEENTH YEAR.

Capital	246,237,089
Bonds	7,352,862,911
Loans	7,600,000,000
Gross income	342,000,000
Loss on income, 10 per cent	34,200,000
Net income	307,800,000
Payment on bonds, 4 per cent	294,104,516
Net surplus for nineteenth year	13,695,484
Capital, end of nineteenth year	259,932,573

TWENTIETH YEAR.

Capital	259,932,573
Bonds	7,739,167,427
Loans	8,000,000,000
Gross income	360,000,000
Loss on income, 10 per cent	36,000,000
Net income	324,000,000
Payment on bonds, 4 per cent	309,566,697
Net surplus for twentieth year	14,433,303
Capital, end of twentieth year	274,365,876

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I profoundly and sincerely regret that the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] misconstrued my position in the questions that I have asked him.

Mr. YATES. Nobody else misconstrued it.

Mr. KITCHIN. There is the situation, and I ask the gentleman to believe me, if he will, or if he can.

Mr. STRONG of Kansas. If he can! [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] has given as much study to a soldier relief bill and to what he considers the proper kind of relief as any Member of the House, if not more. He has worked upon it day and night. As I say, it may be a good bill. I have not yet made up my mind about any of these bills. The gentleman from Oklahoma is thoroughly convinced that his is the best bill, and I know that a great many soldiers throughout the United States who were engaged in the World War think that it is the best bill that has been proposed. After the gentleman had given this time and study to it and had prepared the bill with great pains, after the bill had behind it thousands and thousands of soldiers, I wanted him to know that his party here in this House had not treated him with the proper consideration and had not treated his bill, nor the thousands of soldiers who indorsed the bill, with proper consideration.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

Mr. MORGAN. I think that is unfair to the Republicans of this House.

Mr. KITCHIN. Oh, well, I will not yield any further if the gentleman wants to indorse the majority leader for not permitting him to take up his bill, if he wants to indose the steering committee in its refusal to allow his bill to be considered, if he wants to indorse the Public Lands Committee in absolutely ignoring it, and if he wants to indorse generally the Republican side of the House in not letting him and the soldiers have a chance to even get the bill up. In such circumstances I have nothing more to say. [Laughter and applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG].

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, before the gentleman from North Dakota proceeds, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, I regret that the House fixed so short a time for the discussion of this most important bill. The report prepared by me gives a brief outline of the so-called Canadian reciprocity act. I ask to have it printed in the RECORD as a part of my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks by inserting in the RECORD the report filed by him. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The report is as follows:

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota, from the Committee on Ways and Means, submitted the following report (to accompany H. R. 7779, introduced by Mr. YOUNG):

The Committee on Ways and Means, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7779) to repeal the act entitled "An act to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes," approved July 26, 1911, report the same back with recommendation that the bill do pass.

The so-called Canadian reciprocity agreement was negotiated at Washington during the month of January, 1911, between representatives of the American and Canadian Governments. Diplomatic forms and ceremonies were dispensed with There was very little official correspondence and the negotiations were almost entirely verbal. After the arrangement had been concluded, Mr. Fielding, Canadian finance minister, and Mr. Paterson, minister of customs, addressed a formal letter to Mr. Knox, Secretary of State, setting forth their understanding of what had been agreed upon. The arrangement was to take the form of concurrent legislation instead of a treaty, for the reason that it was said Canada wished to be free to annul it at any time if it should prove to be against their interests.

It was agreed that wood pulp and paper made of wood pulp, when valued at not more than 4 cents a pound, should come into the United States duty free, upon condition that no export duty should be imposed by Canada upon these articles. This provision became section 2 of the act which later passed Congress, and which was approved on July 26, 1911. The operation of that section was not made dependent upon the fate of the reciprocity measure in the Canadian Parliament, so it went into effect.

The proposed changes in the general tariff rates were listed in four schedules. Schedule A embraced the articles that were to be duty free in both countries. It included practically all agricultural products, except wool; fish and fish oil of all kinds (except sardines and fish preserved in oil); hewn timber, sawed lumber, posts, ties poles, staves, and palings; unmanufactured asbestos, gypsum, talc, mica, feldspar, and fluorspar. Very few manufactured products were included in this schedule, the most important of those that were included being galvanized or tinned iron and steel sheets, galvanized wire and wire rods of certain gauges, all barbed fencing wire, cream separators, carbon electrodes, typesetting and typecasting machines, coke, and cottonseed oil.

Schedule B included articles to be admitted into each country from the other at identical rates of duty, which were generally lower than those at the moment then prevailing in either country. Many of the items were secondary products and manufactures of which the chief component materials were made free in schedule A. Under this head came such articles as flour, barley malt, canned vegetables, fresh and canned meats, lard, bacon, prepared cereals, biscuits, and fruit juices. Schedule B also included agricultural implements and machinery, monumental and building stone (except marble and onyx), cutlery and plated ware, clocks and watches, motor vehicles, bathroom fixtures, and some other manufactures of minor importance.

Schedule C included six articles that were to be admitted at special rates by the United States: Aluminum, laths, shingles, planed or finished lumber, iron ore, and coal slack.

Schedule D contained seven articles upon which Canada was to make reductions: Cement, fruit trees, condensed milk, unsweetened biscuits, canned fruits, peanuts, and bituminous coal.

On January 26, 1911, like bills were introduced in the American Congress and Canadian Parliament to carry the arrangement into effect. Both these bills met a storm of opposition. In our country protests came from every industry where the duties had been lowered. Among those opposing the bill the farmers, particularly those in Maine, northern New York, Ohio, Michigan, Minnesota, North Dakota, South Dakota, Montana, Washington, and Oregon, were the most pronounced in their opposition. While the measure was sponsored by a Republican President it was opposed by a majority of the Republicans in Congress, and went on the statute books only because of the united support of the Democrats.

The speeches made in the Canadian Parliament demonstrated beyond a doubt that the proposed reciprocity agreement was, from the economic standpoint, a decidedly one-sided arrangement, by which the chief benefit went to Canada. But political issues were raised in Canada which diverted the attention of the people from the commercial and economic phases of the agreement and resulted in the defeat of the bill in the Canadian Parliament.

The wood-pulp provision was reenacted in the Underwood tariff law and is not affected by this repeal bill.

The Underwood tariff law contains reciprocal provisions as to wheat, flour, potatoes, and potato products, which were complied with last year by Canada, and therefore wheat, flour, potatoes, and potato products are now on the free list from Canada. The passage of this bill will not affect the status of those commodities. Another bill is pending in the Committee on Ways and Means for the repeal of sections 581 and 644 of the Underwood tariff law, which relate to wheat and wheat products, potatoes and potato products, and to impose duties upon those commodities. Importations of wheat have been temporarily suspended during the administration of the food-control law.

It is the belief of the committee that the time has come when the so-called Canadian reciprocity act should be repealed, and it is hoped, in view of the formal rejection by Canada of the proposed reciprocal arrangement, that the bill may be considered without partisanship and speedily passed.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Chairman, in the necessarily brief discussion of this bill I wish to emphasize, first of all, the fact that the Committee on Ways and Means has recommended the repeal of the so-called Canadian reciprocity act through no feeling of hostility, commercial or otherwise, toward Canada. On the contrary, it is the belief of the committee that a possible cause of friction may be removed by the passage of this bill.

Speaking for myself, and probably for many in this House, I believe it is the most sound policy to treat all countries upon a basis of uniformity. That principle was followed in the preparation of the Underwood tariff law, and I venture to say will be followed in the general tariff bill which will hereafter be reported by our committee. This is a principle—that is to say, uniformity of treatment to all nations in respect to tariff duties—which should be followed by both Republicans and Democrats in all future tariff making. It is a peace policy, and if lived up to will remove some of the causes for commercial clashes, and perhaps war.

It has been claimed that there is no need for repeal, for the reason that Canada will never change her position. The Commercial and Financial Chronicle of December 20, 1917, after the inauguration of the new Government at Ottawa, printed a dispatch from its Ottawa correspondent, as follows:

Mr. Sifton is a strong-willed member of a western trio of new members in the Federal Government. All of them are committed point-blank to tariff revision downward, particularly in the items of agricultural implements, farm supplies of all sorts, and free access between the United States and Canada for flour, oats, barley, etc.

According to the Toronto Globe of December 20, 1918, a demand for "reciprocal free trade in everything from A to Z" is made by the United Farmers of Ontario in a resolution adopted on December 19.

My own belief is that there is little fear of Canada ever passing a law to accept or put in operation the reciprocity law now on our statute books. Why should she? Canada was made a present in the Underwood tariff law of practically all she was trading for in the proposed reciprocity arrangement. While it was a one-sided agreement, still Canada did give a certain degree of preference to United States manufactures. Why should Canada agree to do this now, when practically all she asked was given to her by the Underwood law? The only reason that the Laurier government ever thought of signing such an agreement was to secure free access to our markets for her agricultural produce. Now, let us see what was put on the free list by the Underwood law:

Broom corn; buckwheat; corn; cotton; eggs; flax straw; hemp; fruits or berries, green, ripe or dried; hides; hoofs; hop roots; lard; meats; milk; cream; condensed milk; nuts; seeds; skins of sheep, goats, and so forth; hogs; cattle; sheep; wool of the sheep. Potatoes and potato products and wheat and wheat products carried duties, but were to be on the free list upon certain reciprocal conditions. These conditions have been

met by Canada, thus placing these commodities on the free list from that country.

Section 581 of the Underwood tariff law, October 3, 1913, being in that part of the act devoted to the free list, reads as follows:

Potatoes and potatoes dried, desiccated, or otherwise prepared, not specially provided for in this section: *Provided*, That any of the foregoing specified articles shall be subject to a duty of 10 per cent ad valorem when imported directly or indirectly from a country, dependency, or other subdivision of government which imposes a duty on such articles imported from the United States.

Treasury Decision 37815 in respect to paragraph 581, tariff act of October, 1913:

TREASURY DEPARTMENT, *November 21, 1918.*

COLLECTOR OF CUSTOMS,
New York City.

SIR: The department is in receipt of information through the Secretary of State that by an order in council of the Canadian Government, potatoes and potatoes dried, desiccated, or otherwise prepared have been transferred to the list of goods which may be imported into Canada free of all duties of customs. It appears also from instructions issued by the commissioner of customs at Ottawa, Canada, that the order was effective on November 7, 1918.

Potatoes and potatoes dried, desiccated, or otherwise prepared not specifically provided for, imported to the United States from Canada are therefore entitled to entry free of duty under paragraph 581 of the tariff act of 1913 from November 7, 1918.

Respectfully,

L. S. ROWE, *Assistant Secretary.*

Section 644 of the Underwood law, being a part of the act devoted to the free list, reads:

Wheat, wheat flour, semolina, and other wheat products not specially provided for in this section: *Provided*, That wheat shall be subject to a duty of 10 cents per bushel, that flour shall be subject to a duty of 45 cents per barrel of 196 pounds, and semolina and other products of wheat, not specifically provided for in this section, 10 per cent ad valorem, when imported directly or indirectly from a country, dependency, or other subdivision of government which imposes a duty on wheat or wheat flour or semolina imported from the United States.

The Treasury Department informs me that Canada has taken action similar to that in respect to potatoes, in respect to wheat and wheat products; and wheat, wheat flour, and semolina are now on the free list from Canada—at least, so far as the tariff is concerned. Mr. Barnes, president of the Food Administration Grain Corporation, however, has barred the importation of wheat during the pendency of the food-control law. Mr. Barnes told me over the long-distance telephone from New York recently that only 5,000,000 bushels had been imported from Canada during the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, as against about 19,000,000 bushels imported annually prior to the war.

The Underwood law did not get well under operation before the European war began. The conditions created by that war have acted as a high protective tariff. When we get back to peace conditions, which as to wheat will be next June, and as to other things some of them before that time, the American farmers will raise a howl which, by comparison, will make the roar of protest against Canadian reciprocity seem like a feeble murmur. In other words, when the farmers really find out that the Underwood law lets down the bars as to agricultural products to a much greater extent than Canadian reciprocity, they will throw the men responsible for it higher than they did Mr. Taft.

Mr. Chairman, what we have done in favor of other countries and against our own agricultural interests is reflected in an article in the London Economist from its Ottawa, Canada, correspondent, written on May 27, 1919. He says:

There has lately been issued a report of the United States Tariff Commission, which suggests a double system of duties, one for countries which give America specially favorable treatment, and another for countries which discriminate against her. At present Canada has the benefit of free importation to the United States for most of her agricultural produce. In the year which ended March 31, 1918, she exported to the United States the following agricultural produce:

Wheat	$53,561,000
Cattle and horses	16,465,000
Flax	19,445,000
Hay	4,240,000
Wool	6,834,000
Bran and mill feed	5,194,000
Flour	5,602,000
Clover seed	769,110
Potatoes	2,704,093
Turnips	685,967
Rye	984,443
Oats	4,513,946
Barley	1,380,922
Buckwheat	216,488
Beef	1,850,375
Fresh cream	666,401
Preserved cream	2,486,279
	127,599,024

This profitable export trade is largely a result of the Underwood tariff, and its growth has been very rapid. For instance, the export of living animals from Canada to the United States was only $1,746,000 in the year which ended March 31, 1913. By 1915 the exports in this one line alone had increased to $13,389,000, and last year the total was $16,465,000. Of this amount $1,376,000 was for lambs, which it is utterly impossible to ship across the Atlantic. There has also sprung up a profitable trade in wheat under milling grade, which has been in great demand for feeding purposes in the United States, and a good market for flax, bran, and other grain products.

Now, it is well known that the American farmer, particularly in the Northwestern States, which adjoin the Canadian West, has always looked with great disfavor upon the comparatively free importation of Canadian agricultural products. The Middle Western States have old Republican traditions, into which President Wilson made certain inroads, but the Republican Party realize that their wholesale reconversion is a necessity if they are to carry the presidential election of 1920. The agricultural interests in the Middle West were strongly hostile to the reciprocity agreement of 1911, and Mr. GEORGE M. YOUNG, Congressman for North Dakota, who is a member of the Ways and Means Committee at Washington, recently declared that their opposition had not abated. Mr. MONDELL, the new Republican House leader, also expressed the opinion that free importation of Canadian agricultural produce was against the interest of the American farmers. There is every symptom, therefore, that the Republicans will make agricultural protection an important item of the new tariff policy.

The article just read shows that the item for cattle and horses had multiplied many times after the passage of the Underwood tariff law, and that all of the items show a great increase of exports into the United States, and in this thoughtfully written article from a Canadian to the London Economist fear is expressed that the Underwood tariff law may be changed by the present Congress to the very great damage, in his opinion, of the farmers in Canada. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I do not mean to convey the idea that farmers are high protectionists. Upon the contrary, I do not believe they are. But they are very pronounced in their opposition to any policy which discriminates against them. If what they buy is protected by tariff duties—and most things they buy are protected by the Underwood law—they want tariff duties collected upon articles which they sell. That is all I want. That is all they contend for.

If I were asked to summarize the reasons why we want the Canadian reciprocity act repealed I would say:

First. Because the process by which it was prepared and enacted was unconstitutional. The President's power to negotiate with foreign Governments exists nowhere outside of the treaty-making power, and the treaty-making power does not extend to revenue measures; they belong exclusively in their initiation to the House of Representatives. The action of President Taft was an invasion of the constitutional prerogatives of the House to originate revenue legislation.

Second. It violates the principle of uniformity in tariff legislation. It proposed to give to Canada privileges denied to other countries—such action carried to its legitimate conclusion with other countries would tend toward commercial wars and perhaps even to wars by force of arms.

Third. Even if it could be justified upon other grounds, it was a horribly poor bargain which, had it gone into effect, would have injuriously affected the agricultural interests of our country.

Mr. Chairman, for these and many other reasons which I can not set forth in the time assigned to me I am in favor of this repeal bill.

There is a timely article in the American Economist of July 25, 1919, which I desire to have printed in the RECORD. It reads:

REPEAL THE CANADIAN RECIPROCITY ACT—BECAUSE ECONOMICALLY UNSOUND AND ESSENTIALLY DISHONEST.

Reciprocity, as applied to the customs tariff, consists in exchanging what belongs to some one else for something which by such exchange becomes yours. There is an exception to this general rule and it consists in securing something of value for yourself and giving in exchange therefor something which belongs to nobody. Both propositions are essentially dishonest.

Let us demonstrate: A protective tariff is one designed not only to produce revenue from such imports as are made, notwithstanding its provisions, but to shut out the major portion of the commodity involved. A is a manufacturer of saws. Being the largest manufacturer in the United States and having considerable competition from other domestic concerns, he is desirous of establishing a market for his saws in Canada. In order to enjoy a decent margin of profit on his output and to prevent unfair competition from the products of lower-cost nations, such as Germany, England, and others, he, in common with other saw manufacturers, has asked for and received a protective tariff on saws. Having heard so much about the value of reciprocity as an aid to export trade, he asks that Congress pass a reciprocity act which will allow his product to enter Canada either duty free or at a substantial reduction from the present Canadian tariff duty, for be it known that Canada manufactures saws, and hence has a protective tariff on that very important industry.

But does A ask that the reciprocity shall consist in the lowering of the duty on saws, so that Canadian saws may come into this country duty free or at a lower than the present rate of duty? That would be real reciprocity. But no, A has no such foolish idea in his head. He wants his industry protected. He wants no lowering of the "economic barriers" so far as his industry is concerned. He did not ask for protection only to swap it off at the first chance for the poor privilege of selling saws in Canada.

So what does A propose? He proposes to let Canadian wheat come into this country duty free. He can see some sense in that kind of reciprocity. That will not cost him anything, while he gains an entrance for his saws into the Canadian market.

But B has a big wheat farm up near the Canadian border, but on this side thereof. While his land is worth from $50 to $60 an acre, the Canadian wheat lands are worth from $10 to $25 an acre. His investment is at least twice as great as the Canadian farmers, and is probably five or six times as great. Not only that, but he has to pay more for his help, more for nearly everything he buys, because labor and commodities are higher in this country than in Canada. Therefore there being a surplus of wheat in this country, he needs protection against Canada wheat, the unrestricted importation of which would make its growth in this country unprofitable.

Now, if A succeeds in securing "reciprocity" which gains him a market in Canada for his saws, he does so at the expense not of himself but of B, and of the many B's, whose industry is more important to this country than all the saws ever manufactured, to say nothing of the theft of another man's business.

Will any man say that such a proposition is true "reciprocity"? No; it is theft. It is a bartering of another man's prosperity, of his chance to make an honest living at his own all-important industry, for the benefit of A.

Now, take our second proposition, that reciprocity as proposed by some is simply getting something for nothing, a mere "con" game. Take our friend A again as illustration. He sees that the Canadian reciprocity scheme is a dishonest one, so he plans to apply reciprocity where it will do no harm. He thinks that the forest of Brazil should provide a market for his saws, so he proposes reciprocity with Brazil. When asked what he thinks would be a fair basis of reciprocity he suggests the admission of saws into Brazil without payment of duty, the consideration therefor to be the admission of coffee duty free into this country. He argues that such a reciprocal agreement will not wrong any domestic industry, and he is quite right. But what does Brazil get in return? Absolutely nothing. We can not raise coffee in this country, so we are granting no concession to Brazil in admitting it free of duty. Furthermore, if we impose an import duty, we add just so much to the cost to the consumer of coffee in this country. That is an instance where the free trade claims that "a tariff is a tax which is added to the price which must be paid by the ultimate consumer" is true. It is the reverse of a protective tariff, which lowers the cost to the ultimate consumer.

Everyone can see that the proposition to make "reciprocal" concessions on noncompetitive products is a dishonest one. It is as much a crime as obtaining money under false pretenses, which is an offense punishable by imprisonment.

But these are not the only ways in which "reciprocity" is not a square deal. It is not fair to other friendly nations. Our tariff laws should be uniform in their provisions, application, and administration. This most-favored-nation proposition is a breeder of resentment and misunderstanding. We should treat all nations fairly and show partiality to none.

We believe that we have shown that so-called reciprocity is unfair, not uniform in its application, besides being unwise and dishonest.

This Nation can not afford to be a party to dishonesty. It can not afford to rob one class of producers to aid another class. It can not afford to gain any advantage for our own producers by entering into a confidence game to swindle a friendly nation.

Therefore we say: "Repeal the reciprocity act." It will be a matter of news to some of our readers that there is any reciprocity act to repeal, but there is. It is what is known as the Canadian reciprocity act of July 26, 1911, the act which Canada refused to ratify, but which she can change her mind about and ratify at any time unless the same shall be repealed.

A bill looking toward such repeal has been introduced into Congress by Representative YOUNG of North Dakota, being H. R. 7122. Canadian farmers have of late been very active in asking the Canadian Parliament to ratify the act of 1911, not for the benefit of the people of this country, but so that the Canadian farmers may sell their wheat at the higher prices which are obtainable in this country. With a guaranteed price of $2.25 a bushel for wheat, which a fool free-trade administration has saddled upon this country in opposition to every principle of sound economics, the Canadians will have a mighty fine time of it under "reciprocity," and at the expense of every man, woman, and child in the United States.

The Young bill also provides for the repeal of paragraphs 581 and 644 of the tariff act of October 3, 1913, which places potatoes on the free list, also wheat and wheat products from all countries which impose no duties on American wheat or its products. It is important for the welfare of this country and its most important industries that this bill pass and pass immediately, and we respectfully urge the Congress to take prompt action to remove this foolish and inconsistent, this dishonest, act, falsely posing under the name of "reciprocity," from our statute books.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KING. Does the gentleman want more time? His discussion of the bill is right to the point.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. The time has all been promised by the chairman of the committee [Mr. FORDNEY].

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield to the gentleman from Maine [Mr. HERSEY].

Mr. HERSEY. Mr. Chairman, I represent a constituency that borders on Canada. Every State along that border for 3,000 miles is interested in the repeal of the Canadian reciprocity act. They are united, Republicans and Democrats both, to-day for the repeal of this reciprocity act, which holds out our hands to Canada, asking them to accept this un-American law, which they can do at any time. Under the limited time we have to discuss this bill in the House, I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to extend my remarks by inserting in the RECORD a speech I made in the House of Representatives of Maine in 1911 on a resolution indorsing Canadian reciprocity, in which I opposed it, and which the Legislature of Maine, being strongly Democratic, also repudiated Canadian reciprocity. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Maine asks unanimous consent to revise and extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
LEGISLATURE OF MAINE,
March 7, 1911.

ORDERS OF THE DAY.

To-day assigned: Resolution in favor of reciprocity with Canada.

* * * * * * *

Mr. HERSEY, of Houlton. Mr. Speaker, I do not rise at this time for the purpose of discussing the tariff, and neither do I wish for one moment to present this matter from any partisan or political standpoint. I think it is the most important question which will be before this legislature, and I think it should be approached from no partisan standpoint. The manner in which the committee approached it could not have been partisan, Mr. Speaker, for the majority of that committee said that they were opposed to this resolution, while the minority presented a report which is a modification of the original resolve, which indorses the doctrine of reciprocity with Canada, of which I suppose there is no objection in any quarter; but the object of this resolution, Mr. Speaker, if passed by this legislature, must intend to say to the President of the United States and to the incoming Congress in special session that this Legislature of Maine indorses the resolve or treaty for reciprocity with Canada.

That treaty comes before our Congress under peculiar circumstances. It came a few weeks ago like thunder in a clear sky; it startled the Nation, it came from a Republican President, it came without consultation with Congress, it came without consultation with the leaders of his own party or the leaders of any other party, it came without notice, without an examination, it came at a time when it was popular to speak of reciprocity as a great benefit to our Nation, and for the first few days after this announcement the people of this Nation thought that the President had taken a position that would bring to the people of this Nation more prosperity and had inaugurated something for the benefit of the whole people; but as time went on—and time settles these matters all right—it was found that such a measure did not meet the ideas of Congress, either Democratic or Republican; it did not meet the desires of the people of America, and it certainly did not meet the desires or wishes of that great class, the agriculturists, the farmers, the tillers of the soil, because they have learned something of what it contains and of its effects upon this country of ours.

I wish to ask the patience of this house while I bring before you some facts to demonstrate that this treaty ought not to be approved by Congress and ought not to be approved by this legislature. It is class legislation, un-Democratic, un-Republican, and un-American. Between us and Canada there is a border line of 3,700 miles, reaching from the Atlantic to the Pacific. North of that line bordering the United States is a country, a territory as large as the United States—Canada—settled at about the same time that the United States were settled, or a little before, and since the time of those settlements Canada has grown to a country of about 7,000,000 people, while the United States have about 91,000,000. The United States has become the greatest Nation of the earth during that period. Her great natural resources have developed and become the wonder of the world. On the other hand, across the line in Canada, her forests still stand primeval almost as they were on the morn of creation, the great water powers of the St. John and the St. Lawrence and the Great Lakes are undeveloped, her waters through her numerous rivers run, unvexed by millwheels, to the sea. She has a soil as rich as ours, and in all her agricultural resources she surpasses us. She has greater water powers and natural resources undeveloped than we have. Her waters are full of fish to supply to the world, no restrictions upon labor, and for that reason we find the labor of the world drifting to Canada, cheap pauper labor at her hands to develop her resources, her farms are undeveloped, her agricultural pursuits are of no consequence or account, she still retains her 7,000,000, small in the markets of the world; and this treaty says that these 7,000,000 people north of us shall have the markets of 91,000,000 people, and in exchange for the agricultural products of the farmers we shall have the great privilege of a market of 7,000,000.

Now, Mr. Speaker, this present treaty, although it has received merit as something new, as some great thing inaugurated by President Taft as a great blessing to our people, is not new; it is something old, something that this Nation once discarded. We had this same treaty in 1854, and we had it for 12 years, commencing in 1854 and ending in 1865, the same treaty that President Taft says we want now, and at the end of that 12 years we sent from the Congress of the United States to England this notice, that it was no longer for the interest of the United States to continue the same course. Previous to that notice from our Congress to Canada, in the Canadian Parliament of 1864 the privy council made this report:

"It would be impossible to express in figures with any approach to accuracy the extent to which the facilities of commercial intercourse created by the reciprocity treaty have contributed to the wealth and prosperity of this Province; and it would be difficult to exaggerate the importance which the people of Canada attach to the continued enjoyment of these facilities."

England approved of it and England prospered under it and Canada grew rich under it, and we suffered; and so we repudiated it, and Senator Sherman, of Ohio, when that matter came before our Congress, when they repudiated the treaty and would stand by it no longer, said:

"All the products of Canada come into our markets free of this duty. While this treaty stands it is a discrimination against every farmer and every mechanic and every industrial interest of the Western States. The farmer in Canada may raise his grain and produce and send it to our markets free of duty, and it pays no tax. We can not reach their railroads; we can not tax their transportation; we can not affect them in the least; and yet every interest of our farmers is taxed. It is manifest, therefore, that while we maintain our present system of internal taxation the reciprocity treaty is a direct benefit to the Canadian producer, farmer, and mechanic, and it is a discrimination against our own farmers and mechanics. It seems to me, therefore, for this reason alone, if there were no other, that this treaty ought to fall," and it did.

Now, then, during the Cleveland administration and while the tariff question was under discussion it was thought then that they might revive the old treaty of 1854, and they attempted to do it through Cleveland; and he, great Democrat that he was, repudiated that. In the

Canadian Parliament on the 24th day of February, 1903, Sir John Charlton, then a member of the Canadian Parliament, said:

"The American policy has been applied not only to us but to all the world. The object of the United States has been to sell all that it possibly could of the products of its soil and its mills and its workshops and to buy just as little as it could from other countries, and thus have as much of the balance of trade in its own favor as possible. The result has been that the balance of trade in favor of the United States last year amounted to $600,000,000 as against the whole world, $71,000,000 as against Canada. That is a good thing for the United States, and it will be her policy so long as the rest of the whole world will permit her to do it; but it is not good for us."

Then he goes on to say further:

"Something must be done to change the trade conditions that exist between the United States and Canada. Free trade in natural products would afford a reasonable adjustment. Nothing short of this will do, and this condition of free trade of natural products must be granted by the United States without a solitary concession from Canada further than she has already made. We can not afford any more."

We have now through President Taft a revival of the treaty of 1854 and nothing more. In order that you may have no question about it, a few days ago Mr. Fielding, the minister of finance of the Canadian Government, before the Canadian Parliament, said this about the treaty that he wanted his parliament to adopt:

"It is the reciprocity agreement of 1854 over again with comparatively little change. It promises prosperity to the people of Canada, and this House would make a grave mistake and do a great wrong if it refused to take advantage of it."

Now, the President of the United States takes the old treaty of 1854, discarded by the United States, and revives it and puts it before the Senate by a special message, and he says that he wants it to go through without reference to a committee, without discussion, without giving the people of this great Nation an opportunity to see what it contains, and without even giving to Congress the privilege of negotiating that treaty, and he says, "You must pass it before this Congress adjourns," and when Congress adjourns without passing it he inaugurates by a special message a special session of Congress to crowd this treaty down the throats of the people of this Nation. You can not amend it, you have got to take it as it comes, make all the fight you please, it must be taken as a whole or defeated. I say, Mr. Speaker, that is discrimination against the farmers of this country and in favor of Canada and not one whit in favor of the United States.

Now, in order that we may make no mistake about this matter, when England saw that there was free trade by this treaty with her colony, Canada, in agricultural products, she saw that if that thing became effective it meant annexation, and she would lose her colonies, because there was nothing then between them and everything would be in common, and the 7,000,000 would take the blessings of the 91,000,000 in the market, and she could not hold her colonies, and so England says to her minister there, "What about this?" and Fielding sends a cablegram to England, and what does he say? He says:

"Canada is seeking markets everywhere for her surplus products, subsidizing steamship lines, and sending out commercial agents. Would it not be ridiculous in the pursuit of such a policy to refuse to avail herself of the markets of the great Nation lying alongside? The expressed fear that it will seriously affect imports from Great Britain is groundless. The greater part of the agreement deals with natural products Great Britain does not send out. The range of manufactures affected is small, and in most cases the reductions are small.

"It appears to be assumed in some quarters that the tariff rates agreed upon discriminate in favor of the United States and against Great Britain. There is no foundation for this. In every case Great Britain will still have the same rate, or a lower one. Canada's right to deal with the British preference as she pleases remains untouched by the agreement. The adoption of the agreement will probably lead to some further revision of the Canadian tariff, in which the Canadian Parliament will be entirely free to fix the British preferential tariff at any rates that should be deemed proper."

Now, what is reciprocity? It is a popular word, but what is it? I will give you a definition of it, the best definition which I could find in the dictionary.

"Reciprocity is an arrangement or agreement between our own Nation and another nation by which we agree to admit, free of duty, certain articles which we need but which we can not raise or produce here; and in return the other nation admits to its ports free of duty certain articles which we produce and which they need but can not produce in their own land."

Take that definition. Does that define the treaty proposed to be inaugurated in this nation? Not at all. It is not reciprocity. There are a lot of us here who are in favor of reciprocity, but this is nothing but a discrimination against the farmers of the United States. Now, in order that you may understand it still further, what does the Canadian press think of this thing? Are they getting a good thing? The Manitoba Free Press, in that great agricultural country of Manitoba, the richest land upon the face of the earth, what do they say?

"The outstanding feature of the tariff is the complete reciprocity in farm products. This will undoubtedly be popular with the farmers both of the East and of the West. The good times in the eastern Provinces during the life of the Elgin treaty are a matter of tradition, and there is no doubt that the opening of the markets of the great American cities to the products of the eastern farms will be acceptable and profitable to the eastern farmer. In the West free wheat and free access to the Chicago market for his cattle will undoubtedly appeal very strongly to the cultivator of the soil."

The Ontario Advertiser has not been altogether satisfied with us in the past, but after characterizing the treaty as "the Canadian farmers' triumph," it authorizes us to congratulate ourselves that all is now forgiven. It says:

"The treaty agreement is a complete reversal of the normal attitude of the United States for nearly half a century. Except during the brief periods of Cleveland's ascendancy, the policy of the country since the Civil War has been one of stiff-necked protectionism, with a particularly forbidding front toward Canada. Probably no persons have been more surprised at the change than the Canadian negotiators. They could scarcely have expected such liberality when they set out for Washington."

But somebody says in giving the market for Canadian farm products in competition to our own will lower the price of food products and thereby help your labor, but that is the greatest blow there could be to labor in this land. In the United States, in the State of Maine, the labor is the best paid of any laborer on the face of the earth, and you and I know it. Yes; he is the best paid, and why? Because on this great border between us and Canada stands the immigrant inspection officer as well as the customhouse. We keep out the cheap and the pauper labor of the world. Pass that treaty and Canada with her great natural resources and her powers to manufacture cheaply with cheap labor, and how she can compete with the manufacturers of this great Nation! To be sure the cost of living is high, but wages are correspondingly high. You may lower the cost of living by cheapening the farm products, but then you must lower labor at the same time. Let us look at it. There are to-day 48,322 sawmills in the United States, employing in round numbers 1,250,000 men, who support a population of 5,000,000 people. Where would those people be with the natural resources of Canada and the mills upon her great water powers to compete with? There are $300,000,000 invested in the pulp and paper mills of the United States, employing 112,000 men. Premier Gouin, in speaking for the Province of Quebec, is quoted in the press as saying:

"The desire of the Provincial Government is to make Quebec the center of the pulp and paper industry of the world, and there is no reason why this should not be accomplished, for Quebec has the essential pulp wood and water power."

We have heard a great deal of discussion in this legislature about the protection of the fisheries along the coast of Maine. Fishermen have been looking after their wants—sea and shore fisheries. It is a great enterprise in the State of Maine, a great enterprise along the coast of Maine. The great State of Washington is the first State in the Union in the matter of fisheries. What about those fisheries? Pass that treaty and you won't discuss the fish question in a Maine Legislature; it won't be necessary; there will be no fish question, and there will be no fisheries along the coast of Maine. We can not compete with the Canadian waters, that are full of fish; the packing houses along the coast of Maine and Massachusetts and Oregon and Washington can not compete with the packing houses that will be erected where the fish are. Have you any doubt of that? Premier G. H. Murray, of Nova Scotia, in discussing the provisions of the treaty before the Canadian Parliament on February 24 said:

"I see no reason to-day why the fishing fleet of Nova Scotia should not increase threefold. I see no reason why we should not become the principal fish-food producers of this continent.

"For a quarter of a century the fishing portion—one-third—of our population longed for a free market with the nation to the south," he continued. "Now that great wish seems satisfied, and hope is filling the heart of every man who follows the sea for a livelihood."

What about the farmers? I said it was not a matter of politics. Democrats and Republicans alike ought to be agreed in the State of Maine upon this matter. Even the Waterville Sentinel on February 27 said:

"The scheme of reciprocity with Canada proposed by President Taft is not a fair proposition, judged either from the viewpoint of a tariff for protection or from the viewpoint of free trade or from the viewpoint of a tariff for revenue. From the viewpoint of a tariff for protection its aim is to take away from the farmers of this country what little of special privilege is extended to them. From the viewpoint of trade it fails to correct the favoritism granted to other lines of business besides farming. From the standpoint of tariff for revenue it is an absolute failure, because it still adheres to the policy of a tariff for the protection of privilege."

The Bangor Commercial of February 14 said:

"The ratification of the proposed reciprocity measure in its present form would be a blow for the future as well as for the present. A blow to the Maine industries depending upon our forest products would mean a blow to hundreds of thousands of people whose livelihood comes from these industries. We are glad to build for the future, but not at the expense of the present, and can not but object to a measure that, if adopted, will injure Maine's interests until such time as it is abrogated.

"But it is not alone the lumbermen, the paper and pulp manufacturers, and the dealers in the manifold forest products who will be dealt a vital blow should the reciprocity agreement be ratified, for every potato farmer, dairy farmer, cattle raiser, and hay producer will find his prosperity very seriously menaced.

"This is a question that is of vital importance to every farmer, not only in Maine but of all States adjacent to the Canadian boundary, for naturally the interests more directly affected are those near the boundary. They naturally can see no justice or equity in giving the manufacturer protection on the articles that they must buy and proclaiming free trade on the products of the farm, of protecting meat and not livestock.

"It has been said that Canada does not raise a vast amount of farm products, but this does not mean that she can not. Open to Canada the markets of the United States on a more than even basis with our farmers, for our neighbors across the border can buy their farms and obtain their laborers more cheaply, and the result is not far to seek. Right across the Maine line in Canada are thousands and thousands of acres of fertile lands. Give them a profitable market and their production will be vastly increased at the expense of Maine. Our farmers will suffer in lower prices for their products and depreciation of their farms and the State will suffer in the removal of many of its agriculturists across the border. And what is true of Maine is equally true of the other States that are adjacent to the Canadian border.

"It is not at all surprising that the sentiment in Canada over the proposed treaty is one of gratification mingled with surprise, for Canada is the larger beneficiary."

P. B. Carvell, Liberal member from New Brunswick, said recently:

"It is practically the unanimous wish of the electorate of the maritime Provinces, Conservatives as well as Liberal, that there should be freer access to the American markets for the natural branches products of Canada."

Under the agreement he felt sure there was no possibility that any Canadian interest would suffer. On the contrary, they would all be greatly stimulated. In his own country, he said, hundreds of Canadian farmers had crossed the international boundary line, a stone's throw away, not because the land of Maine was more fertile but because the New Brunswick farmer did not have as good a market as the man in Maine.

The Carleton Sentinel, published in New Brunswick, under date of February 3, said this in an editorial:

"We direct our readers to a careful study of the proposed reciprocity agreement concluded between the representatives of Canada and the United States, and made public on Thursday of last week. It will be seen that if this proposal becomes law practically everything produced by the farmers of New Brunswick will be admitted into the United States markets free from duty.

"One can hardly grasp at the outset what this will mean to the farmers and ordinary producers of the Province.

"As compensation for these wonderful boons all that we are granting the United States producers is a reduction in duty of from 2½ to 5 per cent on farm machinery. Thus from a farming standpoint and, in fact, from the standpoint of practically every person in New Brunswick we win both ways. We will not only obtain a better market for our products, but we will obtain cheaper machinery with which to produce them."

It is true that we have a large number of corporations—a trust you may call it—in the United States manufacturing farming machinery. It will help those few trusts in getting a market for their farm machinery, machinery with which they can do better work.

The Observer, published in New Brunswick, under date of February 1, said:

"Never since confederation has there been such a golden prospect for Carleton County farmers as is held out by the new tariff agreement announced in Parliament last Thursday. Throughout Canada the message that Hon. Mr. Fielding bore was considered the most important achievement ever made for the Canadian people. For weeks a committee composed of Canadian and American tariff experts have been arranging an agreement of reciprocity, or free trade, particularly in farm products, and the concessions gained from the Americans are a surprise to every Canadian, for those who have read the full report will have noticed that our neighbors concede to Canada much more than we have given.

"The new arrangement will not become law until the measure passes both Parliament and Congress. That it will pass the farmers here by a most decisive majority goes without saying, but there is reason to apprehend that the measure may be killed in either the House of Representatives or the United States Senate.

"Over in Aroostook farmers are getting 40 cents a dozen for eggs, 50 cents for oats, 12 cents for pork, $10 for hay. When this tariff agreement passes Carleton County farmers will be situated on an equal with their Yankee neighbors, and the day the measure becomes law every farm in Carleton County will increase in value 25 to 50 per cent.

"The day the United States House and Senate passes the proposed measure Carleton County comes in for not only her own but a great slice of her neighbor's market."

Do they know what they are talking about? It is nothing but class legislation, while the farmers of this great Nation are selected for the sacrifice. And you have accomplished nothing by it. You won't relieve the laborer or the manufacturer or the consumer, but you will injure the producer. Now, I say, gentlemen of this House, that the time has been in the past when Democrats and Republicans stood together for Maine and for this great Nation of ours. They stood together shoulder to shoulder when the Union was threatened. They stood together for a United Republic, they marched shoulder to shoulder, they were one, and they saved the Union and they saved the State of Maine. Again they stood together, Democrats and Republicans, some years ago when it was proposed to take our money and depreciate and degrade it and make of a dollar 50 cents, and they stood together, shoulder to shoulder, and they saved the money in this country. The time has come now when they must again stand shoulder to shoulder to save the agricultural interests of this Nation. Too much talk has been made about the consumer who must depend upon the farmer. The vital source of all our life comes from the farmer. Back to the farm we must go for prosperity. The farmer is the lifeblood of the Republic. You must save the farmer if you would save the Nation and the people; and I say the time has come when the producer must be given some protection and you must have some regard for him. The great agricultural interests of this Nation, the millions of farmers to-day that protest against this measure, must be heard, and they will be heard; they will be heard in this House of Representatives, or they will fill the House with those who will hear them. I say that in agricultural Maine we should stand to-day a unit against this treaty, and say that the majority of this committee, composed of Republicans and Democrats alike, are right when they state that this measure, this resolution, ought not to pass. [Applause.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield to any Republican on that side three minutes.

Mr. MORGAN. I would like to have that time to talk on this bill.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I would like to have five minutes.

Mr. KITCHIN. I yield three minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. MORGAN] to talk on this bill.

Mr. MORGAN. Mr. Chairman, I have not had time to study this bill before the House, but I remember very well when this proposition was before the House in its original form, and I remember the position I took on it at the time. I was opposed to the original proposition, and I made a speech against it when before the House; I voted against it, I believe, three times in one form and another. I am opposed to it to-day, and I want to compliment the Committee on Ways and Means in bringing in a bill here in favor of the repeal of this measure. I have always thought it was a discrimination against the agricultural interests. I believe in the principle of protection, and I believe that principle ought to apply to agriculture as well as to manufactures. I believe it ought to apply fairly to all interests, and that is the kind of protectionist I am. So I believe that the passage of this bill will indicate the position which the American people will take upon this great question in the future. I do not expect to see the day come again when the American Congress will ever reenact a measure like this, or we will have an American President who would sign and approve such a bill. I just wanted to place myself on record in favor of the passage of this bill. [Applause.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN]. [Applause.]

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, on last Monday, in replying to an article in the Washington Post regarding the election in the seventh congressional district of Alabama, I called the attention of the House to the fact that Mr. L. B. Rainey, of Gadsden, a Democrat, had been elected to Congress by a majority of 406 votes. Mr. WOOD of Indiana participated in the debate that morning, and the RECORD quotes him as saying or insinuating that I had secured the appointment of a negro by the name of Scott as Assistant Secretary of War, and had also secured the appointment of another negro for some office—he did not say what.

I was in the Hall Monday when Mr. WOOD of Indiana made a speech, but my attention was diverted by some Members who were speaking to me, and I did not hear what he said about me personally with regard to this particular matter. If I had, I would have branded the statement then as incorrect, unwarranted, and untrue. Here is the statement made by Mr. WOOD, and to which I desire to give attention:

I informed them—

He said, speaking of what he told the Republicans in the seventh district of Alabama, referring to me—

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 of War came from the district of Mr. HEFLIN; and, notwithstanding he was black as a coal, he was nevertheless appointed Assistant Secretary of War.

In the first place, Mr. Chairman, there is not now and has not been at any time during the present administration a negro Assistant Secretary of War. During the war there were three Assistant Secretaries of War. I have just been informed by the War Department that all three of them were white men and that the negro, Emmett Scott, referred to by Mr. WOOD, was not an Assistant Secretary of War, but that he was appointed by the Secretary of War to do certain work in connection with the negro soldiers. I did not even know that Scott had been designated to look after the negro soldiers until I heard it charged by Republicans in the seventh congressional district of Alabama that he had been appointed Assistant Secretary of War—a charge which was untrue. Any insinuation or intimation that I knew of or had anything to do with the negro Scott's appointment to the position that he did fill temporarily is without foundation. It is absolutely untrue.

Then, again, Mr. WOOD said:

I told them that, as another evidence of his influence, that when the ship *George Washington* sailed 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.

Mr. Chairman, there is no excuse for this unfounded and untrue statement. I am so innocent of even information as to what he means by this last statement that I do not even know to what he refers. But I want to say that there is no truth in either one of the statements charging or insinuating that I was consulted about or had anything whatever to do with the matter here mentioned by Mr. WOOD of Indiana. There is no word of truth to give rise to or even remotely sustain the charges or insinuations made against me with regard to the negroes here mentioned by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD].

I fear that he talks one way on the negro question in Indiana and quite another way in Alabama. If you had heard him in Alabama you would have thought that he favored white supremacy, and if you should hear him in Indiana you would think that he favored social equality and marriage between whites and negroes. My position on that question is the same here as elsewhere. I always try to tell the negro the truth about this question. I know the feeling of the great white heart of this country, and we ought to be honest and just with the negro and not deceive him in order to get his vote. You hurt us in the South, and the negro, too, by teaching a false doctrine. The masses of the white men in the North are not with you Republican leaders on this question. Mr. Lincoln said that he was opposed to social equality. He said that he was opposed to intermarriage between the races. And the Republican leaders like Mr. WOOD would do well to stay by the doctrine of Mr. Lincoln.

Those of you Republicans who believe in mixed schools and churches and intermarriage between the negro and white races are doing more to cause riots and crime amongst the negroes than any other thing. You cause them to aspire to something that the decent white man and woman abhor and hate, and will never submit to. In order to obtain the negro vote temporarily you mislead, deceive, and do that which will injure for a long time the negro race and at the same time bring trouble, serious trouble, upon the white men and women throughout the country. Every time you Republicans do anything to encourage mixed schools, mixed churches, and marriage between the races, you are sowing dragon's teeth in the path of white women wherever the negro problem is present. The white woman alone in her

home or walking alone through the park in the city, and the country girl walking along the lonely road, as she goes or comes from school, is in danger because of the doctrine that some of you teach. You do an injustice to the good negro, and there are thousands of them. The class that I refer to as the good negro knows that we tell him the truth and give him the true attitude of the real decent white men and women on this race question.

Mr. HERSEY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HEFLIN. Yes.

Mr. HERSEY. Did the gentleman understand Mr. WOOD to claim, either in Alabama or elsewhere, that he was in favor of the intermarriage of the races—the black race and the white race?

Mr. HEFLIN. Not in Alabama; no.

Mr. HERSEY. Anywhere?

Mr. HEFLIN. I am speaking of what I think his position is on the negro question up in the other sections of the country.

Mr. HERSEY. You do understand he claims that?

Mr. HEFLIN. No; I do not say that he claims that. I am stating what I understand his position to be.

Mr. HERSEY. He is not here.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. What is the gentleman's source of any such information as that?

Mr. HEFLIN. I have no direct information. I am simply expressing my opinion as to his attitude on this question. All who indulge in it should quit playing politics with a question that lies at the very heart of all that the white race holds dear and that touches the present and future welfare of the whole negro race in America. Let me say to white men North and South that whenever the crime of rape is committed and white men go out after the brute who commits it do not let anyone harm the innocent negro. It is our duty to see to it that he is protected, and we do that in the Democratic South. But we have registered a vow, and we will keep it as long as there is courage and life in us, and that is when a negro commits the crime of rape on a white woman he must die. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Alabama has expired.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WHITE].

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I am not here to discuss concretely any bill. I ask for five minutes in order to correct a false impression, honestly entertained, no doubt, by my good friend the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN]. I asked it in order that I might speak when he was in the room, and I supposed he was here. I am here to enlighten this committee on the subject of the consideration of the Mondell bill and the Morgan bill and other soldiers' settlement bills. I make the statement that a gentleman on the minority side a few days ago, in the discussion in general debate made the statement, which you will find in the RECORD, that the soldiers' settlement bill was fathered by the Republicans.

I want to say to you in this connection that the bill was introduced by Mr. MONDELL, but I say to you that it has a more remote, though possibly not a more illustrious, ancestry, and the gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] has referred to it before the committee and before this House as the "Secretary Lane bill." So that instead of it being a Republican bill and having a single paternity, that which is impossible in nature has become the phenomenon of legislation, and it has a conglomerate ancestry.

As to the Committee on Public Lands, I want to enlighten my good friend, because I know that he would not knowingly misstate any proposition before this House. I assume that it may be regarded as an act of temerity for a gentleman of such tender years and inexperience as myself to endeavor to even enlighten the gentleman or to correct his statement. I want to say to you with reference to the report on the Mondell bill that nine Democrats and eight Republicans on that committee supported the majority report. I think that this is information to this House, and I am making it, not as a partisan, but as a member of that committee. Of the four gentlemen who signed the minority view, all of them were Republicans—not a single one of them a Democrat. And if the majority that supported the majority report, a majority of Democrats, were sincere, why have they not come before this committee and before this House and urged some measure of the kind? They have not done so. I oppose the Mondell bill conscientiously, because I think it is fundamentally defective. This I say to you, gentlemen on the minority side and on the majority side, is not a partisan question, and should not be degraded as a partisan question in any sense, and it can not be. I say to you further, gentlemen, as a statement of information to this committee, that I myself in that committee, as both Democrats and Republicans will attest who are members of that committee, moved to substitute the Morgan bill for the Mondell bill. It is a matter of record. I make these statements, gentlemen, because I think it fair to the Republicans and the Democrats and to the members of this committee that this statement should be made here and in this manner. I make it respectfully.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. Yes.

Mr. BEE. What has become of the Morgan bill in the Committee on Public Lands?

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I am not able to answer the gentleman's question, except I understand it maintains its place without prejudice in that committee.

Mr. KITCHIN. I did not quite understand. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. I will yield for a question.

Mr. KITCHIN. What impression does the gentleman think ought not to be created and ought not to go out to the country?

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. The report as to the number of Democrats and Republicans on the committee, which the gentleman said was about 2 to 1.

Mr. KITCHIN. Some said 13 to 8.

Mr. WHITE of Kansas. It was 9 to 12; and I wish to state that that majority report was supported by 17 members of the Committee on the Public Lands, consisting of 9 Democrats and 8 Republicans. I make this statement, not as a partisan, but as a patriotic citizen and a member of that committee; and I believe that this legislation should not be tinged with any partisan consideration, either now or at any subsequent time. [Applause.]

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, how much time have I?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has 14 minutes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I really did not intend to get into any debate upon this soldiers' bills matter, or even to refer to it, or to the bills or lack of bills concerning it reported out or kept in by the Republicans of the Committee on the Public Lands. I am glad, very glad indeed, that the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WHITE] has set the House perfectly straight on the Mondell soldiers' bill, the bill introduced by the majority leader of the House. The gentleman says that nine Democrats and only eight Republicans voted to report out of the committee this soldiers' bill.

It appears from the statement of the gentleman that with the dozens of bills introduced by various Members for the relief of the soldiers, no bill at all would have been reported out of that committee in favor of the soldiers if it had not been for the Democrats on the committee. No bill at all, whether a good bill, a just bill, or not, would have been reported. But for the Democrats, all soldiers' relief bills would have been kept in the committee and not one would now be pending for consideration by the House. Now, the Democrats, perhaps, who caused the making of the favorable report on the Mondell bill took the position that there was a sentiment in the country and in the House for the soldiers to have some relief, and that the soldiers had the right to have some bill for their relief considered by the House, whether they agreed to all the provisions of the bill or not. They were willing, for the sake of the soldiers, that some bill, some concrete proposition, should be considered by a Republican House, and so they voted to report it so that the House could consider it if it desired. According to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WHITE]—and I know he is correct—if it had not been for these Democrats on the Committee on the Public Lands the soldiers would not have had an opportunity for this House to have considered any bill, good or bad, in their interest.

I am mighty glad that the Democrats were willing to vote to report some concrete bill, whether wise or unwise, whether they agreed to the bill or not. I am glad they felt that the soldiers really had a right to have something considered in the House. If there is one man in this House who should forever feel under the most grateful obligations to the Democrats on that committee it is the author of the bill, Mr. MONDELL, the Republican majority leader of the House, because if it had not been for these Democrats a Republican committee, which he helped to make and to shape, would have killed his bill in the committee and it could not have been considered by the House. His committee would have ignored and turned down its own majority leader.

These Democrats also out of respect to Mr. MONDELL, the distinguished and able leader of this House, seeing that the committee and members of his own party were going to turn him

down and humiliate him, felt that it was nothing but fair and just, although they might not favor all the provisions of the bill, that the majority leader of the Republican Party of the House ought to have his bill, the first bill he introduced at this session, considered in the House by his own party. [Laughter.] Of course, if I had been on that committee, although I am opposed to the bill, I think I would have taken the view that the Democrats took, that the committee under the circumstances should show enough respect for the majority leader of the House [Mr. MONDELL] to give his bill a chance on the floor of the House. [Laughter.] So that is the way the bill got out. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Now, gentlemen, with respect to the bill now under consideration, I am glad to say that this is one bill, the repeal of the Canadian reciprocity act passed by the Congress under Mr. Taft's administration in 1911, which all Democrats agree with the Republicans should be passed. That reciprocity act was passed, as the Democrats will recall, and I wish to remind them afresh, before the Underwood Act of 1913 was passed. Therefore, from the Democratic standpoint, after the Underwood bill passed, arranging and adjusting the tariff rates according to the Democratic theory and policy, there was little use from the Democratic standpoint in Canadian reciprocity, since it was practically a tariff proposition between this country and Canada. Having the Underwood Act enacted two years after the passage of the reciprocity act, the Democrats have no particular concern in keeping on the statute books the Canadian reciprocity act, especially since Canada rejected it. And then as a real American question it is not fair for this country that we should keep standing forever open for her acceptance the reciprocal agreement with Canada after she, by a vote of her people, has rejected it, leaving Canada for the next 10 or 20 or 30 years free to come in and accept it whenever she thinks conditions have so changed as to make the agreement a one-sided bargain in her favor. Therefore, as a national proposition, in the exercise of our right and interest, we ought to repeal it now.

I am very glad to agree with the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. FORDNEY] and the other Republican members of the Committee on Ways and Means on this bill.

As to the report of my friend from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], perhaps he states the facts, but not all the facts with respect to how that legislation was passed and who voted for it. It is stated in this report that "while the measure was sponsored by a Republican President, it was opposed by a majority of the Republicans in Congress and went on the statute books only because of the united support of the Democrats." Of course, the Democrats did not unitedly support it. We had some Democrats who opposed it.

I want to call the attention of the gentleman from North Dakota to the fact that this same identical reciprocity bill was passed by a Republican House—in February, 1911—in the short session before the Democrats had come in. We Democrats did not take control of the House until the extra session called by Mr. Taft in April, 1911, after the election of 1910. But from December 1, 1910, to March 4, 1911, the Republicans had control of the House by a large majority, and that same identical reciprocity agreement was passed by that Republican House. The Senate, however, refused to take it up, or did not pass it. And because of its failure to pass, Mr. Taft called an extra session for the express purpose of passing this reciprocity agreement, which the Republican House a month before had passed. In this extra session the House was Democratic.

I believe the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], who made this report, was not here then; neither was my friend from Kansas [Mr. WHITE] and many other gentlemen. But let us keep the record straight. Mr. Taft, a Republican President, and Mr. KNOX, the Republican Secretary of State, negotiated with Canada this agreement before any Democrats in the House ever heard of it and before any Democrat in the Senate ever heard of it, and they submitted it to the Republican Congress—the short session of the Sixty-first Congress—and the Republican House passed it.

You know the reciprocity bill could not have gotten out of the Republican Ways and Means Committee in that Republican Congress in 1911 if the majority of the Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee had not been for it. Mr. Payne headed that committee. On that committee were Mr. LONGWORTH, who is now a Member of this House; the late Mr. Hill of Connecticut; Mr. Boutell of Illinois; and Mr. McCall, of Massachusetts, who, one or two years afterwards, was made governor of Massachusetts. They voted to report it out and defended it on the floor. Mr. MANN, one of the strongest and ablest leaders the Republican Party ever had in this House, voted for it in the Republican House in February, 1911, and in the Democratic House in April, 1911. Gentlemen, at the time it was a wise act and, in my judgment, it was the most statesmanlike act of the whole Taft administration. But as I say, there is no use for it now. It will serve no purpose now. I merely wanted to call the attention of the gentleman from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG] to the facts as they appear in the RECORD and to some of the distinguished Republicans in the House who voted for the act.

And, gentlemen, I want to call attention to another gentleman who voted for this reciprocity act both in the Republican House and a month or two afterwards in the Democratic House, and that is the patriotic and distinguished gentleman whom the united voice of the Republicans in this House made Speaker, Mr. GILLETT.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. KITCHIN. I will.

Mr. KNUTSON. Does the gentleman from North Carolina maintain that the original reciprocity act was passed by a Republican House?

Mr. KITCHIN. A Republican House; the original bill submitted by Mr. Taft.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman is mistaken, because it was approved on July 26, 1911, when Mr. CHAMP CLARK was Speaker and the Democrats were in full control. The gentleman's memory is marvelous, but he certainly will not dispute the RECORD.

Mr. KITCHIN. That is the act that Democrats and Republicans and President Taft passed and put upon the statute book in the extra session of 1911. But I was referring to the vote in the preceding February, when the Republicans had control of the House. Will somebody ask Mr. Sabine to send me the RECORD of the vote on that in February, 1911?

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me, that came up at the end of my occupancy of the Speakership, at the end of eight years. I was violently opposed to the so-called Canadian treaty, and suffice it to say that it did not pass during that short session.

Mr. KITCHIN. It is barely possible that I may be mistaken, but I am equally as certain the House did pass it in the short session of the Sixty-first Congress, in February, 1911, while the gentleman was Speaker; but we will see when I get the RECORD.

Mr. CANNON. I will tell the gentleman why I am so clear that it did not pass Congress in the short session. I was sent for to go into the President's room at the other end of the Capitol, where President Taft had been signing bills, and I went over there immediately after the expiration of that Congress, which expired at 12 o'clock on the 4th of March, and I went along with several other Republicans, and the President asked us for our opinion as to the proper time to call a special session of Congress, whether it should be immediately, in April, or in May; and after polling everybody else I said, "Mr. President, the real reason for calling that session together is to ratify the reciprocity treaty with Canada?" He said, "Well, yes." I said, "Mr. President, so far as I am concerned, it does not make a d—— bit of difference when you call it"; and it was called, and the Democratic House passed it.

Mr. KITCHIN. But the gentleman will admit that before the Democrats took control, in the short session when the Republicans were in the majority, the bill passed the House. I did not say it passed Congress. I expressly said it failed in the Senate. The question at issue now is, Did the House in February, 1911, while in control of the Republicans, pass the reciprocity bill? The gentleman may possibly be right and I may possibly be wrong, but I want to get the RECORD. That will tell. Ah, here it is. Let us see. The yeas and nays were ordered on the passage of the reciprocity bill on the 14th day of February, 1911, in the Republican House, and this RECORD shows that both the young gentleman from Minnesota, the active and diligent whip of the Republicans [Mr. KNUTSON], and my esteemed and respected and revered and lifelong friend, Mr. CANNON, are mistaken and that your humble servant was correct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. KITCHIN. Give me one minute more.

Mr. FORDNEY. I yield to the gentleman one minute.

Mr. KITCHIN. The RECORD shows that in the Sixty-first Congress, on the 14th day of February, 1911, with the Republicans by a large majority having control of the House, it was passed by an overwhelming majority. The vote stood—for it, yeas 221, nays 93, or two and one-half times as many yeas as there were nays. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. CANNON. If the gentleman will allow me, the gentleman is correct and I was incorrect in saying that it did not pass the House; but if it had not been for the solid Democratic vote for it, or substantially that, it would not have passed.

Mr. KITCHIN. I only wanted to show the RECORD for the benefit of my young friend, Mr. KNUTSON. [Applause.]

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN] had gone further with his statement, he would have found that when the reciprocity bill passed the House in February, 1911, it passed with a solid Democratic vote and a minority of the Republicans voting for it, and it never received a majority of Republican votes in this House at any time.

Mr. KITCHIN. There are many other righteous acts that never received a majority of the Republicans, either. But that bill received a vote of a majority of the Republicans on the Ways and Means Committee, did it not? The gentleman wes a member of that committee at that time.

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not remember as to that, but I do not think so; and if you think Canadian reciprocity a righteous act, why are you going to vote for its repeal? But the gentleman from North Carolina is always resourceful and will present any kind of an argument, whether it is correct or otherwise, if he can get merriment out of it from the Democratic side of the House, whenever a tariff bill is under consideration.

This treaty has remained upon our statute books since 1911 and would become a law by the approval of Canada. When this bill became a law, so far as the Government of the United States is concerned, the matter was taken up by the Canadian people and submitted to a vote of their people, and it was overwhelmingly defeated. Since that time the law has remained upon our statute books, subject to the approval of Canada, and would become a law at any time that the Canadian Government might approve the treaty.

I have here a statement prepared by the Tariff Commission, a very valuable document, a summary and brief history of all the commercial treaties which have become laws between the Government of the United States and other countries. I commend the reading of this report to every Member of the House. The substance of the report is that this Government never entered into a reciprocity treaty with any foreign country that did not work to the disadvantage of our people.

Many treaties that have been agreed to between the representatives of our Government, the Secretary of State, and foreign authorities have been rejected by the Senate end of this Congress. We entered into a treaty with Canada in 1854. That treaty became effective in 1855 and remained a law for 11 years, and was repealed by a Republican Congress in 1866 by the adoption of protective measures.

Congress was called together in extra session after the House of Representatives had declined to ratify a treaty. Presented in the form it was drawn up, it was necessary to submit it to both Houses of Congress for ratification—the treaty between this Government and Cuba. In 1903 Congress was called together in extra session to pass that treaty. After great pressure had been brought to bear on Congress by President Roosevelt that treaty became a law. I want to show you the effect of that treaty. I was a Member of the House of Representatives at the time that treaty passed the House. I voted against it.

The balance of trade between this Government and Cuba for 17 years from the date of that treaty to the present time shows the balance of trade against the United States of $538,210,000. The average balance of trade annually was more than $31,000,000. Of course the trade between the two countries has very materially increased since that time, as our trade with the whole world has increased in volume.

During the same period of time under our general tariff laws, without any special trade relations between this Government and Canada, a small foreign nation to the north of us, the balance of trade has been in our favor. With Canada the balance of trade annually has been in our favor to the extent of $122,000,000, or more than $1,031,865,000 in 17 years. There is evidently a difference between a country doing business with the people of the United States under a general tariff law and a reciprocity treaty, which means free trade on many products, and the ordinary transaction of business in the usual manner.

I repeat, gentlemen, that there is not a treaty of record between this country and any other country in the world that has not operated to the disadvantage of our people. I can see no benefit coming to the people of the United States by trading a horse to the people of another nation for a horse.

The Republican principle of reciprocity is to accept from a foreign country such goods as they produce that we do not produce, if they will take some of our products under the same terms. It has always been a Republican principle to admit free of duty, or at the very lowest possible rate of foreign duties, articles produced in foreign countries that we do not produce here but must have. Coffee and tea are articles of food produced in foreign countries and not produced here. It is not a competitive product with any product of this country.

Raw rubber is produced in foreign countries and admitted free under the Republican law and under existing law. There never has been a duty on coffee and tea entering this country, except as a war measure during the Civil War. I think I am correct in that statement, although there might have been a duty in very early days before my recollection.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. How about the export duty on coffee in Brazil?

Mr. FORDNEY. No country imposes an export duty on coffee. Brazil produces the bulk of the coffee which comes to this country, and the Government of Brazil purchases all the coffee produced there and sells it at a profit, and that profit goes into the treasury of Brazil. They get around the export duty by that sort of method.

We are talking a great deal about the high cost of living in the papers and to the galleries. The administration has asked additional laws to enable it to bring down the cost of living. Such laws have been passed by Congress. I have reports and a photograph in my office to the effect that more than 30 Government ships are lying at anchor, out of operation, at Seattle, Wash. Thirty Government ships inactive and a great shortage of tonnage all over the world! In Brazil the docks and warehouses are filled to overflowing with coffee waiting for tonnage to bring that coffee to the United States or to take it to some foreign country. If the administration wants to bring down the cost of living in one great food product of this country, why not send some of those Government ships lying at anchor in Seattle to Brazil and bring in a few cargoes of coffee, dump them on the market, and reduce the price of that commodity? [Applause.]

I know at my home old Government Java coffee sold 3 pounds for a dollar some months ago. Now $1.20 for 2 pounds for that same coffee. If this administration is really serious and wishes to do something to reduce the cost of living, why not bring in from Brazil some of this coffee that is begging for tonnage? Here is a steamship company at New York, with which a Munson is connected, comes in and offers, so I am told on good authority, comes and offers the Shipping Board the very high price of $190 per ton for 20 ships. But the Government will not sell for that money, although they admit that it is a very high price.

This company wants to purchase those ships and put them in the South American trade. The administration is the dog in the manger, if my information is correct. It will neither put their boats in operation between this country and South America or let anyone else have the boats to put them in that trade. And they talk about wanting additional laws to reduce the high cost of living! Why not move in that direction if sincere?

Mr. McKEOWN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. McKEOWN. Is it not a fact that strikes at Rio de Janeiro have been one of the causes for the delay of the shipment of coffee, and is not that one of the real troubles?

Mr. FORDNEY. I do not think so. I do not know of any strikes on Government ships operated by the Shipping Board.

Mr. McKEOWN. I am talking about strike conditions of the longshoremen at the ports of Brazil. Is not that the reason?

Mr. FORDNEY. No; that is not my information. My information is that the warehouses and the docks are loaded to overflowing, waiting only for tonnage. The Government of Brazil has been compelled to borrow from people in this country—the bankers of New York—large sums of money to carry that great volume of coffee, because the Government borrows the money to pay the coffee producers of Brazil. All coffee produced in Brazil, under penalty, must first be offered to the Government before sold to any other persons in the world. Therefore the Government controls the coffee trade in Brazil.

Mr. Chairman, I ask for the repeal of this law because we have suffered every time we have entered into reciprocity treaties with any people of the world, and every time we have placed upon our statute books a low rate of duty on imports the industries of this country and American labor have suffered and will continue to do so so long as the great difference in the scale of wages prevails between the labor in this country and the labor of any other country. American laboring men have higher standards of living than any other laboring people under God's sun because of the higher wage scale here in this country. I have statistics from Germany and Austria-Hungary which show that since the war the wage scale in gold in those countries has practically not advanced in an appreciable way. Where the wages were from 10 to 13 cents per hour before the war they are to-day from 10 to 14 cents per hour in gold. Of course, in their depreciated money the wage is higher. The par

value of the German mark is 23.8 cents. It is offered to-day in the markets of the world for 6 cents in gold and also in Germany. Of course the man who received a mark per hour or half a mark per hour before the war now would receive 2, 3, or 4 marks because of the depreciated value of their currency and because of the depreciated value of money all over Europe, and a comparison based upon the mark or the money of any other country, depreciated as it is in Europe, as to the rate of wages paid there and here, is of no value except it be put in terms of gold. There is to-day a difference between the wage scale of the United States and in Europe as great as there was before the war. Compare any wage scale in any line of business in the United States and you will find that the difference is as great to-day between our wage scale in every line of industry, as compared with other countries, as it was before the war. Every article of production whether manufactured or agricultural, in its total cost of production, carries at least 90 per cent labor cost. Now, how in the name of common sense can we have lower prices for the products of this country while the high cost of production prevails? It is not practical and it is only a demagogue that preaches anything else.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FORDNEY. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. If the reciprocity pact with Canada had become operative, it would have worked a great hardship on the agricultural interests of this country.

Mr. FORDNEY. Absolutely; a greater hardship upon the agricultural interests of the country than upon any other industry in the land. Of the 100,000,000 people in this country to-day, only 33 per cent live in the rural districts and are farmers. We look to them to produce the food articles for all the rest of the people; and any law that works a hardship upon the farming industry of the country works a hardship upon the whole people of the country, because we are dependent upon that one-third of our people for our food and our clothing. Therefore, I say to you that any law which affects the agricultural interests of the country should be most carefully considered by men in this House upon both sides of the House. No man wants to vote for a law, Democrat or Republican, which will work to the disadvantage of our people as a whole. We differ in our opinion as to how we should vote on these various measures, but I do not accuse any man who differs with me of being dishonest in his views. If I am right, then he certainly is wrong when he differs with me; and if he is correct in his position, I am wrong, and I will not vote for any law, no matter from what source it comes, unless in my opinion it works to the advantage of the masses of the people. Neither do I think other honest men will. I believe the repeal of this law will remove an obstable of great danger resting in our statute books to-day. There is danger of its becoming a law. Certainly so, if Canada accepts it at any minute. I am anxious, therefore, to repeal the law, and I hope that every man in the House, both Democrat and Republican, will vote for the bill. I ask that the Clerk read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the act entitled "An act to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canade, and for other purposes," approved July 26, 1911, is repealed, to take effect on the day following the passage of this act. On and after such date there shall be levied, collected, and paid upon the articles enumerated in such act, the growth, product, or manufacture of the Dominion of Canada, when imported therefrom into the United States or any of its possessions (except the Philippine Islands, the Virgin Islands, and the islands of Guam and Tutuila), in lieu of the duties levied, collected, and paid under such act, the duties levied, collected, and paid under existing law upon the same articles when imported from other countries.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. The gentleman from North Carolina [Mr. KITCHIN], in explaining why he would support the proposition to repeal the Canadian reciprocity act, said that since the passage of the Underwood tariff act in 1913 Democratic theories in this matter had been put into law and consequently there was no further use for the Canadian reciprocity act to remain on the statute books. I wish that one William Howard Taft, somewhere in his travels, would take note of the observation of the gentleman from North Carolina. Every real Republican in 1911, when President Taft, by main strength and awkwardness, forced this measure through the Congress over the protests of his party knew that it was a Democratic tariff proposition, pure and simple. Mr. Taft had been elected President by a majorty of more than a million and a half votes.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I decline to yield. His party had an overwhelming majority in both Houses of the Congress and controlled all of the Northern States. At the beginning of his administration Republicans had every reason to expect and to look forward to a long lease of power and Republican supremacy.

In my opinion, and I do not say it criticizing Mr. Taft's motives or his patriotism in any way, in urging this proposition and forcing it through Congress he committed the greatest political mistake that was ever made by an occupant of the White House. The one cardinal doctrine of Republicanism for which the party has ever stood is protection—protection of labor, protection of American industries, and protection to the American farmer. We had passed in 1909 the Payne-Aldrich tariff bill under his administration at a special session of Congress. There was some complaint from many good Republicans that certain schedules in that bill were excessive, yet the country accepted the bill, and its subsequent operation demonstrated it to be a wise law, a law that brought in abundant revenue, that gave ample protection to every real American interest. Following this came this astounding proposition from a Republican President that the Republican farmer, whose support had been the backbone of the Republican Party in the States of the great West and Northwest—that the Republican Party proposed to put those things which the farmer produced upon the free list. Republicans could hardly believe that proposition was seriously advanced and would be forced through the Congress with all the power of the Federal administration. The Republican Congress refused to carry out the President's recommendations, and the Sixty-first Congress closed without final action on the proposition. After the adjournment of that Congress, the President called into extra session the new Congress, which was Democratic. I remember reading in the papers just after the new Congress had organized that President Taft had called to the White House Mr. Speaker CLARK and Senator Stone, of Missouri, and consulted with them as to the methods and means of getting the reciprocity act through Congress. I said at that time to myself, "God help the Republican Party," if its head, if its leader, if its President had gone into consultation and caucus with such distinguished partisan Democrats as the two gentlemen mentioned to devise the means of getting through Congress a law diametrically opposed——

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I ask for three minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. WILLIAMS. To every Republican principle. And so the law was passed. The Republican Party was defeated. The passage of this law started all the troubles that have since overtaken the Republican Party and presaged the disasters that came in rapid succession. It lost for the President the confidence of the farmers of the country—the Republican farmers—and he never after that was able to have behind him a united party in his administration.

Mr. KNUTSON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. Canadian reciprocity was to the Republican Party what the daylight-saving law will be to the Democratic Party. Is not that true?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Let us have an answer to that important question.

Mr. WILLIAMS. It is unbelievable, and those who read the history of this country in the years to come will absolutely be unable to comprehend how it was possible for a great party, a party that has been supreme in this country for half a century, that had passed great and beneficent laws, whose policies and principles were believed in and accepted by an overwhelming majority of the American people, could in four short years be so utterly discredited and destroyed as to take a third place in the popular vote, carrying only two small States. That all came about and was made possible by our then President, William Howard Taft, working hand in hand with such Democrats as the distinguished gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman permit one little question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I do.

Mr. KITCHIN. Did the gentleman vote for Mr. Taft after he submitted and approved this so-called miserable, anti-Republican bill for reciprocity with Canada?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am sorry to say I did.

Mr. KITCHIN. Very well——

Mr. WILLIAMS. I voted for him for the reason that he was the Republican Party nominee, nominated at a convention of the party regularly called. I just stayed in the party ranks awaiting the time when an American Republican Congress would repeal this act.

Mr. KITCHIN. I think the gentleman is right.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I am right.

Mr. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I decline to yield further as I have a few other things I desire to say.

Mr. WELLING. We accept the gentleman's apology.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield to me?

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. We heard it stated here this morning that the minority party, the Democratic Party, was in favor of this repeal?

Mr. WILLIAMS. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. And yet that party had, during all the several years which it controlled Congress, plenty of time in which to accomplish the repeal, but did not do it. And from the day of the Underwood tariff act the Canadians have been congratulating themselves on having the benefit of reciprocity without any of the discomforts.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That is true. The only reason given why they favor its repeal now is that under the Underwood tariff act we have practically free trade with Canada. The trouble with Mr. Taft—and I have the highest regard for him personally—is that he was not at the time he advocated this measure a Republican. He has never in his life been a real Republican, and he is not a Republican to-day [applause], if we can judge from his public utterances, stating his views upon great issues that come before the country. He is absolutely not in harmony and has never been in harmony with the real, old-fashioned Republicanism of the country that was advocated by Republican leaders like Abraham Lincoln, like James G. Blaine, William McKinley, and other illustrious leaders of the party. [Applause.] He can not help himself. He is a free trader, as can be demonstrated by many of his utterances before his election to the Presidency, and naturally he thought that he had accomplished great fame when he forced through the Congress this free-trade act over the protest of the great party which made him President.

He is still operating as an assistant or aid of some kind to the Democratic Party. The trouble with Mr. Taft is that he has unlimited capacity to do the wrong thing at the right time all the time, and such has been the case through his entire career. He is now acting as a wet nurse for the league of nations [laughter], and is advising a few Republican Senators—he admits they are few—to not act in harmony with their party in the Senate, but to join with the opposition and force upon the American people this un-American instrument known as the league of nations.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Taft, I think, is the Fatty Arbuckle of American politics. [Laughter.]

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask that the gentleman's time be extended for five minutes.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I have had all the time I want.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Chairman, I rise with a great deal of regret to oppose the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. WILLIAMS], but I want to ask him some questions if I get the time. He says that Taft never was a Republican, never was imbued with those great fundamental Republican principles——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do you think he is?

Mr. KITCHIN. I think he is the best Republican you ever had, and that is the reason you gentlemen are against him. He is too good and patriotic for you.

Mr. WILLIAMS. That proves absolutely that he is no Republican at all.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman says that he voted for Mr. Taft after he had urged and approved the reciprocity act only because he was nominated by the party machine. In that campaign the gentleman had Mr. Wilson to vote for. He was in favor of the reciprocity act. He had Mr. Roosevelt, one of the Republican candidates, to vote for. He was so strong in favor of reciprocity that he advised Taft to submit it to Congress. Mr. Taft submitted it to him before he submitted it to Congress. Roosevelt approved it. There were three candidates. Mr. Wilson was a candidate for the Democratic Party, Mr. Taft of the Republican Party, and Mr. Roosevelt of the other Republican Party. They were all for Canadian reciprocity. Let us see about the next election, in 1916.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Let me ask the gentleman a question there. Was the Canadian reciprocity act a Republican or Democratic measure, in your opinion?

Mr. KITCHIN. It was negotiated by a Republican President and by a Republican Secretary of State, and the act was approved by a Republican President—Mr. Taft. The Republicans afterwards, knowing that, nominated Mr. Taft and another branch of the Republicans nominated Mr. Roosevelt. There were two Republican candidates, and they both approved this reciprocity act.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Do you consider the Canadian reciprocity act a Democratic or Republican measure?

Mr. KITCHIN. I considered it at that time a real patriotic American act, indorsed by a Republican President and by the Republican candidate thereafter, by the Republican Secretary of State, and by the present Republican Speaker, by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH], who is here now in the House——

Mr. WILLIAMS. Did you not get the same thing in the Underwood tariff bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. We got the main things that the Democrats wanted.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And is that a Democratic or a Republican bill?

Mr. KITCHIN. We got the main things the Democrats wanted in the Underwood bill. We voted for reciprocity because it was right. That is the reason Mr. Taft and Mr. Roosevelt and Mr. KNOX and Mr. GILLETT and Mr. LONGWORTH and the late Mr. Payne, who was chairman of the committee, favored it. They did not say, "It is a Republican bill," or "it is a Democratic bill." We all said it was right and we got together and voted for it.

Now, the gentleman is mighty sorry that he voted for Mr. Taft. If he had not, and had voted at all, he would have voted for Mr. Roosevelt or Mr. Wilson, and both believed in the reciprocity act. Who did the gentleman vote for in the election of 1916, Wilson or Hughes? He voted for Mr. Hughes. Mr. Hughes was strong for reciprocity.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Hughes was defeated, too, was he not?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

He was strong for it, and you were strong for him. The gentleman said that Mr. Taft was a Democrat because he was for reciprocity. If so, Mr. Roosevelt was a Democrat, because he was for reciprocity, and Mr. Hughes was a Democrat, because he was for reciprocity.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise and report the bill to the House with a favorable recommendation.

The motion was agreed to.

Thereupon the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. WALSH, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 7779) to repeal the act entitled "An act to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes," approved July 26, 1911, and for other purposes, had directed him to report the same to the House with the recommendation that the bill do pass.

Mr. FORDNEY. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on the passage of the bill.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

On motion of Mr. FORDNEY, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

VOCATIONAL REHABILITATION.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Rules Committee, I submit a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio submits a privileged report from the Committee on Rules, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 327.

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution the House shall resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of H. R. 4438, being a bill to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise.

That there shall be 2 hours and 30 minutes of general debate, one-half to be controlled by those favoring the bill and one-half to be controlled by those opposing the bill.

That at the conclusion of the general debate the bill shall be read for amendment under the five-minute rule.

That the bill, together with the amendments, if any, shall be reported to the House.

Thereupon the previous questions shall be considered as ordered on the bill and the amendments thereto for final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, does the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] desire any time on the rule?

Mr. GARRETT. No; but I will reserve five minutes.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, the bill which the rule makes in order is a bill designed for the rehabilitation of the industrial cripple. It is an effort to complete certain legislation that was started some time in 1915.

The movement for vocational education was before the country for at least 15 years before any definite stand was taken, and finally it was written in the form of law under the Smith-Hughes Act, which provided cooperation between the Federal Government and the States, the Federal Government appropriating a dollar that would be met by the States in return, and the law requiring that when we reached the maximum the amount of $7,000,000 from the Federal Treasury was to be met by $7,000,000 from the State treasuries.

That law applied simply to pupils. Then later on that was supplemented by the effort to rehabilitate the disabled soldiers, and it was thought wise to put that work also under the same board that was then in existence under the law of 1917, called the Smith-Hughes Act.

That supplemental act, as you know, applies only to soldiers, and was purely a Federal function. The States had nothing to do with that at all, and in that respect the law differed widely from the Smith-Hughes Act. When the bill for the rehabilitation of wounded soldiers was before the country we were besieged from many sources to add to it the rehabilitation of the industrial cripple. We did not want to do that at that time, because the soldier rehabilitation was purely Federal, while the industrial cripple would be both Federal and State, and as the Smith-Hughes Act acts in cooperation with the State boards, so the industrial cripple would have to act in cooperation with the State boards, while the soldier bill would not reach the States at all. We asked the proponents of such a measure to withhold any urgency, because we did not see our way clear to put that on the bill, but we promised that at the earliest convenience there would be a measure introduced looking toward the rehabilitation of the industrial cripple. That came on, and was introduced both in the Senate and in the House. The Senate took it up and discussed it for four days, and on June 21 it was passed in the Senate without a dissenting vote.

Our Committee on Education, having joined the Senate committee last session in hearings, saw fit not to open hearings at this session, but considered the bill and unanimously reported it to this House. It has been on the calendar for two or three months.

The rule that we have just now had reported makes this bill in order for consideration. I do not care to enter upon the discussion of the merits of the bill at this time.

Mr. WALSH rose.

Mr. FESS. I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Was the rule which has just been reported reported out by a quorum of the Committee on Rules?

Mr. FESS. There was no question raised about a quorum. There is always a quorum unless the question is raised.

Mr. WALSH. I am asking the gentleman if a quorum of the committee was present?

Mr. FESS. That question did not come up. Consequently it would stand as a quorum.

Mr. WALSH. I do not think the gentleman is correct about that. I think any Member of the House is entitled to know, when a rule or any other measure is reported here, whether a quorum of the committee was present.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman probably is correct in his insistence of the right of the House to know whether a quorum was present in the committee, and I still insist that a quorum is present if the question is not raised. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I think I shall want only two or three minutes. Is the gentleman from Ohio yielding to me, or am I recognized in my own right?

Mr. FESS. The gentleman is recognized in his own right. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I think I should say that I was unavoidably absent when this rule was reported. I was in attendance for a few moments while a hearing upon another matter was in progress, and I really understood that nothing except that hearing was to be had, and I explained my situation to the committee, which excused me, and I left before this matter was taken up. Consequently, to be entirely frank with the House, I have not given any very great consideration to this legislation, even such consideration as members of the Committee on Rules in dealing with a rule usually do give. However, I have come to the conclusion that, so far as I am personally concerned, whatever my opinion in regard to the legislation might be after hearing the debate and considering it, I do not desire to resist the proposition for its consideration.

Mr. WELLING. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. WELLING. Does the gentleman care to state whether any members of the minority side of the Committee on Rules were present when the rule was considered?

Mr. GARRETT. I can not state as to that, because I do not know.

Mr. CANNON. Does the gentleman indorse the proposition that the chairman of a committee can call his committee together and in the absence of every other member of that committee can go to work and perform and direct a report on a bill because there was no question of quorum raised?

Mr. GARRETT. No; I do not, Mr. Speaker. However, let me say in regard to this legislation that I am not in position to state whether there was a quorum present or not. I was in attendance at the Committee on Rules for a very few moments. There were a number of members there. I was at that time the only minority member. Whether any came in afterwards I do not know. But personally I did not count the number of persons who were there, and so far as I know there was a quorum. I do not know how that is.

Mr. WALSH rose.

Mr. GARRETT. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire me to yield for a question?

Mr. WALSH. I desire time.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to this rule, and I am opposed to the bill which it proposes to make in order.

I think the time has arrived in the late weeks of this special session when Members on both sides of the aisle should begin to give some attention to matters of economy.

I am opposed to extending further the authority, the privileges, and the duties of this Federal Vocational Board.

Now, we all recognize the interest in this subject that has been displayed by the distinguished gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], and I wish to heaven that men of his type and ability were upon that board at the present time expending money. Their administration of the laws we have passed, I submit, is open to severe criticism. Heretofore and probably now their expenditure has been and is wasteful, and the manner in which they have been attempting to take care of the wounded and disabled men who participated in the Great War in the military and naval branches of our Government is open to criticism.

Now, this bill seeks to extend it to men disabled in industrial pursuits, including agriculture, trade, commerce, manufacturing, mining, transportation, and all the mechanic arts. I submit that in the present state of the public finances, with the tremendous interest charge that we will be forced to pay in the years to come, with the tremendous expenses of government, we ought not to extend this Federal vocational rehabilitation to civilians until we have demonstrated beyond all question that we can make a success of it in administering the law and conferring its benefits upon our wounded and disabled soldiers and sailors.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will my colleague yield?

Mr. WALSH. For a question.

Mr. TREADWAY. Is my colleague aware that there has been a resolution introduced, which I think is before the Rules Committee to-day, calling for an investigation of this particular board and the way its labors are performed?

Mr. WALSH. I did not know that the resolution had been taken up for consideration, but some resolution should be considered and an investigation ought to be made.

Mr. TREADWAY. If my colleague believes that an investigation ought to be made, does not that raise still further doubts as to whether we should confer additional powers upon that board before they show their ability to conduct the work already in their hands?

Mr. WALSH. It certainly does follow that if there is complaint, and if there has been a failure on the part of this board and its officials in its activities to confer the benefits upon our wounded soldiers and sailors, that certainly we ought not to extend the privileges and duties of it to take in civilians. But I am opposed, as I said, to extending these privileges to persons in civilian life, anyway. After having come out of a great war, with thousands of crippled and disabled soldiers upon our hands, who, I agree, should receive the benefits of legislation to rehabilitate them, I do not believe that the Government should further go into this matter of rehabilitation and extend it along paternalistic lines.

Oh, they will say, the State must match dollar for dollar. If the States are willing to match Federal dollars with an equal amount of their own dollars, let the States embark upon this

matter independently of the Federal Government. Let them try out this experiment. But, I say, Members of the House, that I believe the time has come to stop appropriating the people's money except upon the most urgent need and on the most satisfactory showing that the money is required, and I believe we should be slow before embarking upon new ventures such as this is. Therefore I am opposed to the rule and opposed to the measure which it makes in order.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, I desire to make just a plain statement in regard to this rule. I did not understand that the rule was to be brought on the floor of the House this afternoon. The rule was presented to the Rules Committee, or a question regarding the rule. As far as I know, I think there was no rule drawn or presented to the committee as it was presented to the House. I am going to tell the exact situation. There were four Republican members present. I opposed the rule and reserved the right to oppose the same on the floor of the House. I, as a member of the Rules Committee, will never vote for a rule that comes in there that is so important as this one, or on the floor of the House, without any consideration whatever. The rule was not before the Rules Committee for five minutes. I did not make the point that there was no quorum present until after the vote was taken, and then I was told it was too late; but as long as the question has been asked I want the House to thoroughly understand the situation. There were four Republican members present and no Democrats. The statement that the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] made was exactly correct. I was the acting chairman when the Rules Committee first met this morning, and he asked the question if there would be any definite vote taken; and at that time I did not expect there would be, and I told him we expected merely to have a hearing. Now, let us see the situation in which we are. The Rules Committee this morning held a two hours' hearing on a resolution presented by Mr. ROGERS to investigate the present Federal Vocational Rehabilitation Board. From the evidence that was put before the committee this morning it is plain that a majority of the people feel that that board up to the present time has not functioned. Now, consider this as a business proposition. When you have a resolution before the committee to investigate a board because it is not functioning, then you turn around and vote out by a special rule to make a special order of this House a bill giving more business for the same board that you doubt whether it functions or not. If there is anything businesslike in that I want to know it. And that is why I opposed the rule and am opposed to the present consideration of this bill.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Does the gentleman undertake to assert that simply because charges are made against a board of this character, it raises a presumption that the board is not performing its duties in a satisfactory way?

Mr. SNELL. I am not making that charge myself, but it is under consideration.

Mr. BANKHEAD. That is the inference to be drawn from the gentleman's argument.

Mr. SNELL. That is the condition that confronts us. Personally I am opposed to the legislation, and I certainly am opposed to the rule that makes it in order at this time, and I want the House to know the exact conditions under which it is brought on the floor of the House.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise a question of order against the matter now under discussion. I make the point of order upon the facts that have been developed that this rule is not properly before the House.

I take it for granted that so long as a chairman stands on the report of his committee, it will be presumed that a quorum of the committee was present when the report was ordered. In all legislative bodies, until the question of quorum is raised, I agree to the proposition advanced by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], that the presumption is that a quorum is present. Until it was developed by sufficient evidence that a quorum was not present in the Committee on Rules when this rule was reported, it was perfectly competent and proper for the chairman or acting chairman of the committee to rely upon the presumption that this rule had been reported by a quorum of the committee. Further I agree to the principle that a chairman of a committee is not compellable to answer an inquiry whether any given action was taken by a quorum of the committee. But now, according to the statement of the gentleman from New York who has just taken his seat [Mr. SNELL], this rule was not considered by a quorum of the Committee on Rules, of which the gentleman is a member. The gentleman from Ohio, [Mr. FESS] does not deny, or challenge this statement of fact. Less than a quorum in the Committee on Rules, or in any other committee for that matter, can not properly and legally order a report to this body. It appears in this case that less than a quorum did order a report, and as the evidence to that effect is unchallenged I submit that this rule is not properly before the House. Therefore I make the point of order based upon the statements of the gentleman from New York, [Mr. SNELL].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, the proposition raised by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] is a very serious one. If after action has been taken, either by a committee of the House or by the House, the point can be raised that no quorum was present when the business was transacted in the committee, probably it would invalidate nine-tenths of the actions of this House or of its committees.

We have here this condition: It seems that there was not a quorum of the committee present when this action was taken. There was a member of the committee present who was opposed to the action being taken. It was his privilege, as it was the privilege of any member of the committee, to have raised the point of no quorum; if he desired to raise that question at all, it should not be raised here, it should have been raised there.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I will.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman state what protection the House has against three or four members of a committee getting together and reporting out a measure to the House, particularly in the Committee on Rules, bringing it up for consideration, if the point of no quorum can not be raised in the House?

Mr. TOWNER. The question can not always be raised after action is taken. It is the duty of members of the committee to be present and take part. It is the duty of members of the committee to see that no action is taken unless a quorum is present.

Mr. GARRETT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. Certainly.

Mr. GARRETT. Take the particular case in hand. I have just made a statement myself in the House which I do not know that the gentleman from Iowa heard.

Mr. TOWNER. I did not.

Mr. GARRETT. I attended the committee in the beginning of the session. I made inquiry as to what business would be transacted, and was informed that there would be nothing except a hearing this morning upon a resolution. Upon that statement, I left the committee, explaining to the committee the necessity for so doing, on account of an engagement before I knew that the meeting was to be held.

Mr. TOWNER. By whom was the gentleman informed?

Mr. GARRETT. By the acting chairman of the committee, publicly, in the presence of the other members. I did not know at the time the rule was called up whether any other member of the minority had been in attendance, but I have since learned that there was not. I do not know that the minority would have been opposed to the rule. In view of the statement of the gentleman from Iowa, that it was the duty of members to be present, which I agree to, I thought I would make this statement.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, in view of the statement by the gentleman from Tennessee, it is necessary for me to make a further statement. The committee took a vote on reporting this resolution and it was carried. It was suggested that it was somewhat delicate to report out a resolution where no member of the minority party was present. That was after telephoning all the members of the minority trying to find them, so as to have them present. The gentleman from Tennessee had been in. I was asked to see the gentleman from Tennessee after the vote was had. I talked with the gentleman from Tennessee on the floor of the House and told him I would not call it up unless he would assent to it, and he said he would offer no objection.

Mr. GARRETT. I said I would not resist the rule, so far as I was concerned. The gentleman's statement is correct. I did not inquire of the gentleman as to whether there was a quorum present and there was nothing said about a quorum at that time.

Mr. FESS. That question had not come up; the only question that came up was whether the gentleman would oppose it. I did what I was requested to do and got the assent of the gentleman from Tennessee before I called it up.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. SNELL. I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio was not the question of a quorum discussed in the committee this morning?

Mr. FESS. I think the gentleman was asked if he wanted to make a point of no quorum.

Mr. SNELL. And I said I would not make the point, but I understood it was not to be brought up to-day.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman say he understood it was not to be brought up to-day?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I was authorized to see Mr. GARRETT, which I did, and when he gave his assent I called it up. If he had not assented, I would not have called it up.

Mr. SNELL. I understood the gentleman from Ohio to tell the chairman of the committee and myself that it was not to be brought up to-day, and the chairman so told me that that was what he understood, and no member of the Rules Committee thought it would be brought up.

Mr. FESS. Does the chairman state that he understood so?

Mr. SNELL. Yes.

Mr. FESS. I came from the chairman of the committee immediately on the floor to present it.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I think that these matters are proper for the consideration of the committee in determining whether or not they will or will not adopt the rule. That is all before them. The opportunity is afforded them for doing so, but I think it would certainly be going very far for the Speaker to declare, as a question of order, that action taken by the committee in reporting the rule was not valid, by a point made after action is taken. The point of order was not made and could have been made. The attention of the members of the committee was called to it, and they said that they would not make the point of order.

It occurs to me that it would be going very far to hold such action was invalid and that a point of order could afterwards be raised against it. I admit that all of these matters that have been stated here on the floor of the House are proper for the consideration of the House, if Members think that they ought to vote down the rule because it was not reported out except under these circumstances, and that the committee was not justified in doing it, they can now do so.

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. I will yield to the gentleman.

Mr. CANNON. I do not know what the majority of the House would do about this matter, if it were given the chance. I do not know whether there are any precedents that cover such a case as this, but under all of the circumstances does the gentleman not think, and does not the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] think, without regard to the merits or demerits of the proposition, that by unanimous consent the whole matter should be recommitted to the Committee on Rules?

Mr. TOWNER. I would say to the gentleman that is a matter that is now before the House. If the House takes the view that the gentleman does, and I will not say that it is not justified, the House can certainly vote down the rule.

Mr. CANNON. I wanted if I could to avoid a long discussion and perhaps some feeling about the matter, after the statement of facts which has been made, and thought perhaps that it would better go back to the Committee on Rules by unanimous consent.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] that this is an important matter, and for that reason I made the point of order. But I certainly can not agree with the gentleman that it would be sound practice, safe practice to permit the members of a committee confessedly less than a quorum of that committee being present, to assemble and report any sort of measure to this House, and then to hold as to this report that it could not be challenged, even though the members of the committee voluntarily stated that the report had been made in the absence of a quorum. A practice of that kind would certainly admit of great abuse. I call the attention of the Speaker to a case that arose in this body when Mr. CLARK was Speaker. The gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Houston, was seeking under the alleged authority of his committee to substitute a Senate bill for a House bill. Under the rules it was necessary to have the authority of his committee to make this motion. The gentleman from Tennessee upon inquiry admitted that a quorum of his committee was not present at the time he was directed to move to take up the Senate bill. Upon this admission that a quorum of his committee was not present when action was taken, the Speaker [Mr. CLARK] held that the gentleman from Tennessee lacked the necessary authority to enable him to make the motion for substitution. That case precisely parallels this one.

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. In just a moment. Let me give one or two analogies. In most jurisdictions, it is not permitted to inquire into the proceedings before a grand jury, but when it is sufficiently developed in some way what those proceedings have been, and they appear to be illegal, then advantage can be taken of the same. In this particular case I could not make the point of order sooner than I did for the reason that there had been no statement on the part of anyone, competent to speak, that a quorum of the committee was not present when this rule was reported. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] relied upon the presumption that when the question of no quorum is not raised, it is presumed that a quorum is present.

That principle is sound, and so long as the chairman stood on that presumption, no Member could raise and sustain the inquiry whether there was or was not a quorum of the committee present, when action was taken on the rule. I will go further. There is no one in this House who believes more strongly than I do, in preserving the rights and dignity of a committee and the presumptions in favor of a committee. I admit that if a member of a committee is asked whether or not a quorum was present at the time some particular action was taken he can appropriately decline to answer, and can not be made to answer. This is the rule in the case of a trial jury. The jurors are not allowed to be called to impeach their verdict, by giving evidence of irregularities in the jury room. That, however, is not this case. The lack of a quorum was sufficiently developed here by a voluntary and unchallenged statement of a member of the committee. As soon as that statement was made the point of order was raised that lacking a quorum the members present had absolutely no authority to make a report, no more authority than any other group of Members in this House to get together and make a report. This committee when it acted had no more authority in the premises than a casual group of Members not designated as a committee.

Mr. TILSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman carry out that analogy in the case of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union? That committee having much less than a quorum often agrees to amendments, as the gentleman knows and takes action—it is done frequently in this body—and does the gentleman undertake to say that after that action has been taken, the bill which that committee has passed can be called into question?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Oh, no.

Mr. TILSON. On the question of whether or not there was a quorum present. On the gentleman's argument, if it could be shown that no quorum was present at any time in the Committee of the Whole the action could be invalidated.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The gentleman is losing sight of the distinction which I sought to make, and which I think I have made. I agree that a committee can stand upon the presumption of legality that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] stood upon, and properly so. Indeed I have gone further, and asserted the proposition that a member of a committee can not be made to develop facts showing that the action of the committee was illegal. As the gentleman has asked me a question, I think that I will ask a question or two.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will ask this question of the gentleman from Ohio. Does the gentleman maintain that when a quorum of his committee is not present, the members present have the right to make a report of any sort to this House?

Mr. FESS. I certainly do, and I go further——

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Does the gentleman contend that orderly action can be taken without a quorum?

Mr. FESS. I go further——

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. How much further can the gentleman go?

Mr. FESS. I can not sit in a meeting of the Committee on Rules and allow a matter to go out and then come out on the floor of the House and break up the work by making a point of no quorum in the House, a point which I did not make at the time.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I admit that a question of propriety may be involved.

Mr. FESS. If a Member could do that, he could break up almost everything reported in the last six weeks, because we have not had a quorum most of the time.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The gentleman is making a confession that I do not think he ought to be very proud of, namely that his committee has been taking action that it ought not to have taken in the absence of a quorum. Mr. Speaker, this is not a partisan question. It is a question of the authority of this body over a subordinate committee. It has been admitted by members of this committee, positively stated by one and not denied by others, that the action taken in the committee was by a membership short of a quorum. It was therefore illegal action. The question before us is whether this House can act on a report that confessedly is not legally, or authoritatively, before it.

That is the whole situation. I have not asked the Committee on Rules any questions. I admit the right, as I said before, and I repeat the statement, of the gentleman from Ohio

and of every other member of that committee to decline to answer any questions as to proceedings in the committee, and to stand upon the record, upon the report of the committee, and of the presumption that the committee had the authority to make the report. I agree to all of that fully.

Mr. FESS. But if a gentleman refuses to make the point in the committee and then comes in here and makes it, then——

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. But the question before us has to do with the rights of this body after the facts as to the proceedings in the committee have been developed. Allow me to give one more illustration. Suppose it appeared from the report of the committee itself, that a quorum was not present when this action was taken, what then? Does the gentleman contend that under such circumstances, a point of order could not be made to the report?

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. TOWNER. Does not the same rule obtain in a committee that obtains in the House, that unless a point of order of no quorum is made that the committee may proceed with its deliberations?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The committee could rely upon the presumption that a quorum was present, and proceed with its work but that does not relieve us from the necessity of acting, when it is fully developed, as it has been in this case, that action was taken in the committee in the absence of a quorum.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. But the gentleman has not answered my question.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I yield to my friend from Virginia and then later I will yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. MOORE of Virginia. As to the analogy suggested awhile ago between proceedings in the Committee of the Whole House and the proceeding in a standing committee of the House is not the distinction this: That every Member of the House is entitled to participate in the proceedings of the Committee of the Whole and he is not so entitled so far as proceedings in a standing committee of the House is concerned. In other words, a standing committee is apart from the membership of the House, and I submit that if it can do the thing that is contended here is proper to be done it can sacrifice the right of the entire membership of the House except those Members that happen to be present at the time when the particular matter was being considered by the standing committee.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes that is perfectly true. I now yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. TOWNER. The question I asked the gentleman from Virginia was this: Would a different rule obtain in the committee from that which obtains in the Committee of the Whole or in the House that the presumption is always, and the presumption can not be afterwards changed or repudiated, that the action so taken was when a quorum was present?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I do not assent to that proposition.

Mr. TOWNER. I am asking the gentleman whether or not he would take that position. We have time and time again in the Committee of the Whole House—yesterday, to-day, every day—when we have any bill under consideration, acted when there was no quorum present, and when, as a matter of fact, the record showed there was no quorum present.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Oh, no. A quorum may not have been present, but the record does not affirmatively show that fact.

Mr. TOWNER. Oh, yes; when there were votes taken when there was not a quorum present.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The record of the votes taken does not show that there was no quorum present. Many Members may not have voted at all. The presumption is that enough Members were present, in addition to those voting, to make a quorum. The mere fact that 40, or 50, or any number less than a quorum are recorded as voting, does not show that they were the only Members present. It is presumed that enough nonvoting Members were present to make a quorum.

Mr. TOWNER. The gentleman said there should be no presumption——

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. No I did not say that. I said that the gentleman from Ohio could stand upon the presumption of regularity as to the report.

Mr. TOWNER. The proposition the gentleman now urges is that after a vote has been taken and after action has been reported to the House or in Committee of the Whole, or in any other kind of a committee, that you can then challenge the action that was not challenged when it ought to have been challenged before the committee?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The gentleman's question is very easy to answer. The gentleman confuses the distinction between action in a committee, and the rights of Members of this House, when it affirmatively appears that a report has been made when less than a quorum of the members of a committee were present. The gentleman says that I have argued that no presumptions should be indulged in. On the contrary I made it abundantly clear that every presumption of regularity should be allowed. But this is not a question of presumption. The facts stated in our presence directly establish illegality. Take the case of a court that is called on to determine whether an act was passed with, or without a quorum. The court will not entertain testimony to establish whether or not a quorum was present, but if the record shows affirmatively that a quorum was not present, the court will void the law.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I am surprised that the gentleman is maintaining his present contention, in view of the abuses that will follow, if his position is maintained, that in spite of the unchallenged statement of the gentleman from New York, this rule may still be regarded as having been legally reported. Two members of a committee, including the chairman could make a report, and even if the two conceded on the floor of the House that they and they alone were present when the report was made, still if the gentleman's position is correct, the report must be conclusively presumed to have been made by a quorum.

Mr. FESS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I do.

Mr. FESS. Think of the abuses that the gentleman's ruling would work if he were in the chair. All you need to do to prevent any legislation is enough of you to stay out of the committee and prevent a quorum.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. If enough of us to constitute a majority of the committee stayed out of the committee room we would be a quorum. Surely my friend would not contend that the minority that remained could legally take action requiring a majority?

Mr. FESS. And by so doing you forbid all legislation.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Our action would be the action of the majority. If enough of us to constitute a majority of the committee stayed away, then the minority of the committee, of course, could not make a valid report, or take any other action that required a majority of the committee to be present to give it validity.

Mr. FESS. Does the gentleman hold that when the committee takes a vote and a point of no quorum has not been raised and the vote has been declared by the Chair carried and that reported to the House that a Member could come in from the committee and make the point in the House that in the committee there had not been a legal quorum?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That is not this situation. A member of the committee has stated that a quorum of the committee was not present when this action was taken. That statement has not been denied.

Mr. BEE. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will yield in a minute.

Mr. BEE. Just for a question.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I yield for a question.

Mr. BEE. In answer to the suggestion of the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] as to the difference between the committee and the House sitting as Committee of the Whole, it will be found in this, as the gentleman from Virginia will admit, that the committees are the creation of the House, and the House itself is sovereign. The House has therefore the right to look into the doings of that which it created, and the House being sovereign you can not go back of its action.

Mr. CARTER. Will the gentleman from Virginia yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I will.

Mr. CARTER. Suppose this ruling, as suggested by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS], should be carried out. Could not then the chairman of the committee alone, when it is carried to its last analysis, report a bill out on his own single vote?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I pointed out that if two members were there, they could report a bill, and it could not be attacked in the House, unless one of these members admitted that a quorum was not present when the report was made. If such a statement or admission was made, the case would be like the one under consideration.

Mr. CARTER. Suppose this situation should develop, that a vote should be taken by the committee with less than a quorum present and the vote declared carried; under the suggestion of the gentleman from Ohio, if, after the vote was carried, some member of the committee who was present should then make the point of no quorum, after the vote had been declared carried, what situation would the committee then be in?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I leave the gentleman from Ohio to answer that question.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield for a statement?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I wish to say that this vote was taken in a hurry. I opposed the whole proposition. I did not intend to make this statement at this point, but I think I must. I made the point that there was no quorum present, and the gentleman said it was too late, and "We are going to put it over, anyway." I would not have made those statements, but the gentleman says I have made a breach of faith in saying on the floor of the House that there was no quorum present.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The gentleman from Ohio in the face of the facts just stated, still insists that he will "put it over." I am surprised that he takes such a stand. There is no partisanship in this question of order. I am seeking to maintain the rights of the House and secure orderly procedure. It surprises me to hear the gentleman from Ohio insist that although it now appears in our proceedings that no quorum was present at the time action was taken, in his committee, nevertheless this House is powerless to treat this unauthorized action of a minority as illegal, and reject this report on a point of order. If a conference committee exceeds its authority, short work is made of its report. This action was not in excess of power afforded. The minority was without authority ab initio.

Now, Mr. Speaker, with respect to the reference that was made to the Committee of the Whole; I wish to say that if it appeared that the committee acted in the absence of a quorum the question of the legality of its action could be raised. Suppose that it affirmatively and sufficiently appeared as to some action in the Committee of the Whole that a quorum was not present, does anyone suppose that the House would be powerless to take action when confronted with a situation of that sort? Would a report from the Committee of the Whole, that carried on its face the evidence that it was made by less than a quorum—be a legal report? And if not a legal report, would it be in order?

Mr. DOWELL. Suppose in the Committee of the Whole we have no quorum, and the bill is passed upon, does the gentleman think he can raise that question when it gets into the House?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Let me call my friend's attention to this fact: There is a difference between raising a question tending to develop facts, and having it entertained, and raising a question of order after the facts have been developed. I stated before, and I repeat that statement, that I do not approve of the policy of having the members of a committee impeach the action of their committee. I do not think, if they were asked to make a statement, that they should be compelled to testify. I even think that another Member of the House could raise a question of order against thus making a statement tending to impeach the action of their committee.

Mr. DOWELL. Just assuming, now, if the gentleman please, that in the Committee of the Whole——

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Suppose we deal with the case before us.

Mr. DOWELL. Let us have the question on the proposition that the gentleman is perfectly familiar with.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I am familiar with this situation.

Mr. DOWELL. Suppose in the Committee of the Whole we adopt a bill and recommend it to the House without a quorum being present, and when everyone knows that in the Committee of the Whole there is no quorum. Assuming now that a gentleman would rise in his seat and raise the question of order when the House assembled to consider a bill, that a quorum in the Committee of the Whole was not present, does the gentleman state that the Chair would sustain such a question of order raised at that time? And is not that practically the question you have here now?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That is not the question at all. I have stated, Mr. Speaker, in this connection time and time again, that I think that the Chair ought to hold that the members of a committee should not be compelled to impeach their own action. But that is not the situation confronting us. A like situation to the present one arose in this body during the last session. The gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. Houston, sought to make a motion to take up a Senate bill. The question of his authority was raised, and in response to questions, he frankly admitted that when his committee acted, a quorum was not present. The Speaker thereupon ruled that the action of a minority, was not the action of the committee, and that the gentleman from Tennessee could not make his motion. Now, so far as the gentleman from Ohio is concerned, he was asked whether there was or was not a quorum present when this rule was acted on. I do not think that the gentleman from Ohio was required to answer the question, and he did not answer it. He stood on his report, and the presumptions of validity supporting it. But later the facts were developed by another member of the committee. They will appear in our proceedings.

The RECORD will show that the committee not only did not have a quorum when it acted, but that the statement was made in the committee that, lacking a quorum the chairman was going to "put it through." The effort is now being made to "put it through," although the unchallenged testimony that will appear in the RECORD shows that there was no legal authority behind the report. Confronted with that situation, the Chair ought to rule that this report is not properly before the House.

Mr. BRIGGS. I want to ask the gentleman if in the Committee of the Whole a point of no quorum was made and it was developed there was no quorum, and that then the committee members who were there should go ahead, if the House would not have a right to inquire into that?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The gentleman makes a very pointed illustration. I think that upon the predicated state of facts, the House could take action. Suppose a point of no quorum is made in Committee of the Whole, and the Chairman holds that there is no quorum present?

Mr. BRIGGS. And a roll call develops.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. And the Member wants to withdraw his point of order. How often has it been ruled that this can not be done, because the Chairman's ruling of record shows that no quorum is present? If the point of order was allowed to be withdrawn, and a vote was then taken, the RECORD would then show that the committee was transacting business without a quorum.

The SPEAKER. Suppose the Committee of the Whole House had reported a bill, and after some debate some one would rise and say that when the Committee of the Whole House adopted the bill a quorum of the Committee of the Whole House was not present; would that invalidate it?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. I would not entertain those statements, if objection was made. I would not hear parties participating in action to impeach their action. That is a sound principle, but that is not the present situation.

The SPEAKER. What is the distinction?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The distinction here is that a lack of quorum has been developed by the unchallenged statements of a member of the committee. These statements are before the Speaker, they will be reported as a part of these proceedings. They are admitted to be true. No issue of fact is presented. The facts are in substance, agreed.

The SPEAKER. Suppose the Committee of the Whole House should admit it and put it on record. Would not that be the same thing?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. The difference in that respect would be a difference in the character of the committee. You should draw the distinction, I think, between the Committee of the Whole House and these smaller committees, which stand on a different foundation. The facts are before the House, and before the Speaker. The gentleman has said that he was going "to put it over." Are the rules of the House and the just authority of this House to be disregarded in this fashion?

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, I do not know whether or not you will hold a point of order against the point of order, but the point of order of the gentleman from Virginia comes too late, after a discussion of some length before the point was raised.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. FIELDS. Would it be in order, while the point of order is pending, to move to recommit the rule to the Committee on Rules?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker——

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, may I reply to the point of order submitted by the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD]?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I want to proceed for a moment only. I shall not take much time, but I shall try to add something.

If in the Committee on Rules a bill was recommended to be reported back to the House without a quorum, say only half a dozen present, and then after it had been approved in the Committee of the Whole and reported to the House, some gentleman should stand up and subsequently say that there was not a quorum in the Committee of the Whole, there is no Member here who would say that that made any difference as to the conclusiveness of the proceedings on the bill.

That is the situation here. Members of the committee have stated that there was not a quorum. If that same statement had been made after the Committee of the Whole had acted upon the bill, nobody would have thought it material. If everyone who was present in the Committee of the Whole had said there was no quorum, it would have made no difference.

Now, this rule is elementary. If the point of no quorum is not made and entered of record at the time, it can not be considered afterwards. That is the rule with reference to the House proceedings. It is the rule everywhere—in court proceedings, in legislative bodies, and in committees.

Mr. CONNALLY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. I will ask the gentleman from Iowa if it is not a fact that a member of the Committee on Rules stood here on the floor and stated that the point of no quorum was made, and the chairman of the committee said we were going to "put it over, anyway"?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No. That was not stated in that way, and if it had it would be immaterial. Such matters must be determined by the record and not by statements made afterwards.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. I can not yield now. It simply shows what we are getting into—the illogical position that would be reached if this point of order was sustained. It would become a question of dispute among Members instead of a determination by rules.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. There is no dispute here. The facts are all admitted.

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. No; they are not admitted. There is a dispute here now. Some gentleman now states that a point of no quorum was raised in the committee. That is disputed.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GREEN of Iowa. Yes.

Mr. SNELL. I made the plain, absolute statement that after the vote was taken I made the point of order that there was no quorum, and they told me it was too late.

Mr. FESS. That statement was not made when I was in the Rules Committee.

Mr. SNELL. You said you had got started and were going to put it through.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, it is due both the gentleman from New York [Mr. SNELL] and myself that I should make the statement that after the resolution was passed by the committee I left the Committee on Rules to come down on the floor of the House to see the floor leader, who had asked that this rule be made in order to make this bill the order to-day and to ask the floor leader that we put it over and allow some other bill to come on. I found that my delay in reaching the floor had given it to the Committee on Ways and Means, which had taken the floor, and it was decided we would put this over until 2.30.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. FESS. In just a moment. Then I notified the floor leader, who was anxious that the program be not interrupted. He has been misunderstood, because I did not present this rule to the Committee on Rules until to-day. Having asked the Rules Committee to meet yesterday in order to have it considered in time for to-day, I was asked by the chairman to put it over until to-day. I presented it to the Rules Committee to-day, when one member of the Rules Committee felt that he had not had time to consider it, and said he was opposed to the bill, and while he would not obstruct consideration of it, he made it very clear that he was opposed to it and preferred that we would not go on with it. But the program of the afternoon was completed. I went to the Rules Committee and notified the chairman of the situation.

Mr. SNELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield right there?

Mr. FESS. I spoke to the chairman of the committee and asked him whether I should present the rule, and he asked whether I had seen Mr. GARRETT. I told him that I had, and that Mr. GARRETT said he would not resist it; that he was not sure that he was in favor of the bill, but that he would not object to its consideration. Then it was that I came to the Speaker and told him that I would call it up. That is the situation exactly.

Mr. SNELL. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. FESS. I yield.

Mr. SNELL. The gentleman says the program for the afternoon was completed when his resolution had not been presented to the Rules Committee. Now, what I want to know is, who completes the program?

Mr. FESS. That committee had acted upon the resolution, which I presented in accordance with the wishes of the floor leader.

Mr. SNELL. You said in the statement in the Rules Committee this morning that the program had been completed to consider this. I raise the question, Who made the program?

Mr. FESS. The whole thing is that the gentleman from New York is opposed to this bill and is attempting to obstruct it now, and I want the ruling of the Chair, and will put the House on record whether we are in favor of this bill or not. [Applause.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I desired to make a suggestion to the gentleman from Ohio when I rose, but in view of his last statement I hardly know whether it is worth while to make the suggestion or not. But I will. In view of the condition which has developed here—namely, that there were only four members of the Committee on Rules present, which was a fact unknown to me at the time the gentleman came to me on the floor of the House—I want to make a suggestion. The gentleman has been perfectly fair with me, as I have been, of course, with the gentleman, and I do not wish to do anything that would appear to violate in any way the statement which I made to the gentleman that I would not resist the adoption of the rule; but I think it is fair that I should say that I did not know at that time that there was not a quorum present. I believe the gentleman did tell me, perhaps, that no other representative of the minority came in, or else he told me that he had been unable to find any other member of the minority. I believe that was the statement of the gentleman.

Now, in view of the importance of this matter as a precedent, I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio: Does he not think it would be wise for him to ask unanimous consent that it be recommitted to the Committee on Rules?

Mr. FESS. I will say to my friend that I can not ask that at this stage. In order to maintain the integrity of the rules, I want the Speaker to rule on this point of order.

Mr. HARDY of Texas and Mr. BLANTON rose.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Committee on Education I ask for recognition for a moment.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] desired recognition earlier, and the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON] after the gentleman from Texas [Mr. HARDY] has concluded.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I speak only by way of a suggestion that has occurred to me, which may be worth something or not. The analogy between the proceedings of the Committee of the Whole House and of a committee of the House has been presented, and I see it strikes the mind of the Speaker, as it struck me, with much force. I wish to call the attention of the Speaker to some differences that actually exist. The proceedings of the House and the proceedings of the Committee of the Whole are open and are held under such conditions, rules, and circumstances as to admit of no undue advantage being taken. Every day the House meets in regular stated session for its action. It perpetuates itself and carries itself on in an open session. On the contrary, committees of the House are only called together by action of the chairman, either by written notice or by verbal notice of the time and place of meeting. I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that no fraud could be perpetrated upon the Committee of the Whole, because all Members of the House have notice and may be here. On the other hand, a minority of a committee of the House might act designedly, having only the members of that committee present who were favorable to the reporting of a bill. Let me not be understood as raising any question of that kind as an actual fact. I am only talking about the possibilities. If it were admitted that less than a quorum, when that fact was disclosed, could report and put through a bill, and especially if it were admitted that you could not inquire into the proceedings of a committee to show that there was no quorum present, then any kind of combination might be made between the chairman of a committee and any minority members of that committee to report any bill that was before them to the House. In other words, it occurs to me that what has been stated by the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] as being the rule, that you could not raise the question of a quorum with reference to the proceedings of a Committee of the Whole House—and I do not think you can—does not apply to the smaller committees established for the preliminary work of the House. On the contrary, it seems to me that any member of a committee of this House, if a bill has been reported in the absence of a quorum, has an absolute right to raise the question of no quorum in that committee and have it gone into.

Mr. BLACK. That may be the only way in which it could be done.

Mr. HARDY of Texas. That might be the only way in which he could protect the House against the unauthorized action of a minority of the committee, and I believe that whenever the question is raised this House has the right to inquire of every member of the committee, was there a quorum present when the bill was reported, and every member of the committee must say. I think that is necessary for the protection, not of minorities, but of majorities against the unauthorized action of a minority, and that it is absolutely necessary for the House to have the right to inquire into the proceedings before a committee when the question of no quorum in the committee is raised in the House.

Mr. CONNALLY. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. Yes.

Mr. CONNALLY. According to the contention of the gentlemen on the committee, would it not be possible for the chairman of a committee to act alone, with no other member present, and although every other member of the committee might come on the floor of the House and say he was not present at that meeting of the committee, would not such a ruling prevent the question being raised?

Mr. HARDY of Texas. It would certainly be possible for the chairman and two or three members of a committee to get together and act upon a bill, and then say that the question of a quorum could not be raised. In this way a bill might be reported to this House, not by the committee to which it was reported, but by one or two members of that committee, even though the committee was nearly unanimous against it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER. The Chair promised to recognize the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLANTON].

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I take it that if this rule had been adopted after debate, without the question of a quorum being raised, the question then would have been settled and could not be raised subsequently; but I also take it that there is a time for the membership of the House to raise the question of a quorum or no quorum in a committee with respect to the favorably reporting of any measure. Now, I am just as heartily in favor of this bill as any man in this House. I have supported it since it was first introduced and since hearings began on it, and I expect to vote for it when it comes up in the House, and ordinarily I would support the chairman of my committee on any reasonable proposition; but I do not expect to vote for any rule or for any measure that attempts to disregard the full rights of the membership of the House. I do think that in the interest of orderly procedure and in conformity with the rules, safeguarding at all times the rights of the House membership, that when the question has been raised that there was no quorum in the Rules Committee when this resolution was favorably reported, and when that question has been opportunely raised at the proper time when the matter was first presented to the House for action, and when it has been asserted by a member of the Rules Committee and by its ex-chairman [Mr. GARRETT] that there were only four members present at the time the rule was favorably reported, I take it that where that assertion is undenied on the floor of the House, this House should not consider the rule in the face of that fact. Although I expect to vote for the bill when it is properly before the House, I am opposed to the House taking any matter up at all until it is properly shown that a quorum has sent it here.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I wish first to reply to the point of order made by the gentleman from Alabama, to the effect that the point of order raised by me came too late. The gentleman from Alabama was doubtless thinking of the situation in the House when a section, or a paragraph of a bill is read. If a point of order is not made when the reading is concluded, and you pass on to discussion, it is then too late to raise the question of order. The reason for this rule is that when the paragraph is read, the reading discloses whether or not the matter so read is in order, and any point of order should be then made, but that is not the present situation. This question of authority could not be raised until the fact of the lack of authority was developed. Neither I, nor any other Member could raise the question while the gentleman from Ohio was speaking, for the simple reason that he stood on the record and on the presumption that a quorum had ordered the report. I admit that so long as he relied upon this presumption he could not be required to state whether a quorum was present when the Committee on Rules acted. But the moment that it was developed in the presence of this body by the positive statement of the gentleman from New York that a quorum was not present in the committee when this rule was reported, the point of order was made. I maintain that it was made in due time, and was therefore in order.

Now a word further. The consideration of the bill to which this rule relates has never been entered upon. The point of order as to the authority of the committee to order a report came at the very threshold of the discussion over the rule. I admit that if we had entered upon the discussion of the bill, and debate was in regular progress, then in the interest of orderly procedure no belated question of authority ought to be entertained. I admit that. But again I say, that that is not this situation.

In this connection I wish to ask how the question of no quorum in the committee could ever be raised in the House, if the House can not take cognizance of the facts now in its possession? Suppose eight members constituted a quorum of a committee and at a given meeting only seven members were present, six of one party and one of another. The minority member, we will say, raises the question of no quorum, but the Chair arbitrarily holds that he will not entertain it on the ground that it is made too late, and a report is ordered by the six members over the protest of the single objecting member. The report is then made, and is brought into the House by the chairman. On its face it is regular and the chairman stands on the presumption of regularity. But one of his associates frankly admits that a quorum was not present. This statement is not challenged, but is admitted by the chairman in a word, the facts are agreed. Is it possible that under such circumstances the Speaker of this body is without authority to hold that the report was improperly made and therefore is not properly before the House?

That is no fanciful suggestion. It suggests a situation that may arise at any time, a situation that did arise in this body under Mr. Speaker CLARK, who held under circumstances similar to these that the action of less than a quorum in a committee afforded no authority to bring up a bill in the House. If this proceeding is sustained, then the committees need not concern themselves to maintain quorums, since their action without a quorum, even when the lack of a quorum is admitted, can not be challenged. In the past many committees have been timid about acting without a quorum. Overrule this point of order, and the necessity of maintaining a quorum in a committee when action is proposed to be taken will be entirely removed.

Mr. CANNON. Mr. Speaker, just a word. The committee of the House, under the rules of the House, is presumed to have a quorum present until the point is made that there is no quorum present, and then the rule provides that there shall be a call. The result is to be reported to the House. If there is a quorum present, the roll call shows it, and if there is no quorum present, a call of the House is had or the House adjourns, as the case may be. As far as the House itself is concerned, the Journal of the House decides. You can not go behind the Journal. I do not know whether the committee in this case kept a journal or kept a record. There is nothing in the rules of the House that requires it to keep a record. So far as I know, when the question of no quorum is raised in committee the roll is called, and if no quorum is present no action is had. If there was a quorum present, the matter being questioned, it seems to me if we are going to require the committee to keep a record at all, that the record might be produced and would show the presence or absence of a quorum. I do not know what the ruling of the Chair may be. I do not recollect that this question was ever raised, so far as my recollection goes, in the House. We have not entered upon the consideration of this rule. It is a proposition to enter upon the consideration, and the House is to determine whether we will or not by a yea and nay vote. There should be a rule proposed by a majority of the committee, and I think it is sufficiently shown here that a majority did not order it.

Mr. POU. Mr. Speaker, I think it due myself that I should make a short statement. At 10 o'clock this morning I talked from my hotel with the clerk of the Committee on Rules, and was informed that the meeting of the committee had been called for the purpose of hearing certain gentlemen on the Rogers resolution, as the resolution was called. In a word, the meeting was a committee hearing, as we call meetings where it is not intended to take action. I certainly understood that no vote would be taken this morning. Because of another engagement, I did not attend. I am therefore one of the guilty absentees.

I will say this also: I try to attend all the meetings of the Committee on Rules. Occasionally this is not possible. Certainly it is the duty of every member to attend all meetings if he can. It is likewise true that gentlemen should stay in this Chamber whenever the House is in session, but occasion-

ally that is not possible also. I can only apologize for my absence from the hearing this morning and promise to do better in the future. [Laughter.] I believe, however, I have never missed any important vote in the Committee on Rules since I have been a member if I was physically able to attend.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I want to call the attention of the Chair to the debate in the last Congress which was had in the case to which the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] referred, and particularly to the argument of the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] at that time. His argument then seemed to me to be correct, as it does still seem to be correct. I refer, of course, to the argument he made in the last Congress. On page 6689 of the RECORD of the last Congress, in the RECORD of May 17, 1918, I read:

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Certainly. A quorum is always presumed to be present if the point is not raised in the body transacting business. Take the case suggested by the gentleman, in which the committee begins business with a quorum, but actually loses it before a bill is reported; but no point of no quorum is raised, ought the statement of a Member in this body to the effect that less than a quorum was present when the bill was actually reported, be admitted and cause the bill to be stricken from our calendar as having been improperly reported? If the question of no quorum can be raised in the present instance, as against the record of the committee, then in the case suggested it could be raised, if it is a question of fact to be decided in this body by oral testimony, as against the presumption to conclusiveness in favor of the regularity of the committee's action, as revealed by the records of the committee.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That is precisely my attitude to-day.

Mr. MAPES. After several interruptions the gentleman repeated the same thought, and definitely stated that the minutes of the committee should be controlling.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes. Now, let us have the minutes of the committee showing that there was a quorum present.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, I beg the indulgence of the Chair for just one observation. Repeatedly the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] has said that the records show that there was no quorum present. I beg to take issue with the gentleman. The records show exactly the contrary. There is no record here before this House, except the report of the committee, and that report is presumptively the report of the committee. The proposition here which the gentleman from Virginia is arguing is that he has a right to impeach the records by the statements of men afterwards who have attended or who did not attend the meeting of the committee. Are the statements of gentlemen to be received as impeaching the action of the committee after the action has been taken? Of course, if the matter enters into a question of jurisdiction, that is another proposition, but even that question can not be shown by the statement of men on the floor of the House.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I would not take the floor again, but as I stated heretofore, having raised the question of order I presumed that my remarks would be the ones last heard, in other words that I would close the debate. As soon as I sat down half a dozen gentlemen asked for recognition, and most of them submitted remarks. If I had known that these gentlemen were going to speak, I would have delayed my concluding remarks until they had made their speeches. I wish to say just a word in respect to the citations from the RECORD read by the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES]. My contention at that time was precisely what it is to-day, namely that it is inadvisable to entertain statements by members of a committee to impeach committee action, that the House ought to stand on the record, if there is a record to the contrary, of what is proposed to be stated. That is the rule with respect to the verdict of a civil jury. The courts of my State will not allow the verdict to be impeached by putting the members of the jury on the witness stand to show illegal, or improper acts on their part, but when the illegality is developed then the court is bound to take cognizance of it. In the case cited, by the gentleman from Michigan, the fact that the chairman of the committee, not only did not stand on the record, but admitted that there was no quorum present when his committee acted, precluded him from making the motion he sought to make. In that case the chairman required authority of his committee to make a motion, but in response to a question the chairman, Mr. Houston, stated that when action was taken a quorum of his committee was not present, and argued against the propriety of receiving statements of this character, but the statement having been made the Speaker [Mr. CLARK] held that Mr. Houston had put himself out of court, that the meeting at which the authority to empower the chairman, Mr. Houston, to take up a Senate bill was voted was not a committee meeting, and that this being so the chairman could not bring up the Senate bill under the circumstances. Now that is precisely the situation confronting us with respect to this report.

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes.

Mr. GARNER. If the rule as suggested by the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER] should apply, then all the chairman would have to do would be to have a meeting all by himself, report the bill, and that would be all there would be to it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Yes; that would be an inevitable consequence of such a ruling, since no absent Member could challenge the record or be heard to impeach the conclusive presumption of the report that the same had been authorized by a quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SAUNDERS] raises the point of order that the resolution is not in order. It is not a question of the propriety of the action of the committee. It is simply a plain question of the duty of the Chair to decide that it is now out of order. It is well established that a committee can act only with a quorum present, and the Chair is disposed to recognize that there is a difference between the Committee of the Whole House and the ordinary committees of the House. The Chair has served on a great many committees and does not recollect a single instance when any committee on which he served took action without a quorum of the committee being present. On the contrary, his recollection is that the committees were always scrupulous to see to it that a quorum was present.

The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CANNON] was the first one to raise the point which has been repeated a number of times during this discussion, and which certainly is impressive, that if you say that a committee can report without a quorum, unless the point is raised in the committee, then a chairman can have a meeting by himself, can report a bill, and it can not be questioned, because there is no one present to raise the point of no quorum, and nobody but himself would know whether there was a quorum present or not. That might lead, naturally, to great abuse, and, of course, of itself it would be a great abuse; but that does not determine the validity of the point of order. It seems to the Chair that this discussion has illustrated the wisdom of the rule that what takes place in a committee is not to be divulged in public.

The Chair has been shown two precedents on this subject, one by Mr. Speaker Reed and one further back. As far as the Chair can see, from a cursory reading, the earlier precedent is directly in point, that such action by a committee without a quorum does not make the report of the committee subject to the point of order on the floor of the House after its consideration has commenced. As Mr. Speaker Reed said, the line must be drawn somewhere when irregularities can not be questioned, and it seems to the Chair, according to these precedents, that after consideration has begun the question of a quorum in the committee can not be raised.

The Chair, therefore, overrules the point of order.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I regard this matter as one of very considerable consequence, and without in any way quarreling with the decision of the Chair, I am impressed with the idea that the proprieties of the occasion should induce the House to recommit this matter to the Committee on Rules—not in a spirit of opposition, therefore, to the rule itself, but because of the situation which developed here. If my appeal to the gentleman from Ohio is in vain——

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. Yes.

Mr. FESS. When the gentleman made the suggestion a moment ago that that procedure be taken I was not averse to it, except I wanted the ruling of the Speaker, because I thought that was extremely important for the procedure of the House.

And if my friend will yield to me for a minute to make a statement—I have not consulted with any members of the committee at all—I will be free to state my own convictions on the matter.

Mr. GARRETT. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, there has been developed, I think, some unfriendly attitude toward the legislation that has come in in an unexpected manner, and it is somewhat embarrassing to me personally as well as chairman of the Committee on Education that has reported this bill. There is very distinctive opposition to the bill in certain quarters. It has been the result of weeks of propaganda. I am somewhat unhappy over the possible effect of that propaganda. It does not go to the merits of the bill, but simply through dissatisfaction, because certain things could not be done which certain people wanted done. I hesitate to forfeit the opportunity of voting on the measure when it is now before the House. I feel that a great many friends of the measure feel just as the gentleman from Tennessee feels, although I think he has been frank with me that he does not know that he is in favor of the bill, and I

honor him for that frankness, because I know that he always takes the position based upon his own judgment, which I have always highly respected, and it is not that that I refer to, as the gentleman knows. If the Committee on Education could be consulted I would consider asking unanimous consent that the matter be referred back to the Committee on Rules. I have understood that the Committee on Rules will assure me that there will be a quorum, and that action will not be deferred for lack of a quorum. I do not want to put myself in the attitude, however, of interfering with the progress of the bill when we have it now before the House.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Will the gentleman yield, with the permission of the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. GARRETT. I yield.

Mr. BANKHEAD. The intimation the gentleman from Ohio has just suggested that there will be a quorum of the Committee on Rules to consider this rule indicates speedy action upon this legislation.

Mr. FESS. My opinion is that we will have to delay it for some time now, because of the crowded program for to-morrow and the next day and probably next week that would forfeit speedy action upon it if it goes back to the Committee on Rules now.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit, does the gentleman wish to proceed further?

Mr. FESS. Not now.

Mr. GARRETT. Several gentlemen have come in, perhaps, during this discussion who have not heard all the facts. A peculiar state of facts developed in connection with this proposition. I myself was advised of the meeting of the Committee on Rules when I reached my office about 10.30 this morning. I immediately went from my office to the committee. When I entered the committee room a public hearing was in progress, and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] was addressing the committee upon an investigating resolution. I first privately inquired of the acting chairman whether there would be a vote upon any proposition, and he informed me, as he stated upon the floor of the House, that the meeting was for the purpose of hearing the gentleman from Massachusetts and others upon a resolution proposing an investigation. I thereupon interrupted the gentleman from Massachusetts, explaining that I had an engagement, apologized to him, stated publicly to the committee that I had an engagement, and I understood that nothing in the way of business was to come up, so I would ask to be excused, and was excused. Now, it developed that subsequently business did come up. I am not complaining of that. The gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] came to me after the House had convened and explained the situation, and said that the matter was not to be called up if I were disposed to make any point against it. Nothing was said about whether a quorum was present and I did not know anything to that effect.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARRETT. For a question.

Mr. MONDELL. Well, for a suggestion. I have been busy with other matters and have not been in the House during the discussion this afternoon. This occurs to me: No one, I assume, has any objection to the consideration of this bill. There is claimed to be a question as to the regularity of the proceedings relative to the rule. That being the case, has anyone any objection to proceeding with the consideration of the measure without regard to the rule? The measure can be considered by unanimous consent of the House.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MONDELL. I do.

Mr. WALSH. I will state to the gentleman that I object to the consideration of the bill, with a rule or without it.

Mr. MONDELL. That being the case, of course, settles the matter. I had hoped there would be no objection.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Will the gentleman yield? What is the objection to proceeding with the consideration of the bill under the rule? That has been ascertained to be regular and conformable to established procedure. What is the objection to proceeding with it?

Mr. MONDELL. I certainly have no objection to proceeding under the rule.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. It has been decided that the point of order that it was reported without a quorum is not well taken. That has been held and determined.

Mr. MONDELL. My understanding is the Chair has held that the report of the Committee on Rules is regular.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. That is what I say. It has been held to be in conformity with the regular proceedings, so why not proceed?

Mr. MONDELL. I should like to proceed rather than discuss other matters. I am anxious to have the bill considered.

Mr. GARRETT. Has the gentleman concluded the statement he was about to make? Is he going to ask unanimous consent? Mr. Speaker, I move to recommit the matter to the Committee on Rules.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think it is in order to recommit; that is the Chair's impression at first blush. The Chair's recollection is that he made that motion himself once, and it was held it was not in order.

Mr. GARRETT. My recollection is that the Chair is correct about that, namely, that it is not in order to recommit to the Committee on Rules.

Mr. FESS. I move the previous question on the adoption of the rule.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. BLANTON. I make the point that there is no quorum present, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. That does not apply against a motion to adjourn.

Mr. BLANTON. Division, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote on agreeing to the rule.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion to adjourn.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 1, noes 95.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the rule.

The question was taken, and the Speaker announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a division.

The House divided; and there were—ayes 51, noes 52.

Mr. FESS. I demand tellers, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. BLANTON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas makes the point of no quorum. The Chair thinks no quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify the absent Members. Those in favor of agreeing to the rule will, as their names are called, vote "yea," and those opposed will vote "nay," and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 134, nays 115, answered "present" 7, not voting 173, as follows:

YEAS—134.

Alexander	Evans, Mont.	Kreider	Rose
Almon	Fess	Lampert	Rouse
Anderson	Freeman	Layton	Rubey
Andrews, Nebr.	French	Lea, Calif.	Sanders, Ind.
Ashbrook	Garland	Linthicum	Schall
Ayres	Glynn	Lonergan	Sinclair
Baer	Graham, Ill.	Luhring	Sinnott
Bankhead	Green, Iowa	McFadden	Smith, Idaho
Barbour	Hadley	McKeown	Stedman
Benham	Hardy, Colo.	McLaughlin, Mich.	Stiness
Boies	Haskell	Madden	Strong, Pa.
Brinson	Haugen	Mapes	Summers, Wash.
Brooks, Ill.	Hawley	Mays	Sweet
Browne	Hayden	Michener	Temple
Browning	Hays	Miller	Thompson
Burroughs	Hernandez	Monahan, Wis.	Tilson
Butler	Hickey	Mondell	Timberlake
Campbell, Kans.	Hicks	Moore, Ohio	Towner
Caraway	Hill	Morgan	Vestal
Carss	Hoch	Morin	Voigt
Christopherson	Huddleston	Nelson, Wis.	Volstead
Cooper	Hudspeth	Newton, Minn.	Walters
Crago	Johnson, Ky.	Newton, Mo.	Wason
Curry, Calif.	Johnson, S. Dak.	Nolan	Watson, Pa.
Dallinger	Johnson, Wash.	Ogden	Webster
Darrow	Juul	Parrish	Wheeler
Davis, Minn.	Kearns	Radcliffe	White, Kans.
Denison	Keller	Raker	White, Me.
Dickinson, Iowa	Kelly, Pa.	Ramseyer	Williams
Dowell	Kendall	Randall, Calif.	Yates
Dunbar	Kiess	Reed, W. Va.	Young, N. Dak.
Edmonds	King	Rhodes	Zihlman
Elliott	Kinkaid	Ricketts	
Elston	Kraus	Riddick	

NAYS—115.

Bee	Caldwell	Cramton	Flood
Benson	Campbell, Pa.	Crisp	Focht
Black	Candler	Cullen	Gard
Bland, Mo.	Cannon	Dale	Garner
Bland, Va.	Cantrill	Davis, Tenn.	Garrett
Blanton	Carew	Dickinson, Mo.	Good
Booher	Carter	Dominick	Greene, Mass.
Box	Clark, Fla.	Drane	Griest
Briggs	Clark, Mo.	Evans, Nebr.	Hardy, Tex.
Buchanan	Cleary	Evans, Nev.	Harrison
Byrnes, S. C.	Coady	Ferris	Hastings
Byrns, Tenn.	Connally	Fisher	Heflin

Hersman	McDuffie	Rainey, J. W.	Tillman
Holland	McLane	Rayburn	Tincher
Howard	MacGregor	Reber	Treadway
Hulings	Mansfield	Riordan	Vinson
Hull, Tenn.	Martin	Robinson, N. C.	Walsh
Humphreys	Minahan, N. J.	Rogers	Watkins
Husted	Moore, Va.	Romjue	Watson, Va.
Igoe	Nelson, Mo.	Saunders, Va.	Weaver
Jacoway	O'Connell	Sears	Welling
Johnson, Miss.	Oldfield	Smith, Mich.	Welty
Jones, Pa.	Oliver	Smithwick	Whaley
Jones, Tex.	Overstreet	Snell	Wilson, La.
Kincheloe	Padgett	Steagall	Wilson, Pa.
Lanham	Park	Stevenson	Woods, Va.
Lankford	Pell	Sumners, Tex.	Woodyard
Lazaro	Pou	Taylor, Colo.	Young, Tex.
Lufkin	Quin	Thomas	

ANSWERED "PRESENT"—7.

Bacharach	Graham, Pa.	Longworth	Neely
Fields	Knutson	Major	

NOT VOTING—173.

Ackerman	Fitzgerald	McArthur	Rowe
Andrews, Md.	Fordney	McClintic	Rucker
Anthony	Foster	McCulloch	Sabath
Aswell	Frear	McGlennon	Sanders, La.
Babka	Fuller, Ill.	McKenzie	Sanders, N. Y.
Barkley	Fuller, Mass.	McKiniry	Sanford
Begg	Gallahger	McKinley	Scott
Bell	Gallivan	McLaughlin, Nebr.	Scully
Blackmon	Gandy	McPherson	Sells
Bland, Ind.	Ganly	MacCrate	Sherwood
Bowers	Godwin, N. C.	Magee	Shreve
Brand	Goldfogle	Maher	Siegel
Britten	Goodall	Mann	Sims
Brooks, Pa.	Goodwin, Ark.	Mason	Sisson
Brumbaugh	Goodykoontz	Mead	Slemp
Burdick	Gould	Merritt	Small
Burke	Greene, Vt.	Montague	Smith, Ill.
Casey	Griffin	Moon	Smith, N. Y.
Chindblom	Hamill	Mooney	Snyder
Classon	Hamilton	Moore, Pa.	Steele
Cole	Hersey	Moores, Ind.	Steenerson
Collier	Houghton	Mott	Stephens, Miss.
Copley	Hull, Iowa	Mudd	Stephens, Ohio
Costello	Hutchinson	Murphy	Strong, Kans.
Crowther	Ireland	Nicholls, S. C.	Sullivan
Currie, Mich.	James	Nichols, Mich.	Swope
Davey	Jefferis	O'Connor	Taylor, Ark.
Dempsey	Johnston, N. Y.	Olney	Taylor, Tenn.
Dent	Kahn	Osborne	Tinkham
Dewalt	Kelley, Mich.	Paige	Upshaw
Donovan	Kennedy, Iowa	Parker	Vaile
Dooling	Kennedy, R. I.	Peters	Vare
Doremus	Kettner	Phelan	Venable
Doughton	Kitchin	Platt	Ward
Dunn	Kleczka	Porter	Webb
Dupré	LaGuardia	Purnell	Wilson, Ill.
Dyer	Langley	Rainey, H. T.	Wingo
Eagan	Larsen	Ramsey	Winslow
Eagle	Lee, Ga.	Randall, Wis.	Wise
Echols	Lehlbach	Reavis	Wood, Ind.
Ellsworth	Lesher	Reed, N. Y.	Wright
Emerson	Little	Robsion, Ky.	
Esch	Luce	Rodenberg	
Fairfield	McAndrews	Rowan	

So the resolution embodying the rule was agreed to.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

Until further notice:

Mr. KNUTSON with Mr. BELL.
Mr. BOWERS with Mr. NEELY.
Mr. MCARTHUR with Mr. SISSON.
Mr. MCPHERSON with Mr. MAJOR.
Mr. SHREVE with Mr. MCANDREWS.
Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio with Mr. BRAND.
Mr. HULL of Iowa with Mr. FIELDS.
Mr. KAHN with Mr. DENT.
Mr. JAMES with Mr. ASWELL.
Mr. MAGEE with Mr. GOODWIN of Arkansas.
Mr. PORTER with Mr. GANLY.
Mr. MANN with Mr. GOLDFOGLE.
Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania with Mr. DONOVAN.
Mr. KENNEDY of Rhode Island with Mr. KITCHIN.
Mr. KLECZKA with Mr. KETTNER.
Mr. ANDREWS of Maryland with Mr. WISE.
Mr. PURNELL with Mr. GANDY.
Mr. MOORES of Indiana with Mr. DEWALT.
Mr. MUDD with Mr. DAVEY.
Mr. CROWTHER with Mr. SMITH of New York.
Mr. ANTHONY with Mr. WINGO.
Mr. BLAND of Indiana with Mr. WEBB.
Mr. FOSTER with Mr. SANDERS of Louisiana.
Mr. SMITH of Illinois with Mr. HENRY T. RAINEY.
Mr. MURPHY with Mr. COLLIER.
Mr. NICHOLS of Michigan with Mr. CASEY.
Mr. STEPHENS of Ohio with Mr. PHELAN.
Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania with Mr. VENABLE.
Mr. OSBORNE with Mr. BRUMBAUGH.
Mr. PAIGE with Mr. BLACKMON.
Mr. TINKHAM with Mr. OLNEY.
Mr. PARKER with Mr. BARKLEY.
Mr. FREAR with Mr. SABATH.
Mr. FULLER of Illinois with Mr. RUCKER.
Mr. VARE with Mr. O'CONNOR.
Mr. WARD with Mr. NICHOLLS of South Carolina.
Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts with Mr. ROWAN.
Mr. REAVIS with Mr. GALLAGHER.
Mr. REED of New York with Mr. FITZGERALD.
Mr. PETERS with Mr. BABKA.
Mr. BURKE with Mr. UPSHAW.
Mr. DEMPSEY with Mr. SMALL.
Mr. MCKENZIE with Mr. HAMILL.
Mr. CHINDBLOOM with Mr. TAYLOR of Arkansas.
Mr. DUNN with Mr. SIMS.
Mr. COLE with Mr. SULLIVAN.
Mr. COPLEY with Mr. STEPHENS of Mississippi.
Mr. GOODYKOONTZ with Mr. MEAD.
Mr. DYER with Mr. SHERWOOD.
Mr. FAIRFIELD with Mr. SCULLY.
Mr. GREENE of Vermont with Mr. MAHER.
Mr. HAMILTON with Mr. MCKINIRY.
Mr. HOUGHTON with Mr. MCGLENNON.
Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky with Mr. EAGLE.
Mr. MCKINLEY with Mr. GRIFFIN.
Mr. RODENBERG with Mr. EAGAN.
Mr. HUTCHINSON with Mr. MCCLINTIC.
Mr. IRELAND with Mr. LESHER.
Mr. KELLEY of Michigan with Mr. LEE of Georgia.
Mr. WILSON of Illinois with Mr. MOONEY.
Mr. WINSLOW with Mr. MOON.
Mr. WOOD of Indiana with Mr. MONTAGUE.
Mr. COSTELLO with Mr. STEELE.
Mr. ROWE with Mr. DUPRÉ.
Mr. SANFORD with Mr. DOUGHTON.
Mr. RAMSEY with Mr. GALLIVAN.
Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa with Mr. LARSEN.
Mr. PLATT with Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina.
Mr. SCOTT with Mr. DOREMUS.
Mr. SELLS with Mr. DOOLING.
Mr. ACKERMAN with Mr. WRIGHT.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, I desire to withdraw my affirmative vote and vote "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. KNUTSON, and he answered "Present."

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I voted "aye," but I am paired with the gentleman from Tennessee, Mr. HULL, and I therefore desire to withdraw my vote and vote "present."

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. FIELDS, and he answered "Present."

Mr. NEELY. Mr. Speaker, I voted "aye," but I am paired with the gentleman from West Virginia, Mr. BOWERS. I desire to withdraw my vote and be recorded as present.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the gentleman's name.

The Clerk called the name of Mr. NEELY, and he answered "Present."

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER. A quorum is present. The Doorkeeper will open the doors. Under the rule the House automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] in the chair.

FOOD-CONTROL BILL.

Mr. HAUGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may file a conference report on 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, up to 12 o'clock to-night.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Iowa asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD as late as 12 o'clock to-night the conference report on the food-control bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE.

Mr. KELLER. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make a statement to the House.

The SPEAKER. That will not be in order now, as the Chair thinks. The House, under the rule, automatically resolves itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 4438) to provide for industrial vocational rehabilitation, with the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] in the chair.

Mr. BANKHEAD. Mr. Speaker, will it be necessary to raise the question of the control of the time in the committee before we go into committee?

The SPEAKER. The rule, the Chair understands, provides for it.

Mr. FESS. The rule does not name any particular person in control of the time.

The SPEAKER. Then the House rules provide that one-half of the time be controlled by those favoring the bill and one-half by those opposed to the bill. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] will please take the chair.

Thereupon the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4438, with Mr. MADDEN in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. The House is in Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 4438, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4438) to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to dispense with the first reading of the bill. Is there objection?

Mr. CANNON. I object. I have not had time to read the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is made. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That in order to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and who are without sufficient means to provide for their own rehabilitation and their return to civil employment, there is hereby appropriated for the use of the States, subject to the provisions of this act, for the purpose of cooperating with them in the maintenance of vocational rehabilitation of such disabled persons, and in returning vocationally rehabilitated persons to civil employment for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the sum of $500,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the sum of $750,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and annually thereafter the sum of $1,000,000. Said sums shall be allotted to the States in the proportion which their population bears to the total population in the United States, not including Territories, outlying possessions, and the District of Columbia, according to the last preceding United States census: *Provided*, That the allotment of funds to any State shall not be less than a minimum of $5,000 for any fiscal year. And there is hereby appropriated the following sums, or so much thereof as may be needed, which shall be used for the purpose of providing the minimum allotment to the States provided for in this section, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1919, the sum of $66,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, the sum of $46,000; for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and annually thereafter the sum of $34,000.

All moneys expended under the provisions of this act from appropriations provided by section 1 shall be upon the condition (1) that for each dollar of Federal money expended there shall be expended in the State under the supervision and control of the State board at least an equal amount for the same purpose: *Provided*, That no portion of the appropriation made by this act shall be used by any institution for handicapped persons except for the special training of such individuals entitled to the benefits of this act as shall be determined by the Federal board; (2) that the State board shall annually submit to the Federal board for approval plans showing (a) the kinds of vocational rehabilitation and schemes of placement for which it is proposed the appropriation shall be used; (b) the plan of administration and supervision; (c) courses of study; (d) methods of instruction; (e) qualification of teachers, supervisors, directors, and other necessary administrative officers or employees; (f) plans for the training of teachers, supervisors, and directors; (3) that the State board shall make an annual report to the Federal board on or before September 1 of each year on the work done in the State and on the receipts and expenditures of money under the provisions of this act; (4) that no portion of any moneys appropriated by this act for the benefit of the States shall be applied, directly or indirectly, to the purchase, preservation, erection, or repair of any building or buildings or equipment, or for the purchase or rental of any lands; (5) that all courses for vocational rehabilitation given under the supervision and control of the State board and all courses for vocational rehabilitation maintained shall be available, under such rules and regulations as the Federal board shall prescribe, to any civil employee of the United States disabled while in the performance of his duty.

SEC. 2. That in order to secure the benefits of the appropriations provided by section 1 any State shall, through the legislative authority thereof, (1) accept the provisions of this act; (2) empower and direct the board designated or created as the State board for vocational education to cooperate in the administration of the provisions of the vocational education act approved February 23, 1917, to cooperate as herein provided with the Federal Board for Vocational Education in the administration of the provisions of this act; (3) in those States where a State workmen's compensation board, or other State board, department, or agency exists, charged with the administration of the State workmen's compensation or liability laws, the legislature shall provide that a plan of cooperation be formulated between such State board, department, or agency, and the State board charged with the administration of this act, such plan to be effective when approved by the governor of the State; (4) provide for the supervision and support of the course of vocational rehabilitation to be provided by the State board in carrying out the provisions of this act; (5) appoint as custodian for said appropriations its State treasurer, who shall receive and provide for the proper custody and disbursement of all money paid to the State from said appropriations. In any State the legislature of which does not meet in 1919 or 1920, if the governor of that State shall accept the provision of this act, such State shall be entitled to the benefits of this act until the legislature of such State meets in due course and has been in session 60 days.

SEC. 3. That the Federal Board for Vocational Education shall have power to cooperate with State boards in carrying out the purposes and provisions of this act, and is hereby authorized to make and establish such rules and regulations as may be necessary or appropriate to carry into effect the provisions of this act; to provide for the vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons and their return to civil employment and to cooperate, for the purpose of carrying out the provisions of this act, with such public and private agencies as it may deem advisable. It shall be the duty of said board (1) to examine plans submitted by the State boards and approve the same if believed to be feasible and found to be in conformity with the provisions and purposes of this act; (2) to ascertain annually whether the several States are using or are prepared to use the money received by them in accordance with the provisions of this act; (3) to certify on or before the 1st day of January of each year to the Secretary of the Treasury each State which has accepted the provisions of this act and complied therewith, together with the amount which each State is entitled to receive under the provisions of this act; (4) to deduct from the next succeeding allotment to any State whenever any portion of the fund annually allotted has not been expended for the purpose provided for in this act a sum equal to such unexpended portion; (5) to withhold the allotment of moneys to any State whenever it shall be determined that moneys allotted are not being expended for the purposes and conditions of this act; (6) to require the replacement by withholding subsequent allotments of any portion of the moneys received by the custodian of any State under this act that by any action or contingency is diminished or lost: *Provided*, That if any allotment is withheld from any State, the State board of such State may appeal to the Congress of the United States, and if the Congress shall not direct such sum to be paid, it shall be covered into the Treasury.

SEC. 4. That the Secretary of the Treasury, upon the certification of the Federal board as provided in this act, shall pay quarterly to the custodian of each State appointed as herein provided the moneys to which it is entitled under the provisions of this act. The money so received by the custodian for any State shall be paid out on the requisition of the State board as reimbursement for services already rendered or expenditures already incurred and approved by said State board. The Federal Board for Vocational Education shall make an annual report to the Congress, on or before December 1, on the administration of this act, and shall include in such report the reports made by the State boards on the administration of this act by each State and the expenditure of the money allotted to each State.

SEC. 5. That there is hereby appropriated to the Federal Board for Vocational Education the sum of $200,000 annually for the purpose of making studies, investigations, and reports regarding the vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons and their placements in suitable or gainful occupations, and for the administrative expenses of said board incident to performing the duties imposed by this act, including salaries of such assistants, experts, clerks, and other employees, in the District of Columbia or elsewhere as the board may deem necessary, actual traveling and other necessary expenses incurred by the members of the board and by its employees, under its orders, including attendance at meetings of educational associations and other organizations, rent and equipment of offices in the District of Columbia and elsewhere, purchase of books of reference, law books, and periodicals, stationery, typewriters and exchange thereof, miscellaneous supplies, postage on foreign mail, printing and binding to be done at the Government Printing Office, and all other necessary expenses.

SEC. 6. That the Federal Board for Vocational Education is hereby authorized and empowered to receive such gifts and donations from either public or private sources as may be offered unconditionally. All moneys received as gifts or donations shall be paid into the Treasury of the United States, and shall constitute a permanent fund, to be called the "Special fund for vocational rehabilitation of disabled persons," to be used, under the direction of the said board, to defray the expenses of providing and maintaining courses of vocational rehabilitation in special cases, including the payment of necessary expenses of persons undergoing training. A full report of all gifts and donations offered and accepted, together with the names of the donors and the respective amounts contributed by each, and all disbursements therefrom shall be submitted annually to Congress by said board.

With committee amendments.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would like to suggest the advisability in the main of agreeing as to who shall have charge of the time for and in opposition to the bill. The rule provides that those in opposition shall have one hour and fifteen minutes and those in favor of the bill shall have one hour and fifteen minutes, and ordinarily some member of the minority would have charge of the opposition time. The Chair understands that all the members of the commitee are in favor of this bill. The Chair hopes, in order to expedite the consideration of the bill, some arrangement will be entered into as to who shall have charge of the opposition time. That will relieve the Chair.

Mr. FESS. The Rules Committee thought it well not to name any particular person opposed to the bill or to provide for time to be controlled by those opposing, because there is no one that I know of in opposition to the bill. The rule therefore was left open, and it was thought that the Member whom the Chair recognized in opposition to the bill would have control of the time on that side.

The CHAIRMAN. That would be quite agreeable to the Chair, but the Chair thought it would be more expeditious to have it done in the other way.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, after I make a preliminary statement, then the Chair may recognize whomsoever he desires in opposition.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

Mr. BLANTON. In view of the fact that the gentleman from Ohio could not be recognized for more than an hour, if no one opposing the bill claims the right to be recognized, I ask unani-

mous consent that half the time be controlled by the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] and the other half by the gentleman from Florida [Mr. SEARS].

Mr. WALSH. Well, I am opposed to the bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio will proceed.

Mr. RAKER. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. It is not intended, is it, that the gentleman from Ohio is to occupy an hour, but that the Chair will recognize Members pro and con, five minutes at a time?

The CHAIRMAN. No; this is general debate. The gentleman from Ohio has one hour and a quarter at his disposal, and the gentleman in control of the opposition will have an hour and a quarter.

Mr. RAKER. That is satisfactory.

Mr. WALSH. It is not very satisfactory, but it is provided in the rule.

Mr. FESS. Gentlemen of the committee, this legislation is designed to complete a program of legislation that has had some recognition in this body for the last few years. This particular bill, looking toward the reeducation, retraining, or rehabilitation of those crippled in industrial pursuits, is not purely a Federal proposition, except as it is done in cooperation with the various States under or with the approval of the Federal Board of Education.

The value of this sort of work is hardly questioned by those who have made a sympathetic study of the problem. We very readily took to the rehabilitation of the soldiers. There was very little opposition to that. At the same time there are more crippled in industry every year, if all injured are included, than there were crippled in the military service. It is true that these cripples are not all what you would call total disabilities. A very careful investigation was made by the Federal Government, and the report is to the effect that there are 22,500 total disabilities resulting from such injuries every year. If we take the total number who suffer both total and slight disability it will approach very close to 300,000 per year. It is stated that a man's life in activity is something like 20 years. So, taking the average of the age of those crippled, it would seem that it occurs along between 20 and 30, and if you could have 20 years of activity you will immediately see what a loss this total number of disabled people are to the country, and what an advantage it would be if the Government could take that same group and through their rehabilitation put them on their feet as self-supporting. In this case it would have an economic value as well as an altruistic.

I do not think it is necessary for me to enter upon a discussion of the value of this sort of legislation. That was all thrashed out in the rehabilitation legislation of the last Congress. The only question here is whether it is worth while for the Government to appropriate, out of the Federal Treasury, a certain fund to be administered in cooperation with the various States for this work. Personally I am convinced that it is a very useful function. I recognize the viewpoint of those opposing it.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to my friend from Massachusetts.

Mr. WALSH. Will it disturb the continuity of the gentleman's argument?

Mr. FESS. It will not.

Mr. WALSH. Did the committee take into consideration the question of the constitutional right of Congress to appropriate money for this purpose? And under what clause of the Constitution would you appropriate it?

Mr. FESS. Our committee did not go over that at all in the consideration of the measure, the same question having been thrashed out back in the eighties, in the discussion of the famous Blair educational bill; and then later, in 1917, when we passed the Smith-Hughes Act, the matter was thoroughly thrashed out in the committee and also on the floor of the House. So I have no doubt whatever as to the constitutional sanction for this legislation.

Mr. BEE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to my friend.

Mr. BEE. Is there not a provision in the Constitution of the United States for the diffusion of knowledge? And would not the diffusion of knowledge cover the Smith-Hughes bill and the Blair educational bill, as contradistinguished from this bill, which has no constitutional support whatever? I just ask that of the gentleman as a student of history.

Mr. FESS. I am not at all disturbed about the constitutionality of the application of the fund on matters of education. It seems to me that is entirely cleared up.

Mr. BEE. I agree with the gentleman as to matters of education, absolutely.

Mr. FESS. I think my friend means that this is questionable as to whether it is education or not?

Mr. BEE. Yes.

Mr. FESS. Education is not simply a matter of reading and writing. It is not confined to intellectual acumen. Education has to do with the training of the body as well as of the mind. This is rehabilitation of the human frame that has been injured to the point of uselessness in its efforts for service.

Mr. BEE. In support of the constitutional educational bill, is not the language "diffusion of knowledge" confined to educational matters in the accepted sense of the term?

Mr. FESS. I do not know of anything being said about the diffusion of knowledge in the Constitution of the United States, as my friend the distinguished judge from Virginia [Mr. WATSON], well recognizes. There is a general-welfare clause that probably would bring it within the range.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. DENISON. I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he recognizes at all any difference between the principle or the duty of the Federal Government to contribute money or to appropriate money to rehabilitate soldiers who are disabled in the defense of the country, and the rehabilitation of those who are injured, perhaps by their own carelessness, by accident in private industry?

Mr. FESS. There is a broad difference. In the first place, the disabled soldier is purely a Federal function with which the State has nothing to do, while this is not only a Federal function but a State function, and the Federal Government does not do anything except to contribute to the fund administered by the State with the approval of the Federal authority that has charge of the fund.

Mr. BLANTON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Certainly.

Mr. BLANTON. It is a fact that the various educational institutions of to-day give credit for various kinds of athletic training in the regular course of the institution?

Mr. FESS. A great many do.

Mr. BLANTON. In other words, they take into account the training of the physical body as well as the mental?

Mr. FESS. My friend is correct in that statement. Education to-day goes much more largely into the training of the body than in years past. We are coming to recognize that value as we did not before.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman further yield?

Mr. FESS. Certainly.

Mr. DENISON. Can the gentleman inform the House as to what States have rehabilitation laws?

Mr. FESS. Thirty-eight States have compensation departments, in some of which they may have some form of rehabilitation. Rehabilitation, as I have said already, appears as a new field of compensation, not yet entered upon. However, laws are provided in 38 States looking to recompense rather than to replacing the injury by training. That has not been carried on as largely as, of course, it will be from now on. This is a stimulation for that purpose.

Mr. TREADWAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. TREADWAY. I would like to inquire of the chairman of this committee whether this bill was heard by the Committee on Education or by the joint Committee on Education and Labor. I sent to the committee for the hearings, and was given a copy of the hearings on Senate bill 4921, of the Sixty-fifth Congress. Has there been any hearings on the bill now before us?

Mr. FESS. This bill is very similar to the bill of the last session that was introduced by my colleague on the committee, Mr. BANKHEAD. Upon that bill we had full hearings by the Senate and House committees. This bill is, with a few minor changes, the bill upon which the hearings were had.

Mr. TREADWAY. The hearings are practically on this bill?

Mr. FESS. The hearings are applicable to this bill.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The Smith-Hughes bill already provides for vocational education?

Mr. FESS. Applied to pupils in schools.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. It is the purpose of this bill, or one of the purposes, to provide compensation for disabled or injured persons?

Mr. FESS. Oh, no.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Suppose he did not have money enough to go to school?

Mr. FESS. He would be unfortunate, that is all. Would my friend from Michigan go to that extent, to vote sufficient money to enable the person to educate himself?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No.

Mr. FESS. I do not know to what limit the charge on the Treasury might be if you started on that policy.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. That is why I made the inquiry.

Mr. FESS. We are trying to protect the Treasury.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. This is, in fact, for a beneficial purpose as well as a financial purpose. Would it not be well some time to include people who were born disabled to give them an education and afford relief?

Mr. FESS. The States are caring for those unfortunate people.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The States have compensation laws that take care of those injured in industries, too, do they not?

Mr. FESS. Paying a man who is injured is one thing, and training him so that he does not need the pay is another thing. That is what we are trying to do here. My friend will immediately recognize that we could not do anything better, if it is within our power, than to take the cripple who is useless, who is on the junk heap, with no hope, and by some training put him on his feet, make him a self-supporting man, respectable, who can look the world in the face and ask a favor of no man.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I agree with that proposition.

Mr. FESS. I think I ought to state that there is a misconception in the minds of some Members in that many think we are giving money to people who are going to train themselves. The Federal board does that under the rehabilitation act. We do not do that here. All we do is to stimulate the States to train, by giving to the States a certain proportion of money, if the State will raise the same amount, to be applied to the payment of teachers, not to the equipment of a school, but to the payment of teachers and the training of teachers to do the work, and that is all.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Does the State or the Federal board prescribe the training that shall be given?

Mr. FESS. It must be done upon their approval.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The approval of the Federal board or the State board?

Mr. FESS. Upon the approval of the Federal board.

Mr. LAYTON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. LAYTON. What I would like to understand is whether or not there will be any provision at all for the disabled man who is not able, unless he can live without food and clothes, to get this vocational training.

Mr. FESS. We make no provision at all for the payment of money to anyone.

Mr. LAYTON. That man or woman who is able to maintain himself or herself in the meantime can take advantage of the vocational training.

Mr. FESS. That is one of the inequalities of life that you can not correct by law.

Mr. HUSTED. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. HUSTED. What important advantage does the gentleman expect to gain through Federal financial contribution over what he would get if he left the entire expense to be borne by the State?

Mr. FESS. Our experience in the land-grant college work has been that the dollar originally paid, to be matched by the State, has been matched many times beyond itself by the States. In other words, when we first began it we gave dollar for dollar, and now the States are contributing something like ten dollars to the one that the Federal Government contributes. The same thing is true of the Smith-Hughes Act. We started out dollar for dollar, and I venture to say it will not be 20 years until the States will give in their contribution far beyond the amount given by the Federal Government, and the same thing ought to be done here.

Mr. HUSTED. Is it the gentleman's idea that you can encourage the States to enter into this work by a contribution of a dollar which eventually comes out of their own pocketbooks, anyway?

Mr. FESS. Precisely so. If the Government will give a dollar to be matched by another dollar, ultimately the stimulation will bring more than the one dollar.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. The same thing is true of the highways.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Yes.

Mr. SANDERS of Indiana. The same result is obtained with respect to the improvement of highways.

Mr. FESS. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. SMITH] just remarked that. So far as I know, there is no Federal stimulation that has not sufficiently stimulated the States to make it vastly greater than was originally intended when the law was enacted.

Let me, if gentlemen please, analyze the bill so that I may not consume too much time. The first section of the bill shows the breadth of it.

It was first thought that it ought to be limited to industry. Then it was thought that if rehabilitation of persons in industry was left, why not extend it, why not let it include the farm, commercial work, or what not, so we amended it in the committee and said, "Rehabilitation of persons disabled in industrial pursuits, including agriculture, trade, commerce, manufacturing, mining, transportation, and all the mechanic arts." There was some objection to the qualification or the limitation where we would not take in persons who were capable financially of doing it themselves. That provision is written in the law. I know there is considerable objection to that provision, although there was a reason for placing it there.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I do.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Other than this provision to which the gentleman has just referred, who is excluded? I see it covers agriculture and so on.

Mr. FESS. Our purpose was not to exclude anyone.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is what I wanted to know, if it is to include all who are injured?

Mr. FESS. If the injured person was wealthy——

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. I understand, but other than that?

Mr. FESS. He would be, under the law, excluded, but it was not meant to exclude any injured persons.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. That is what I wanted to know.

Mr. GARNER. I notice the gentleman has not included stock raisers.

Mr. FESS. Would not that be included under farm, agriculture?

Mr. GARNER. No; many stock raisers are not farmers.

Mr. FESS. I think my friend is wrong about it.

Mr. GARNER. No; there are many stock raisers who are not farmers.

A MEMBER. Would it come under the class of agriculture?

Mr. GARNER. I doubt it.

Mr. FESS. I think it is included; it was meant to be.

Mr. LEA of California. I would like to know if the gentleman would not consider a professional person to be excluded from the benefits of this bill?

Mr. FESS. I am rather inclined to think that a professional man is excluded.

Mr. LEA of California. Such as a school-teacher?

Mr. FESS. This is intended to be vocational habilitation. There was some discussion about that. If a professional man is engaged in any of these industries he would be included. We do not make the appropriation, but simply authorize a minimum of $500,000 and a maximum of $1,000,000 to be reached within three years. Then, we make the provision that no State shall receive less than $5,000, because if it is less than that it will be so spread out it will not amount to anything at all. We make a special appropriation, or authorize it, the first year for $66,000, the next $46,000, and then thereafter continuously every year $34,000 to care for this minimum.

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. If my friend will just wait a moment. In order to take care of States like Arizona, which would have gotten $1,000 on the general estimate under this law if we did not put that $5,000 provision in. The Government makes up $4,000. In reference to Colorado, the Government would have to make up $1,000 or about that. Delaware, the Government would have to make up $4,000; Florida, the Government would have to make up $1,250; Idaho, $3,500; and so on. This will sum up just about $66,000 the first year.

Mr. RAKER. I would like to ask the gentleman what interpretation the committee gave in lines 7 and 8, page 1, to the words "who are without sufficient means to provide for their own rehabilitation." Now, suppose a man had enough to take care of himself and the ordinary living of his family, but not enough so that he might go to school. He would not be excluded?

Mr. FESS. That would have to be left to the board to determine. There has been a serious and considerable contention that that ought to come out, but I have not given my assent to taking it out, and the House will have to do as it pleases about that on the basis that we do not care to enter upon the rehabilitation of somebody who can easily pay for it themselves.

Mr. RAKER. I think the question of discretion should be used. The intention does not confine it to paupers.

Mr. FESS. Oh, no.

Mr. BRIGGS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. FESS. I yield to my friend from Texas.

Mr. BRIGGS. I notice the bill originally carried the expression "industry or otherwise," and the committee strikes that

out and substitutes specifically certain trades, agriculture, and other branches of employment.

Was it the intention of the committee that all those who were disabled in industries or otherwise should have the benefit of this bill? The reason I ask is that only within the last day or two there was called to my attention the case of a constituent of mine who wanted to know whether he could take advantage of the vocational education provided now by the Government for the soldiers; that he was a druggist and had become paralyzed, and wanted to know if he could not get the benefit of an instruction that would fit him for earning a living in some capacity in his line. I do not believe that under this bill as it is drawn it will be possible for him to do so.

Mr. BANKHEAD. It says in specific terms that it allows the training of those engaged in trade and commerce.

Mr. BRIGGS. I do not know as the term of "trade and commerce" would include a druggist.

Mr. FESS. Trade, industry, or otherwise is the storm center around which the whole discussion on this bill has raged. It was thought it would be much better to specify, and that is why the limitation was placed there.

Mr. BRIGGS. I favor the provisions of this measure, and I think the limitation placed on there ought to apply to those who need it and to whom the Government should really try to give the benefits of the act.

Mr. FESS. Let me state that——

Mr. HICKS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. Let me state to the committee that I am consuming more time than I should, because I want to yield to my colleagues; and if the committee members will just excuse me a minute until I state what the bill is, then I will yield.

Mr. HICKS. Just one moment about this question here. Is it not true at the present time that the definition of the word "commerce" covers practically every pursuit in which a man is engaged?

Mr. FESS. I do not know how you would limit it, I confess. On page 3 the Members will note what the Federal board will require a State to do in order to get the money, and it is specifically stated so that there can be no doubt about it, and it is not necessary for me to read it.

Section 2 is one of the sections about which much dispute has arisen recently. It provides what the State legislature must do in order to be eligible to be a beneficiary of this fund, and in line 16, page 4, it reads:

> In those States where a State workmen's compensation board or other State board, department, or agency exists, charged with the administration of the State workmen's compensation or liability laws, the legislature shall provide that a plan of cooperation shall be formulated between such State board, department, or agency, and the State board charged with the administration of this act, such plan to be effective when approved by the governor of the State.

That is so as to make it operative. There has been a considerable objection to this bill on the ground that the State board interferes with the compensation commission. We specificially provide in the bill that States—and there are 38 in number which have the compensation commissions—will have a cooperative arrangement through the legislature between the State board of education and this compensation commission. So there can not be any ground for the statement that any particular State can not get this fund, such as has been stated in letters to Members. I have received such statements myself.

Mr. BRIGGS. As I understand it, this bill does not in any wise interfere with the State industrial accident organizations or boards. It is something entirely different and apart from that and in addition and supplementary thereto.

Mr. FESS. Exactly right. Another thing ought always to be carried in mind, that the Federal board is not stepping over into the States. The Federal board is contributing a certain amount of money to be applied by the States, of course on the approval of the Federal board. That is, the State must do it in order to meet the requirements that are published. So the idea that the Federal board is going out of its way is not pertinent at all, as is also this suggestion that the Federal board is not functioning as it ought. There is no objection to this bill on the ground that the Federal board has been in the slightest degree lax on the soldiers' disability bill. There the Federal board has all that to do, while in this bill it is the State's doing, using the Federal Government's money on the approval of the Federal board. People have not differentiated between the two.

Mr. BRIGGS. Is it contemplated in this measure that the national board in charge of vocational education for the soldiers and sailors shall administer this act, or is there to be a different board, separate and apart from this present one?

Mr. FESS. It would be the same board. I do not think Congress would agree to create more commissions.

Mr. BRIGGS. It is contemplated that the same privileges now accorded to soldiers, sailors, and marines under the present vocational bill would be accorded civilians under this bill?

Mr. FESS. Oh, no.

Mr. BRIGGS. This is more limited in its scope and is only to aid and give assistance to the States in arranging this character of relief?

Mr. FESS. The gentleman has characterized it exactly. We give under this bill nothing like we give under the bill for disabled soldiers.

I am taking so much time, and as there are members of the committee who want to be heard, I will reserve the balance of my time.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio has used 30 minutes.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I will reserve the balance of my time, and later on I will endeavor to answer questions.

Mr. RAKER. The gentleman is familiar with this subject. Before he yields up his time may I ask him what is the objection to striking out all the limitations in the first section and simply saying "Rehabilitation of any disabled person, disabled in any lawful business or vocation." Is not that what we ought to do?

Mr. FESS. I think we ought to leave the discretion somewhere with somebody, which should be the Federal Board; and it would be better, it seems to me, to define in the law precisely what we expect to do. I realize that what the gentleman says is a subject of interest that has been discussed in the corridors of the House Office Building for some time. It has come to me. But under the five-minute rule I hope opportunity will be given for full discussion.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 15 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD].

Mr. CANNON. Will the gentleman yield for a motion that the committee rise?

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rules it is provided that the time shall be divided.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Chairman, I do not care to speak if the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS] wants to move to rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Massachusetts desire the floor?

Mr. WALSH. No. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. MADDEN, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 4438) to provide for the promotion of vocational rehabilitation of persons disabled in industry or otherwise and their return to civil employment, had come to no resolution thereon.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE.

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted as follows:

To Mr. FOSTER, for one week, on account of important busines.

To. Mr. SCOTT (at the request of Mr. MAPES), on account of illness.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SAUNDERS of Virginia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks made in connection with the parliamentary questions that were under discussion to-day.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD as indicated. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 25 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, October 10, 1919, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting copy of a communication from the Secretary of Labor submitting an estimate of appropriation required for expenses incident to the international conference of labor, authorized by Senate joint resolution 80 (H. Doc. No. 260), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, from the Committee on the District of Columbia, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 9036) to repeal and annul certain parts of the charter and lease granted and made to the Washington Market Co. by act of Congress entitled "An act to incorporate the Washington Market Co.," approved May 20, 1870, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 364), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas, from the Committee on Rules, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 329) providing for the consideration of the conference report on House bill 8624, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 366), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 330) providing for the consideration of Senate joint resolution 90, a resolution restoring American citizenship to Frances Scoville-Mumm, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 367), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the resolution (H. Res. 331) providing for the consideration of the conference report on House bill 6810, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 368), which said resolution and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII,

Mr. KNUTSON, from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 90) to readmit Frances Scoville-Mumm to the character and privileges of a citizen of the United States, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 363), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

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. 9727) granting an increase of pension to Josiah J. Sikes; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9520) granting a pension to Euphrates Huff; Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 9731) granting an increase of pension to William D. Reed; 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. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 9818) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Chester, Hancock County, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Nebraska: A bill (H. R. 9819) authorizing the Winnebago Tribe of Indians of Wisconsin and Nebraska to submit claims to the Court of Claims; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 9820) to create a rent commission in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. GOULD: A bill (H. R. 9821) to amend an act entitled "An act relating to the Metropolitan police of the District of Columbia," approved February 28, 1901, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 9822) to authorize the President of the United States to arrange and participate in an international conference to consider questions relating to international communication; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GREENE of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 9823) for the repeal of certain legislation connected with the upbuilding of the American merchant marine, and providing for the disposition, regulation, or use of the property built or acquired by the United States under such acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 9824) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Revere, in the State of Massachusetts, cannon, helmets, or any other form of trophies of the present war; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. EVANS of Montana: A bill (H. R. 9825) authorizing any land-grant railroad company, or its successors, to convey for public-road purposes, certain parts of its right of way; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RIDDICK: A bill (H. R. 9826) to validate certain declarations of intention to become citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: Resolution (H. Res. 328) for the appointment of a committee of three to investigate the charges of political influence in appointments for commissioned officers of the Army and Navy; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. WHALEY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 226) authorizing the establishment of a free port at Charleston, S. C.; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RIDDICK: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 227) for the relief of the Fort Peck Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AYRES: A bill (H. R. 9827) for the relief of E. H. Wolf; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DRANE: A bill (H. R. 9828) granting an increase of pension to James H. St. Clair; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9829) granting a pension to James D. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. EMERSON: A bill (H. R. 9830) granting a pension to Fred R. Rife; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER of Massachusetts: A bill (H. R. 9831) granting an increase of pension to George Milton Frye; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 9832) granting an increase of pension to Victor Fousse; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9833) granting a pension to Hugh T. Roberts; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9834) granting a pension to Mary C. Herrington; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9835) granting a pension to Charles Anderson; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9836) granting an increase of pension to Frank L. Yost; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HARDY of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 9837) granting an increase of pension to Irving Reed; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HAYS: A bill (H. R. 9838) granting a pension to John Johnson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 9839) granting an increase of pension to John Hutchison; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of South Dakota: A bill (H. R. 9840) for the relief of E. V. Dickson; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. KELLEY of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 9841) for the relief of Nehemiah Purdy; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. KENDALL: A bill (H. R. 9842) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Sutton; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MICHENER: A bill (H. R. 9843) to carry into effect the findings of the Court of Claims in favor of Myron C. Bond, Guy M. Claflin, and Edwin A. Wells; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. RICKETTS: A bill (H. R. 9844) granting an increase of pension to James F. Comley; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VARE: A bill (H. R. 9845) granting a pension to Alice J. Goeble; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of Mr. F. DeW. Armour, president, Branch No. 1, New York National Association of United States Civil Service Employees, Navy Yards and Stations, favoring an increase of not less than 40 per cent in salaries of all clerical employees of the various naval establishments; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Snoqualmie Tribe, No. 5, Improved Order of Red Men, asking Congress to grant to all American Indians full rights of American citizenship; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

Also, petition of Rev. John Field Speel, of Albany, N. Y., relating to the withdrawal of the British troops; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of the First Christian Church of Ashland, Ohio, favoring full citizenship for all American Indians; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CURRY of California: Petition of Sacramento (Calif.) Valley Development Association, in favor of the development and equipment of the United States arsenal at Benicia, Calif., as a manufacturing arsenal; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers to accompany House bill 9679, granting a pension to Belle Thompson Alter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of sundry ex soldiers, sailors, and marines, urging Congress to grant an additional bonus to honorably discharged ex-service men; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KENNEDY of Iowa: Petition of United States Naval Training Station, Great Lakes, Ill., favoring legislation to increase pay of United States civil-service employees at the navy yards and stations; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Lawton Camp, No. 2, United Spanish War Veterans, to incorporate in bill to appropriate public moneys for the purpose of giving a bonus of $30 per month to each soldier, etc., of the World War, a like provision for the soldiers, etc., of the Spanish-American War; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MACGREGOR: Petition of American citizens of Lithuanian origin, appealing to the President of the United States and the United States Congress to give moral support to the Lithuanian people in their struggle against the Bolsheviki and Polish militarism by recognizing the Lithuanian Republic as an independent State; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of United Brotherhood of Maintenance of Way Employees and Railway Shop Laborers, of Detroit, Mich., protesting against the passage of the so-called Cummins bill; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. RAMSEYER: Petition of Lawton Camp, No. 2, United Spanish War Veterans, asking that all soldiers, sailors, and marines who served their country during the War with Spain and the Philippine insurrection be given a bonus of $30; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WATSON of Pennsylvania: Resolution adopted on October 6, 1919, at a regular monthly meeting of Perkiomen Post, No. 184, of the American Legion, East Greenville, Pa., indorsing and approving the action and purpose of the congressional investigating committee to place responsibility for unnecessary wrongs inflicted against officers and soldiers of the American Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, statement presented by Joseph Mather, clerk of the Middletown monthly meeting of Friends, at Langhorne, Pa., and signed by Arthur Edwin Bye, Wilhelmina B. Ivins, and Marion H. Longshore, protesting against Senate bills 2691 and 2715, providing for compulsory military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: Petition of the Yarmouth Board of Trade, favoring the passage of House bill 6814 with amendments so as to make the duty on potato starch and potato flour 3 cents per pound; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. YATES: Petitions of W. F. Hall Printing Co., Chicago; Noll Hauworth Co., Quincy; Variety Manufacturing Co., Chicago; Illinois Tool Works, 154 East Erie Street, Chicago; American Building Foundry Co., Chicago; Morden Frog & Crossing Works, Chicago; Morman Manufacturing Co., Quincy; American Distilling Co., Pekin; Wilson Provision Co., Pekin; John A. Gauger & Co., Chicago; and George D. Roper, Rockford, all of the State of Illinois, protesting against the closed shop; to the Committee on Labor.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *October 10, 1919.*

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

Almighty God, justice and judgment are the habitation of Thy throne, and Thou hast called us to be coworkers together with Thee to establish the great principles upon which Thy kingdom rests in the earth. We pray Thee to help us to be willing and glad servants of Thine, to perform the duties that are upon us as in Thy sight, and to receive at the close of each day of our labor the consciousness that we have wrought in harmony with the will of God. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. CURTIS 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	Hale	Moses	Smith, Ariz.
Ball	Harris	Myers	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Harrison	Nelson	Smith, Md.
Brandegee	Henderson	New	Smoot
Calder	Hitchcock	Newberry	Spencer
Capper	Kellogg	Norris	Stanley
Chamberlain	Kendrick	Overman	Sutherland
Culberson	Keyes	Page	Thomas
Curtis	King	Phelan	Townsend
Dial	Kirby	Pittman	Trammell
Elkins	Knox	Poindexter	Underwood
Fernald	La Follette	Pomerene	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Lenroot	Reed	Walsh, Mass.
Frelinghuysen	Lodge	Robinson	Walsh, Mont.
Gay	McCormick	Sheppard	Warren
Gerry	McCumber	Sherman	Williams
Gronna	McNary	Shields	Wolcott

Mr. PHELAN. I desire to announce that there is an important meeting of the Committee on Immigration and that Senators GORE, DILLINGHAM, COLT, and NUGENT are in attendance on that committee, who requested that the fact be reported to the Senate.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I wish to state that the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] are absent on official business.

Mr. CURTIS. I wish to announce that the Senator from Iowa [Mr. KENYON], the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. STERLING] are absent on official business.

Mr. GERRY. I desire to announce that the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. SMITH], and the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. JOHNSON] are detained by illness in their families. I ask that this announcement may stand for the day. I also wish to announce that the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SIMMONS], the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. JONES], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. BANKHEAD], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. NUGENT], and the Senator from Louisiana [Mr. RANSDELL] are detained on official business. The Senator from Tennessee [Mr. MCKELLAR] is necessarily detained from the Senate in attendance on a meeting of the Committee on Education and Labor.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to the roll call. There is a quorum present.

CLAIM OF ROBERT A. LAUGHLIN (S. DOC. NO. 125).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting, pursuant to law, a judgment rendered by the Court of Claims in favor of Robert A. Laughlin amounting to $215.76 and requiring an appropriation for its payment, which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

SCHEDULES OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 126).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury transmitting schedules of claims in the amount of $353,920.50 allowed by the several account officers of the Treasury Department under appropriations the balances of which have been exhausted or carried to the surplus fund under the provisions of section 5 of the act of June 28, 1874, 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 a bill (H. R. 7779) to repeal the act entitled "An act to promote reciprocal trade relations with the Dominion of Canada, and for other purposes," approved July 26, 1911, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. CURTIS. I present resolutions in regard to increased pensions for Indian war veterans, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

There being no objection, the resolutions were referred to the Committee on Pensions and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON RESOLUTIONS.

The Indian war veterans in convention assembled do hereby resolve: That mindful of the courtesies extended to the organization by the citizens of Wichita, Kans., and proud of the fact that they have materially prospered, hereby extend our thanks for the courtesies received.