By Mr. HICKS: A bill (H. R. 12774) for the purpose of improving the facilities and service of the Bureau of War Risk Insurance; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 12775) to amend an act entitled "An act for making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: A bill (H. R. 12776) to establish the provisions of the act entitled "An act for the relief of Indians occupying railroad lands in Arizona, New Mexico, or California"; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CALDWELL: A bill (H. R. 12777) to further amend section 10 of the act entitled "An act making further and more effectual provision for the national defense, and for other purposes," approved June 3, 1916; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MASON: Resolution (H. Res. 472) asking the Military Affairs Committee of the House to investigate and report to the House whether our lack of preparedness in the late war was on account of inefficient soldiers or inefficient citizens; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. DALE: Resolution (H. Res. 473) authorizing the appointment of a clerk to the Committee on Expenditures in the Treasury Department; to the Committee on Accounts.

By the SPEAKER: Memorial of the Legislature of the State of New Jersey, urging the United States Government to acknowledge the independence of the Irish republic; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. LUFKIN: Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the establishment by the United States Department of Agriculture of a forest experiment station in the White Mountain National Forest; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. DALLINGER: Memorial of the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts, relative to the establishment by the United States Department of Agriculture of a forest experiment station in the White Mountain National Park; to the Committee on Agriculture.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. BEE: A bill (H. R. 12778) for the relief of the Dittlinger Lime Co.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FISHER: A bill (H. R. 12779) conferring jurisdiction upon the Court of Claims to hear, examine, consider, determine, and adjudicate the claims of Marion B. Patterson; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. LESHER: A bill (H. R. 12780) to correct the military record of Eugene Downing; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. MAPES: A bill (H. R. 12781) granting an increase of pension to Ida C. Brandon; to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 12782) granting a pension to Emanuel F. Oliver; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. ROGERS: A bill (H. R. 12783) granting a pension to Anthony D. Mitten; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 12784) granting an increase of pension to Luther Van Arman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WHITE of Maine: A bill (H. R. 12785) granting an increase of pension to Patrick A. Galvin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILSON of Louisiana: A bill (H. R. 12786) authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to sell and patent to Spencer F. Griffin, of Catahoula Parish, La., certain lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

1883. By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of the education commission of the Methodist Episcopal Church South and the Board of Missions of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, urging Congress to take action for the relief of the people of Europe and Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1884. By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of the International Iron Molders' Union, of Mansfield, Ohio, against the Sterling-Graham sedition bill, etc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1885. Also, petition of Eugene Laughlin, of Warsaw, Ohio, and 112 other citizens of Coshocton County, Ohio, favoring the so-called shoddy bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

1886. By Mr. BROOKS of Pennsylvania: Petition of the Rev. B. C. Witmore and members of his church, of Hanover, Pa., urging the passage of House bill 1112; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1887. By Mr. DENISON: Petition of William Madison Hicks, chairman, and C. H. James, secretary, and numerous other citizens of West Frankfort, Ill., urging favorable consideration of House bill 1112, providing for the parole of Federal prisoners; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

1888. By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of citizens of Rockford, Peru, Earlville, Mendota, and Garden Prairie, Ill., opposing the sale of the former German ships; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1889. Also, petition of Capt. Frank H. Billig, of Rockford, Ill., relative to the bonus for the soldiers of the late war; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

1890. By Mr. GALLIVAN: Petition of citizens of Dorchester and Boston, Mass., relative to the bonus for Government employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1891. By Mr. GOLDFOGLE: Petition of Frank Hollander and Rosie Hollander, Jake Sheriff and Minnie Sheriff, Arthur Hall and Sam Hall, M. Wasser, Joe Goldfinger, Tillie Hecht, Julius Myer, Mrs. Myer, Abe Meyer, Isadore Myer, and Mrs. I. Myer, all of New York City, protesting against the sale of the former German ships; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

1892. By Mr. McARTHUR: Petition of the City Council of the city of Portland, Oreg., relative to the protection of the timber from fire, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1893. Also, petition of the City Council of the City of Portland, Oreg., relative to certain legislation regarding roads built to the national forests, etc.; to the Committee on Roads.

1894. By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Victor B. Bridgman Post, No. 44, Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States, favoring the passage of House bill 5766; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1895. Also, petition of the Merchants' Association of New York, protesting against the passage of certain sections of House bill 12610; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1896. Also, petition of J. H. Williams & Co., Brooklyn, N. Y., urging the restoration of the commercial attachés service eliminated by the House Appropriation Committee; to the Committee on Appropriations.

1897. By Mr. SIEGEL: Petition of the New York County United States Spanish War Veterans, protesting against the postal rate from 2 cents to 1 cent; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

1898. By Mr. SMITH of Idaho: Petition of the board of county commissioners of Gooding County, Gooding, Idaho, and the Twentieth Century Club, of Twin Falls, Idaho, relative to Federal appropriations for the construction of roads; to the Committee on Roads.

1899. By Mr. TIMBERLAKE: Petition of the Sagebrush Post, No. 68, the American Legion, of Brush, Colo., relative to legislation regarding the bonus to the soldiers, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1900. Also, petition of sundry citizens of the cities of Akron and Flagler, of the State of Colorado, protesting against universal military training, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1901. Also, petition of citizens of the counties of Lincoln, Elbert, Kit Carson, and Cheyenne, of the State of Colorado, protesting against the Kahn military bill, etc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

1902. By Mr. WATSON: Petition of citizens of Fairview Village, Montgomery County, Pa., in favor of the Sterling-Lehlbach bill; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

1903. By Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota: Petition of William G. Carroll Post, American Legion, Minet, N. Dak., urging the passage of House bill 11553, providing for the soldiers' settlement in Imperial Valley, Calif., and means to irrigate such lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, *February 27, 1920.*

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

Almighty God, Thou dost know the secrets of all hearts. We can not dissemble from Thee and cloak our sins. We pray that the sanctifying influence of Thy Spirit may cleanse our hearts of everything that is evil in Thy sight, that we may present our lives spotless and blameless before Thee. Grant this day that the service we may render shall be all the service possible through us to our fellow men. May we be guided by Thy Holy Spirit, that our work begun, continued, and ended in Thee may be acceptable in Thy sight. For Christ's sake. Amen.

AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

On request of Mr. CURTIS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of yesterday's proceedings was dispensed with and the Journal was approved.

THE ADRIATIC QUESTION.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to have published as a Senate document the correspondence relating to the Adriatic question, and I ask unanimous consent that that may be done.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Would the Senator object to having it printed in the RECORD also?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think it would be very desirable to have that done.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. It is not usual to have both courses taken, but I think in this instance, it being a state paper, it ought to be done.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I perfectly agree with that.

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

The correspondence referred to is as follows:

JOINT MEMORANDUM OF DECEMBER 9, 1919.

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
February 26, 1920.

The text of the joint memorandum signed on December 9 by Premier Clemenceau for France, Sir Eyre Crowe for England, and Undersecretary Frank L. Polk for the United States reads as follows:

PARIS, *December 9, 1919.*

The following memoranda were signed by Clemenceau, Crowe, and myself at the close of the meeting of the Supreme Council at Quai d'Orsay this morning:

"At the moment when the peace conference is entering what it is hoped may be the last stage of its labors for the conclusion of peace with Germany, Austria, and Hungary, the territorial settlement still remains incomplete in respect of regions which the (?) uncertainty is calculated to affect gravely the vital interests of the countries directly involved and might easily endanger the peace of Europe and of the world.

"Being persuaded that this danger could only grow in intensity if the peace conference were to terminate before an agreement had been reached among the principal allied and associated powers concerning the Adriatic question, the representatives of the conference of America, Great Britain, and France desire to call the attention of their Italian colleague to the urgent necessity of finding a solution. They realize fully the difficulties with which the Italian Government is confronted in dealing with this problem, but it is precisely for this reason that they believe that it would be unjust to all the parties concerned, and in the first place to Italy herself, were they any longer to delay putting frankly before the Italian Government a statement of the position such as they see it after many months of examination and reflection. The friends of Italy therefore feel impelled to make a further effort to reach a settlement which would be the fulfillment of her legitimate aims and aspirations with the equitable claims of the neighboring States as well as with the supreme interests of the peace of the world.

"The three representatives, accordingly, venture to invite the Italian Government to proceed to a fresh survey of the field in the light of the statement which they have now the honor to make.

"The British and French representatives have followed with earnest and sympathetic attention the negotiations which have passed between the Italian Government and the President of the United States. If they have hitherto refrained from tendering their direct advice to the Italian Government in the matter, it was because they had hoped the Italian Government would be able to reach an agreement with President Wilson to which the British and French Governments could readily subscribe. It will be remembered that the British and French Governments have already, more particularly by their note communicated to President Wilson on September 10th, used their best efforts to promote such an agreement which the President's answer to that note gave every reason to hope could be brought about. Though a complete agreement has not so far been arrived at, the points of difference still outstanding have been so much reduced as to justify an expectation that complete accord will now be reached.

"It is well, with this view, to place on record, in the first place, the chief points on which agreement has been reached. This is all the more desirable as it would appear from recent official Italian statements that some misapprehension may exist in regard to matters which can readily be cleared up, such, for instance, as the exact description of what is generally referred to as President's Wilson's line. The points of agreement are, in the main, embodied in the American memorandum communicated to the Italian delegation in Paris on October 27th.

"(1) With regard to Istria, President Wilson had from the first agreed to a frontier running from the Arsa River to the Karawanken Mountains, which widely overstepped the recognized ethnical line between Italy and Yugoslavia and which would have, as a result, to incorporate in Italy, more than three hundred thousand Yugoslavs. Italy's geographical position, as well as her economic requirements, was held to justify this serious infringement of the ethnic principle and President Wilson, anxious to give the fullest value to these important considerations, went still further in agreeing to an extension eastward in such a way as to give to Italy the region of Albona in spite of the considerable additional number of Yugoslavs thereby incorporated.

"Moreover, to strengthen the strategic security of Italy, President Wilson, in agreement with the Italian Government, has indorsed the creation of a buffer State between the Italian territory in Istria and the Serb-Croat-Slovene Kingdom in which some two hundred thousand Yugoslavs, as against less than forty thousand Italians, will be placed under the control of the League of Nations. Anxious to remove any conceivable strategetic menace that Italy might fear from the Serb-Croat-Slovene State, President Wilson has agreed, and the British and French Governments are glad to associate themselves with this agreement, that the so-called Assling region shall be permanently demilitarized. The three representatives would be happy to learn from the Italian Government whether slight modification of the demilitarized zone between the Arsa River and Cape Promotore are deemed necessary to safeguard the security of the defenses on Italian territory.

"(2) There is complete agreement concerning the creation, in the interest of Italy, of the buffer State to be known as the (free State of Fiume?) and its control by the League of Nations. Ethnic considerations would demand that this State, containing two hundred thousand Yugoslavs, should be afforded an opportunity by plebiscite to decide its own fate. In deference to Italy's objection that the incorporation of this region in the Serb-Croat-Slovene State by free act of the inhabitants might create a real menace, it is now agreed that the determination of the whole future of the State shall be left to the League of Nations, which, in conformity with Italian requirements, shall not fail to provide the full measure of autonomy which the city of Fiume enjoyed under Austro-Hungarian rule.

"(3) The three representatives are glad to record their appreciation of the wisdom and moderation which have marked the attitude of the Italian Government toward the difficult question of Dalmatia. They feel that the Italian Government has acted on an enlightened view of their higher interests in officially withdrawing territorial claims to an area where, to enforce them, would have meant permanent discord with the inhabitants of the Serb-Croat-Slovene State and prevented all possibility of friendly relations with them. In order, however, to safeguard every Italian racial and sentimental interest it has been agreed that the city of Zara shall enjoy a special régime. Its geographical position indicates Zara as a part of the Yugoslavs State, but, provided the town is left within the Yugoslavs customs union, it is to be given complete sovereignty under the League of Nations and freedom to control its own affairs.

"(4) The same wisdom and moderation as that which had marked the attitude of the Italian Government toward the Dalmatian question have characterized their attitude as regards the islands in the Adriatic. The Italian Government appears to be at one with President Wilson in realizing the necessary racial, geographic, and political connection of the Dalmatian coastal islands with the Yugoslav State. On the other hand, the possession of certain outlying islands, though ethnically Yugoslav and economically connected with Yugoslavia, are considered by the Italian Government necessary to Italy's strategic control of the Adriatic, and the reasonableness of this claim has been accepted, the following islands being accorded to Italy on a demilitarized status, namely: (*a*) The Pelagosa group, (*b*) Lissa and the small islands west of it, (*c*) Lussin and Unie. These islands are to pass in full sovereignty to Italy, who, on her part, is to make an agreement with the Slav population of Lissa providing for their complete local autonomy.

"(5) Italy is to receive a mandate for the administration of the independent State of Albania under the League of Nations. Attached to the present memorandum is an outline of the form which, in the opinion of the three representatives, such a mandate should take. The frontiers of Albania on the north and east at present will be those fixed by the London conference in 1913; the southern frontier is still a matter for negotiation. In order, however, not to delay a general settlement by such nego-

tiations, the following provisional arrangement could be adopted: Greece shall occupy the territory west and south of a demarcation line, which shall run as follows (reference one million two hundred thousand Austrian staff map): From Mount Tumba, on the northern boundary of Greece, northwestward along the crest of the Nemercha Ridge to the Vojusa River; thence down that river to Teleleni, Mirica, to point 98; thence south, passing between the villages of Lopsi-Martolozit and Zemblan; thence through points 1840 and 1225 to a point about two miles south by east of 1225; thence westward, passing just north of Poljana; thence southeast to point 1669; thence west and northwest to point 2025; thence southwestward to the coast, just south of Asprhyonruga. The triangle of territory from point 98, on the Vojusa River, between Baba and Sinanaj, northeastward to Lake Malik and southward to the Greek frontier and the demarcation line mentioned above should be the subject of later negotiation between the three allied representatives, on the one hand, and Italy and Greece on the other, the three allied representatives acting for Albania.

"(6) The city of Valonia, together with such hinterland as may be strictly necessary to its defense and economic development, is to be granted to Italy in full sovereignty.

"The above six points in their general aspect are those on which, after many months' negotiation, the Italian Government have happily reached an agreement with the President of the United States. They afford to Italy full satisfaction of her historic national aspirations, based on the desire to unite the Italian race; they give her the absolute strategic control of the Adriatic; they offer her complete guard against constitutional guarantees against whatever aggressions she might fear in the future from her Yugoslav neighbors, an aggression which the three representatives on their part consider as most improbable if the lines of a just and lasting settlement are reached. They have even carried their concern for Italian security to the point of neutralizing the Dalmatian Islands and adjacent waters from the northern border of the Ragusa region to Fiume. The three representatives therefore venture very earnestly to urge on the Italian Government in the most friendly spirit that they should reflect on the great advantages which the above settlement, following on that which gave to Italy the frontiers of the Alps, would bring her and the great moral and material triumph with which its successful conclusions would now provide the Italian Government.

"Anxious, however, to give the most sympathetic consideration to every Italian interest or sentiment, the three representatives have carefully examined in all their bearings certain further demands, which the Italian Government have presented under the following four heads: A. Control by Italy of the diplomatic relations of Zara. B. An arrangement by which the city of Fiume the so-called (corpus separatum) should be dissociated from the free State of Fiume and made completely independent, though its port and railway should be left to the free State. C. Direct connection of the city of Fiume (with the ?), Italian Province of Istria, by the annexation to Italy of a long, narrow strip of territory running along the coast from Fiume to Volosca between the railway and the sea, the Italian frontier in Istria being pushed eastward so as to include the whole peninsula within Italy. D. Annexation to Italy of the island of Lagosta.

"With regard to the first point, the representation of Zara, there ought to be no difficulty in satisfying the national Italian demand that this small historic Italian town shall preserve its Italian character both in its internal administration and in its representation abroad. It is already conceded that (beyond such connection with Yugoslavia as Zara shall have by its incorporation in the Serb-Croat-Slovene customs union) the city shall be completely independent under the League of Nations. The city will therefore be entirely free to decide, subject to the approval of the League of Nations, how it shall be diplomatically represented abroad. If, as is contended, the city is completely Italian, its choice will naturally be made in accordance with the Italian claims, and it is hoped that in this way entire satisfaction will be given to the desire of the Italian Government. The Italian proposal to withdraw the city of Fiume, except its port, from the free State, is one which has been found seriously perplexing. The main object of the creation of a buffer State between Italy and Yugoslavia was precisely to guarantee on the one hand Italian strategic security, and on the other the prosperity and development of Fiume. It is not understood how it would be possible for the so-called buffer State to exist without Fiume, and still less, how it would be possible for Fiume to exist except within the buffer State. Fiume and the buffer State are absolutely dependent one on the other, and any arrangement which removed Fiume from the buffer State would put an end to the prosperity alike of the city and of its hinterland. Mindful of the sentimental feeling aroused in Italy by the question of Fiume, the three representatives have always believed that a practicable plan could be devised whereby the city of Fiume within the buffer State should enjoy a privileged position. With this object in view they propose for Fiume precisely the same degree of autonomy as the city had under Austro-Hungarian rule. It is believed that this provision and the watchful and sympathetic interest of the League of Nations will guarantee to Italy full protection for the Italian ethnic and cultural elements at Fiume. With absolute sovereignty vested in the League of Nations and with Italy represented in the council of the league, every Italian interest will be fully safeguarded. Moreover, to separate the city of Fiume from the buffer State could not fail to lead to a protest against the very establishment of such a buffer State, which under such conditions would be inhabited entirely by Yugoslavs. With respect to the new Italian proposal for the annexation to Italy of a long, narrow, strip of coast from Fisnona to the gates of the city of Amann there are difficulties of a practical nature. The reason for which the Italian Government have made this demand is stated to be a purely sentimental one, namely, the desire that the city of Fiume should not be separated from Italy by any intervening foreign country. No doubt such a sentimental reason may be of great importance in the eyes of the Italian Government, but it would appear to rest on a misapprehension of the real position of Fiume. The creation of the buffer State, which is to be completely independent of Yugoslavia, was, among other reasons, probably intended to safeguard the position of Fiume; and the free State of which Fiume must, as indicated in the preceding paragraph, form an essential part is already in direct contact with the Kingdom of Italy not only by sea but by a long land frontier of approximately a hundred miles. Full effect therefore is already given to the sentimental considerations to which the Italian Government attach so much value; in fact, the new Italian plan would not achieve this object so well, as in practice it is to be feared that it would be quite unworkable. The Italian Government does not propose to interfere with the railway connecting Fiume with the north, which they admit is to remain within the free State. This railway runs for a considerable distance along coast, and the Italian proposal amounts, so far as this region is concerned, to cutting off from the free State and incorporating with Italy the line of sandy and barren beach intervening between the railway and the sea. Whilst the injury to the free State, which would in this eccentric way be entirely cut off from its only seaboard, is obvious and unmeasurable, it is not easy to understand what would be the benefit to Italy, unless it be considered a benefit to her that the free State should be so crippled. Nor does it seem necessary to dwell on the extraordinary complexities that would arise as regards customs control, coast-guard services, and cognate matters in a territory of such unusual configuration.

"The plan appears to run counter to every consideration of geography, economics, and territorial convenience, and it may perhaps be assumed that if these considerations were overlooked by the Italian Government this was due to their having connected it in their mind with the question of annexing to Italy all that remains of the Yugo-Slav portion of the peninsula of Istria.

"This question of further annexation of Yugo-Slav territory is raised quite unambiguously, both by the demand for the whole of Istria and by the proposal to annex the island of Lagosta. In neither case do even considerations of strategy arise, for the strategical command of the Adriatic is already completely assured to Italy by the possession of Trieste, Pola, the islands facing Fiume, Pelagosa, and Valona. Additional security is afforded by the proposed demilitarization of the whole free State of Fiume, together with a large zone lying to the north of it, and of the small portion of Istria remaining to the free (?) of Fiume.

"Economic consideration being equally excluded, there remains nothing but a desire for further territory. Now, the territories coveted are admittedly inhabited by Yugo-Slavs. They contain practically no Italian elements. This being so, it is necessary to refer to the way in which President Wilson, with the cordial approval of Great Britain and France, has met every successive Italian demand for the absorption in Italy of territories inhabited by peoples not Italian and not in favor of being absorbed. On this point the following passage may be quoted from a telegram addressed to Signor Tittoni by the Secretary of State at Washington on November 12:

"'Your excellency can not fail to recognize that the attitude of the American Government throughout the negotiations has been one of sincere sympathy for Italy and of an earnest desire to meet her demands. Italy claimed a frontier on the Brenner

Pass, and the demand was granted in order to assure to Italy the greatest possible protection on her northern front, although it involved annexing to Italy a considerable region populated by alien inhabitants. Italy demanded further a strong geographic eastern frontier, and this likewise was granted in order to assure her abundant protection, although it involved incorporation with Italian boundaries of further territory populated by alien inhabitants. Italy demands the redemption of her brothers under foreign sovereignty, and every effort was made to meet this wish, even in certain cases where by so doing much greater numbers of foreign races were brought within Italian sovereignty. Italy demanded complete naval control of the Adriatic, and this was granted by according her the three keys of the Adriatic—Pola, Valona, and a central island base. When all this failed to satisfy Italian claims there was added concession to concession at Sextan Valley, at Tarvis, at Albona, in the Lussin Islands, in the terms of the Fiume free State, and elsewhere. In our desire to deal generously, even more than generously, we yielded Italy's demand for an Italian mandate over Albania, always hoping to meet from Italy's statesmen a generous response to our efforts at conciliation.'

"To the considerations thus urged by Mr. Lansing the three representatives desire to add another argument. In doing so they trust the Italian Government will not credit them with any desire to give advice on questions of Italian high policy, on which the Italian Government will rightly claim to be the best judge. But an appeal to an historical argument may be permitted to the representative of three countries to whom the liberation of Italian territories from foreign domination has been a matter of unwavering concern and sympathy through generations of noble and often terrible struggles. Modern Italy won the place in the hearts of all liberty loving peoples, which she has never since lost by the pure spirit of her patriotism, which set before her people the generous aim of uniting under the Italian flag those extensive Provinces formerly within the ancient Italian boundaries which were and have remained essentially Italian territories in virtue of their compact Italian population. The sympathies of the world have accompanied Italy's advance to the outer borders of Italia Irridenta in pursuit of the sacred principle, the self-determination of the peoples. This principle is now invoked by other nations. Not invariably is it possible, owing to the complicated interaction of racial, geographical, economic, and strategical factors, to do complete justice to the ethnic principle. Small isolated communities surrendered and outnumbered by populations of different race can not in most cases be attached to the territory of their own nation from which they are effectively separated. But the broad principle remains that it is neither just nor expedient to annex as the spoils of war territories inhabited by an alien race, anxious and capable to maintain a separate national State or irridentism exactly analogous in kind to that which justified the demand of Italia Irridenta for union with the Italian State.

"The three representatives venture with all deference to express the opinion that in declining to agree to the incorporation of more Yugo-Slav territory they are acting in the highest interest of the Italian Nation itself.

"From this point of view, the inclusion in Italy of purely Yugo-Slav territories, where neither security nor geographical or economical considerations compel annexation, is not in itself a commendable policy. It would be bound to create within the Italian borders a compact body.

"The three representatives would make an earnest appeal to the Italian Government to seize the present most fovorable of opportunities for arriving at a friendly agreement with them for the immediate conclusion and permanent guaranty of the definite settlement on lines which they venture to think fully realize all the legitimate national aspirations of Italy and fully safeguard her preeminent position in the Adriatic. A settlement based on the foundations which Italy, in conjunction with her allies, could thereby lay would have given a means of reconciling interest at present divergent and of offering Italy an opportunity for rendering more cordial and solid her relations with the new nations who are her neighbors and to whom she could furnish such valuable assistance and economic support as her resources and experience entitle her to offer.

"The spirit of moderation which was characterized in the recent attitude of the Italian Government leads the three representatives to hope that this appeal from Italy's American, British, and French allies will not pass unheeded, and that the Italian Government will, by assuring definite agreement with their allies, place on firm foundations the great moral and material triumphs to which Italy's efforts and sacrifices throughout the war have so justly entitled her.

"The United States, British, and French Governments desire to recognize the independence of the Albanian State. They consider that the State of Albania will require, to the extent indicated in paragraph 4 of article 22 of the covenant of the League of Nations, 'the administrative advice and assistance' of one of the great powers. For this task Italy, by her great geographical situation and economic capacity, is primarily indicated.

"The United States, British, and French Governments are anxious therefore to intrust to Italy a mandate over the State of Albania under the conditions implied in the covenant of the League of Nations. They consider that these conditions should form the basis of Italy's acceptance of this mandate and should be in a convention to be concluded between the Italian Government and the Governments of the principal allied and associated powers. The headings of such a convention would be the following:

"One. Albania is recognized as an independent State within the frontiers indicated in the body of the covering memorandum.

"Nothing in these stipulations shall, however, prevent the Albanian State from negotiating with the Serb-Croat-Slovene State such region rectifications as may be in accord with local ethnographic and economic requirements.

"Two. The Serb-Croat-Slovene Government shall have the right to construct and operate railways through northern Albania north of parallel 41° 15′ and otherwise to enjoy full privileges of international purport across northern Albania.

"Three. The right to control the development of the Boyana River shall be vested in the council of the League of Nations, with power to delegate the work to either Italy or the Serb-Croat-Slovene State under proper restrictions. It is assumed for this purpose that Montenegro will form part of the Serb-Croat-Slovene State.

"Four. A commission shall forthwith be established, consisting of a representative of the Italian Government, a representative of the League of Nations, and a representative of the Albanian State, who shall be designated by the principal allied and associated powers, for the purpose of elaborating (a) the terms of the mandate to be intrusted to Italy over Albania and (b) the organization of the future State of Albania. This commission shall terminate its labors within five months from the signature of this convention and will address a report thereon, with the necessary recommendation, to the council of the League of Nations. The final decision as to the terms of the mandate and the organization shall be made by the council of the league acting by a majority vote.

"Five. The commission foreshadowed in the above paragraph shall base its deliberation not only on the considerations above outlined but also on the following principles:

"(a) The freedom of conscience and the free and outward exercise of all forms of worship, the complete liberty in education and linguistic matters of all the inhabitants of the State of Albania.

"(b) The organization, in so far as may be compatible with the tradition of the country and the exercise of efficient administration, of legislative and administrative bodies representing all sections of the population.

"(c) The prevention of the exploitation of the country or its colonization in a manner liable to militate against the interests of the native inhabitants. Under this heading would be included any recommendations which the commission might make as to improvements in the existing system of land tenure.

"(d) The eventual creation of gendarmerie, the senior officers of which may be nationals of the mandatory power. The mandatory power shall have the right for a period of two years from the date of which the mandate is conferred and pending the organization of the native gendarmerie the request for armed forces in the country. After that period the State of Albania shall be permanently demilitarized, and no power shall be allowed to maintain regular forces in the country without the sanction of the council of the League of Nations."

BRITISH-FRENCH REVISED PROPOSALS OF JANUARY 14, 1920.

The following is a paraphrase of the text of the British-French revised proposals, as accepted by Premier Nitti and handed to the Jugoslav delegation by Premier Clemenceau on January 14.

THE ADRIATIC QUESTION—REVISED PROPOSALS HANDED TO THE JUGOSLAV DELEGATES BY M. CLEMENCEAU ON THE AFTERNOON OF JANUARY 14, 1920.

"(1) There shall be an independent State, under the guarantee of the League of Nations, consisting of the corpus separatum of Fiume. The right of this independent State to choose its own diplomatic representation shall be accorded. The Serb-Croate-Slovene State shall be given the town of Susak, it being understood that the railways terminating there, together with all facilities for their development, and the whole port as well,

are to be handed over and to belong to the League of Nations which will take into consideration the interests of the Serb-Croat-Slovene State, Hungary, Transylvania, as well as the city itself and will make arrangements accordingly.

"(2) The Free State (of the previous proposals) shall disappear and the boundary shall be so drawn between Italy and the Serb-Croat-Slovene State as to meet the following requirements:

"(A) To provide along the coast a connection by road within Italian territory. This, however, shall be done in such a manner as to leave within the Serb-Croat-Slovene State the whole of the railway from Fiume northward through Adelsberg. Where the railway from Fiume follows the coast, the boundary line shall lie between the railroad and the corridor joining Fiume with Italy.

"(B) A readjustment of the Wilson line in the region of Senosecchia in order to provide for the protection of Trieste.

"(C) The boundary line to be further drawn as marked by the blue line on the map attached. This will leave in the Serb-Croat-Slovene State purely Jugoslav districts.

"(3) There shall be an independent State, under the guarantee of the League of Nations, consisting of Zara, within the limits of the municipality. The right of this independent State to choose its own diplomatic representation shall be accorded.

"(4) Valona shall be retained by Italy, as provided for in the Treaty of London, and, in addition, the mandate over Albania shall be given to Italy. In northern Albania, the boundaries shall be readjusted as shown on the attached map. Those districts of Albania which will thus go to the Serb-Croat-Slovene State will enjoy a special régime as an autonomous province similar to that which the treaty with the Czechoslovak republic provides for its autonomous provinces. The southern boundary of Albania shall be the line which was proposed by the British and French delegations on the Commission on Creek Affairs. This leaves Greece Koritza and Argyrokastron.

"(5) There shall be assigned to Italy the following island groups: Lussin, Lissa, and Pelagosa. There shall be placed under the sovereignty of the Serb-Croat-Slovene State the remainder of the islands.

"(6) All Adriatic islands shall be demilitarized.

"(7) There shall be special provisions permitting Italians in Dalmatia to choose, without leaving the territory, Italian nationality.

"(8) Economic enterprises now existing in Dalmatia shall by an international convention have their security safeguarded."

The following is the text of the cable sent on January 19 by the Secretary of State asking the point of view of the British and French Governments in undertaking to dispose of the Adriatic and Russian questions before ascertaining the views of the American Government:

"WASHINGTON, *January 19, 1920.*

"Please take up with Mr. Clemenceau and Mr. Lloyd-George the question of the way the Russian and the Italian problems have been handled and ascertain their point of view. The United States is being put in the position of having the matter disposed of before the American point of view can be expressed, as apparently Mr. Clemenceau and Mr. Lloyd-George have sought only the views of the Italian and Yugo Slav Governments before ascertaining the views of the United States Government. Is it the intention of the British and French Governments in the future to dispose of the various questions pending in Europe and to communicate the results to the Government of the United States? There are features in connection with the proposed Fiume settlement which both Mr. Clemenceau and Mr. Lloyd-George must realize would not be acceptable to the President.

"As it was pointed out by Mr. Polk before his departure, the Dalmatian and other questions should be taken up through regular diplomatic channels, and the fact that you are not charged with full powers could have no bearing on the question. As no American official could be sent to these gatherings that could have the same authority as the prime ministers of the three Governments in question, it is manifestly impossible for the United States Government to be represented at the meetings of the prime ministers.

"(Signed) LANSING."

STATEMENT OF THE FRENCH AND BRITISH PRIME MINISTERS OF JANUARY 23.

The text of the reply of the British and French prime ministers to the preceding cable reads as follows:

"PARIS.

"His Britannic Majesty's ambassador presents his compliments to his excellency the United States ambassador and has the honor to state that he has been charged by Mr. Lloyd-George and Mr. Clemenceau to hand to Mr. Wallace the inclosed telegram, drawn up by Mr. Lloyd-George and M. Clemenceau before their departure. In reply to the telegram from Mr. Lansing, which Mr. Wallace handed to Mr. Lloyd-George and M. Clemenceau on the 20th instant, Lord Derby would be grateful if the telegram now inclosed could be transmitted to Mr. Lansing at the earliest opportunity."

The telegram reads as follows:

"The French and British prime ministers have given their careful attention to the memorandum communicated to them by the American ambassador in regard to the Russian and Italian negotiations. As to the Russian question, they had previously sent a statement of their views for the consideration of the United States Government, inviting their consent and cooperation.

"As regards the Italian question, the absence of the United States has never been regarded by the French and British Governments as more than temporary, and they have never lost sight of the American point of view on this question, on the right solution of which the future of the world so largely depends. The French, British, and Japanese Governments have never had the intention of making a definite settlement of the questions raised without obtaining the views of the American Government. They therefore took up the Adriatic question at the point at which it was left on the departure of Mr. Polk for Washington. Signor Nitti transmitted certain proposals in modification of the joint memorandum handed to Signor Scialoja by the request from the United States, France, and Great Britain on December 9, 1919. On the assembly of the conference in Paris a fortnight ago M. Clemenceau and Mr. Lloyd-George immediately resumed negotiations between the Italian Government and the representatives of Jugo-Slavia, and finally arrived at what they considered an arrangement which was the best available reconciliation of the Italian and Jugo-Slav points of view. The details of this settlement are appended. The French and British Governments are glad to think that practically every important point of the joint memorandum of December 9, 1919, remains untouched and has now been indorsed by the Prime Minister of Italy. Only two features undergo alterations, and both these alterations are to the positive advantage of Jugo-Slavia.

"1. The free State of Fiume, which would have separated 200,000 Jugo-Slavs from their fatherland, disappears. Three-quarters of these people are at once and forever united with Jugo-Slavia, a source of perpetual intrigue and dispute is done away with; and if in return Jugo-Slavia has to agree to the transfer of territory to Italy including some 18,000 Jugo-Slavs in addition to those already included under the Wilson proposals, the balance is clearly to the benefit of Jugo-Slavia. Fiume becomes an independent State under the guaranty of the League of Nations, and the authority of the League of Nations over the port becomes absolute and immediate in the interests of all concerned.

"2. As regards Albania, an attempt has been made to afford satisfaction to the necessary requirements of all parties concerned. The details of the administration of this country by Jugo-Slavia, Italy, and Greece have yet to be elaborated, but in working to this end sight will not be lost of the feelings and future interests of the Albanian people, and every endeavor will be made to carry out the arrangements in full consultation with them. The French and British Governments consider that the above is a fair settlement of a difficult and dangerous question, and have informed the Italian and Jugo-Slav Governments that in the event of its not being accepted they will be driven to support the enforcement of the treaty of London, which is satisfactory to nobody. Had a plenipotentiary representing the United States Government been in Paris, M. Clemenceau and Mr. Lloyd-George would have cordially welcomed his full cooperation in this negotiation, but in the absence of anyone who could speak on behalf of the United States, and in view of the vital importance of arriving (*) the settlement of a question which has inflamed southeastern Europe for more than a year, and which if it is not promptly composed may not only impede the recuperation and reconstruction of two countries greatly exhausted by the war but may lead to war itself, the prime ministers of France and Great Britain felt that no other course was open to them but to proceed to dispose as quickly as possible of difficulties between two of their allies, in close and continuous consultation with both while they were all in Paris together. In doing this they have not intended to show the slightest discourtesy to the United States Government nor have they wished to conceal their action in any way from the latter. They are indeed sure that the President would not have desired them to make a settlement impossible during the necessarily short stay of the prime min-

isters in Paris by requiring every phase of the negotiations to be communicated to Washington in order to obtain his consent to the proposals when he had not heard the arguments and could not interview the principals concerned. In their judgment, the only plan was to proceed with the negotiations as rapidly as possible and to submit the results to the United States Government as soon as a definite conclusion had been reached.

"(Signed) WALLACE."

PRESIDENT WILSON'S NOTE OF FEBRUARY 10.

On February 10 there was dispatched to the British and French representatives at Paris a note from President Wilson, the text of which is as follows:

"The President has carefully considered the joint telegram addressed to this Government by the French and British prime ministers and communicated by the American ambassador in Paris in regard to the negotiations on the Adriatic question. The President notes with satisfaction that the French, British, and Japanese Governments have never had the intention of proceeding to a definite settlement of this question except in consultation with the American Government. The President was particularly happy to receive this assurance, as he understood that Monsieur Clemenceau and Mr. Lloyd-George, in agreement with Signor Nitti, had decided upon a solution of the Adriatic question which included provisions previously rejected by the American Government, and had called upon the Jugo-Slav representatives to accept this solution on pain of having the treaty of London enforced in case of rejection. The President is glad to feel that the associates of this Government would not consent to embarrass it by placing it in the necessity of refusing adhesion to a settlement which in form would be an agreement by both parties to the controversy, but which in fact would not have that great merit if one party was forced to submit to material injustice by threats of still greater calamities in default of submission.

"The President fully shares the view of the French and British Governments that the future of the world largely depends upon the right solution of this question, but he can not believe that a solution containing provisions which have already received the well-merited condemnation of the French and British Governments can in any sense be regarded as right. Neither can he share the opinion of the French and British Governments that the proposals contained in their memorandum delivered to the Jugo-Slav representatives on January 14 leave untouched practically every important point of the joint memorandum of the French, British, and American Governments of December 9, 1919, and that 'only two features undergo alterations, and both these alterations are to the positive advantage of Jugo-Slavia.' On the contrary, the President is of the opinion that the proposal of December 9 has been profoundly altered to the advantage of improper Italian objectives, to the serious injury of the Jugo-Slav people, and to the peril of world peace. The view that very positive advantages have been conceded to Italy would appear to be borne out by the fact that the Italian Government rejected the proposal of December 9 and accepted that of January 14.

"The memorandum of December 9 rejected the device of connecting Fiume with Italy by a narrow strip of coast territory as quite unworkable in practice, and as involving extraordinary complexities as regards customs control, coast-guard services, and cognate matters in a territory of such unusual configuration. The French and British Governments, in association with the American Government, expressed the opinion that 'the plan appears to run counter to every consideration of geography, economics, and territorial convenience.' The American Government notes that this annexation of Jugoslav territory by Italy is nevertheless agreed to by the memorandum of January 14.

"The memorandum of December 9 rejected Italy's demand for the annexation of all of Istria, on the solid ground that neither strategic nor economic considerations could justify such annexation, and that there remained nothing in defense of the proposition save Italy's desire for more territory admittedly inhabited by Jugo-Slavs. The French and British Governments then expressed their cordial approval of the way in which the President had met every successive Italian demand for the absorption in Italy of territories inhabited by peoples not Italian and not in favor of being absorbed, and joined in the opinion that 'it is neither just nor expedient to annex as the spoils of war territories inhabited by an alien race.' Yet this unjust and inexpedient annexation of all of Istria is provided for in the memorandum of January 14.

"The memorandum of December 9 carefully excluded every form of Italian sovereignty over Fiume. The American Government can not avoid the conclusion that the memorandum of January 14 opens the way for Italian control of Fiume's foreign affairs, thus introducing a measure of Italian sovereignty over, and Italian intervention in, the only practicable port of a neighboring people; and, taken in conjunction with the extension of Italian territory to the gates of Fiume, paves the way for possible future annexation of the port by Italy, in contradiction of compelling considerations of equity and right.

"The memorandum of December 9 afforded proper protection to the vital railway connecting Fiume northward with the interior. The memorandum of January 14 establishes Italy in dominating military positions close to the railway at a number of critical points.

"The memorandum of December 9 maintained in large measure the unity of the Albanian State. That of January 14 partitions the Albanian people, against their vehement protests, among three different alien powers.

"These and other provisions of the memorandum of January 14, negotiated without the knowledge or approval of the American Government, change the whole face of the Adriatic settlement, and, in the eyes of this Government, render it unworkable and rob it of that measure of justice which is essential if this Government is to cooperate in maintaining its terms. The fact that the Jugo-Slav representatives might feel forced to accept, in face of the alternative treaty of London, a solution which appears to this Government so unfair in principle and so unworkable in practice would not in any degree alter the conviction of this Government that it can not give its assent to a settlement which, both in the terms of its provisions and in the methods of its enforcement, constitutes a positive denial of the principles for which America entered the war.

"The matter would wear a very different aspect if there were any real divergence of opinion as to what constitutes a just settlement of the Adriatic issue. Happily no such divergence exists. The opinions of the French, British, and Americans as to a just and equitable territorial arrangement at the head of the Adriatic Sea were strikingly harmonious. Italy's unjust demands had been condemned by the French and British Governments in terms no less severe than those employed by the American Government. Certainly the French and British Governments will yield nothing to their American associate as regards the earnestness with which they have sought to convince the Italian Government that fulfillment of its demands would be contrary to Italy's own best interests, opposed to the spirit of justice in international dealings, and fraught with danger to the peace of Europe. In particular, the French and British Governments have opposed Italy's demands for specific advantages which it is now proposed to yield to her by the memorandum of January 14, and have joined in informing the Italian Government that the concessions previously made 'afford to Italy full satisfaction of her historic national aspirations based on the desire to unite the Italian race, give her the absolute strategic control of the Adriatic, and offer her complete guarantees against whatever aggressions she might fear in the future from her Jugo-Slav neighbors.'

"While there is thus substantial agreement as to the injustice and inexpediency of Italy's claims, there is a difference of opinion as to how firmly Italy's friends should resist her importunate demands for alien territories to which she can present no valid title. It has seemed to the President that French and British associates of the American Government, in order to prevent the development of possibly dangerous complications in the Adriatic region, have felt constrained to go very far in yielding to demands which they have long opposed as unjust. The American Government, while no less generous in its desire to accord to Italy every advantage to which she could offer any proper claims, feels that it can not sacrifice the principles for which it entered the war to gratify the improper ambitions of one of its associates or to purchase a temporary appearance of calm in the Adriatic at the price of a future world conflagration. It is unwilling to recognize either an unjust settlement based on a secret treaty the terms of which are inconsistent with the new world conditions or an unjust settlement arrived at by employing that secret treaty as an instrument of coercion. It would welcome any solution of the problem based on a free and unprejudiced consideration of the merits of the controversy or on terms of which the disinterested great powers agreed to be just and equitable; Italy, however, has repeatedly rejected such solutions. This Government can not accept a settlement the terms of which have been admitted to be unwise and unjust, but which it is proposed to grant to Italy in view of her persistent refusal to accept any wise and just solution.

"It is a time to speak with the utmost frankness. The Adriatic issue as it now presents itself raises the fundamental question as to whether the American Government can on any terms cooperate with its European associates in the great work of maintaining the peace of the world by removing the primary

causes of war. This Government does not doubt its ability to reach amicable understandings with the associated Governments as to what constitutes equity and justice in international dealings, for differences of opinion as to the best methods of applying just principles have never obscured the vital fact that in the main the several Governments have entertained the same fundamental conception of what those principles are. But if substantial agreement on what is just and reasonable is not to determine international issues; if the country possessing the most endurance in pressing its demands rather than the country armed with a just cause is to gain the support of the powers; if forcible seizure of coveted areas is to be permitted and condoned and is to receive ultimate justification by creating a situation so difficult that decision favorable to the aggressor is deemed a practical necessity; if deliberately incited ambition is, under the name of national sentiment, to be rewarded at the expense of the small and the weak; if, in a word, the old order of things which brought so many evils on the world is still to prevail, then the time is not yet come when this Government can enter a concert of powers the very existence of which must depend upon a new spirit and a new order. The American people are willing to share in such high enterprise, but many among them are fearful lest they become entangled in international policies and committed to international obligations foreign alike to their ideals and their traditions. To commit them to such a policy as that embodied in the latest Adriatic proposals and to obligate them to maintain injustice as against the claims of justice would be to provide the most solid ground for such fears. This Government can undertake no such grave responsibility.

"The President desires to say that if it does not appear feasible to secure acceptance of the just and generous concessions offered by the British, French, and American Governments to Italy in the joint memorandum of those powers of December 9, 1919, which the President has already clearly stated to be the maximum concession that the Government of the United States can offer, the President desires to say that he must take under serious consideration the withdrawal of the treaty with Germany and the agreement between the United States and France of June 28, 1919, which are now before the Senate, and permitting the terms of the European settlement to be independently established and enforced by the associated Governments."

"(Signed) LANSING."

REPLY OF THE FRENCH AND BRITISH PRIME MINISTERS OF FEBRUARY 17.

The text of the memorandum signed by the prime ministers of France and Great Britain in reply to President Wilson's communication of February 10 reads as follows:

"LONDON, *February 17, 1920.*

"The prime ministers of France and Great Britain have given their earnest attention to the communication made to them in regard to the Adriatic settlement on behalf of President Wilson. They are glad that the Government of the United States has set forth its views so fully and with such complete frankness; they do not, however, find it altogether easy to understand the steps by which the Government of the United States has arrived at its present attitude.

"In the first place, they believe that there is no foundation for the assumption which underlies the American communication that the proposed settlement outlined in their telegram of January 20 involves a capitulation to the Italian point of view, as opposed to the Yugo-Slav, and therefore constitutes a settlement with which the Government of the United States can have nothing to do. The memorandum from the United States Government criticizes the proposed settlement on four grounds.

"Firstly, that it cedes to Italy the narrow strip of territory running along the coast as far as the Corpus Separatum of Fiume;

"Secondly, that this strip of territory, coupled with the constitution of Fiume as a free city, under the guarantee the League of Nations clearly paves the way for its annexation to Italy;

"Thirdly, that the modification of the Yugo-Slav-Italian frontier operates to the detriment of Yugo-Slavia in its control of the northern railway from Fiume; and

"Fourthly, that it provides for the partition of Albania. The memorandum of the Government of the United States would appear to have entirely ignored the great advantage conferred on Yugo-Slavia at the same time.

"The origin of the proposal of January 20 lies in the fact that when the prime ministers of Great Britain and France came to deal directly, both with the representatives of Italy and Yugo-Slavia in Paris, they found that nobody desired protect Free State of Fiume, which had always been an essential part of the American proposals for settlement. They discovered that Yugo-Slavia would prove settlement which did away with the

"Free State, including, as it does, a population of 200,000 Slavs, and included as much as possible of its territory and population within its own borders. Accordingly the Governments of France and Great Britain, continuing the negotiations from the point at which they had been left on December 7, made the proposal under discussion, including the rectification of the Wilson line and the cession to Italy of a strip of territory running along the shore so as to connect it with the free city of Fiume, the net upshot of which was that Yugo-Slavia was to gain, as compared with the American proposal, an additional 150,000 Yugo-Slavs, while agreeing to the inclusion within the Italian frontier of a further 50,000 Yugo-Slavs in addition to the 400,000 which President Wilson had already agreed to allot to that country.

"As regards the suggestion that the proposal of January 20 clearly paved the way for the annexation of the town of Fiume to Italy, the French and British Governments can not possibly accept the implication that the guarantee of the League of Nations is worthless and that the Italian Government has no intention of abiding by a treaty which it enters into. As regards the railway, the proposal of January 20 gives to the Yugo-Slav State the control of the whole line from the point where it leaves the port of Fiume, which is under the control of the League of Nations. This railway is a commercial and not a strategic railway. Under President Wilson's proposals it is commanded by Italian guns. According to either plan nothing could be easier than for Italy to cut it in the event of war. They do not, therefore, see that there is substance in this criticism, a proposal whose real effect is to transfer the whole railway to Yugo-Slavia instead of leaving it in the hands of the free city of Fiume, which no one desires.

"There remains the question of Albania. They are glad to receive the criticism of the American Government on this part of their proposal. They would point out, however, that their telegram of January 20 states that 'The details of the administration of this country by Yugo-Slavia, Italy, and Greece have yet to be elaborated, and in working to this end sight will not be lost of the feelings and future interest of the Albanian people, and every endeavor will be made to carry out the arrangements in full consultation with them. Further, they would point out that so far from this proposal being made in the interests of Italy it was made in the interests of Jugoslavia. The Jugoslavs pointed out that though, under the proposal of January 20, the northern part of their territory was guaranteed adequate access to the sea through the port of Fiume, the southern part of Yugo-Slavia had no such access, and that the national outlet was to build a line down the Drin River to the mouth of the Boyana River. The French and British Governments thought that there was force in this contention, and their proposal in regard to Albania was designed to enable Yugo-Slavia, inasmuch as Albania was unable to undertake the work for itself, to develop, under international guarantee, a railway, have never been able to establish a settled government for themselves, and as the northern part of the population is overwhelmingly Christian and the southern part similarly Mohammedan, they thought it best to entrust the responsibility for government and development of these two parts to Yugo-Slavia and Italy, respectively. They have, however, agreed that the whole of Albania should be brought under the mandatory system, and they believe that this will make it possible eventually to satisfy aspirations of the Albanian people for unity and self-government.

"The Governments of Great Britain and France therefore must repeat that they find difficulty in understanding the present attitude of the United States Government toward the proposals, and they hope that in view of these explanations that Government will see its way to reconsider its attitude. In their view, these proposals are the natural outcome of the policy of the joint memorandum of December 9, once, with the consent of both parties concerned, the idea of the free State of Fiume was abandoned in view of the absence of the American representatives they had no option but to attempt to settle this question by themselves. It is not, however, the desire of the two Governments to force a settlement which is unacceptable to the President of the United States, and they will therefore not attempt to insist upon its acceptance until they have heard the view of the United States Government on this dispatch. They have confined themselves, therefore, to asking the Yugo-Slav Government to give a definite answer to their memorandum of January 20, since they must know what the attitude of that Government is.

"They feel bound, however, to ask the United States Government to consider the effect of their action. The proposal of December 9 has fallen to the ground because nobody now wants to set up the artifical free State of Fiume. The proposal of January twentieth is objected to by the United States, which had no representative at the deliberations and which can not therefore be in close touch with the changes of opinion and circumstances which have taken place since its plenipotentiaries returned to America. They can not help feeling that a large part of the misunderstanding is attributable to the difficulty of reaching a common understanding. In such circumstances how does the United States Government, which, to the regret of the Allies, still has no plenipotentiaries at the conference, propose that this dispute, which prevents the reconstruction and threatens the peace of southeastern Europe and whose settlement is urgently required, should ever be closed?

"Further, the British and French Governments must point out that the fears to secure an agreed settlement between Italy and Jugoslavia must leave them no choice but to acknowledge the validity of the treaty of London, they would recall to the United States Government that the treaty of London was entered into in the spring of 1915, at a most critical and dangerous moment of the war. In thus entering the war on the side of human freedom Italy made a condition that the Allies should secure for her, as against Austria-Hungary, strategic frontiers which would guarantee her (?) retention by the Central Powers of the strategic command of the northern plains of Italy; had the Austro-Hungarian Empire remained in existence as the ally of Germany the provisions of the treaty of London would have been sound. Relying upon the word of her allies, Italy endured the war to the end. She suffered a loss in killed of over 500,000 men and in wounded of three times that number while her people are burdened by crushing debt. It was clearly impossible for her allies to declare at the end of the war that their signature to the treaty meant nothing but a scrap of paper and that they did not intend to apply the *time* their bond. They agreed with President Wilson that these circumstances under which the treaty of London were concluded had been transformed by the war itself, the Austro-Hungarian Empire had disappeared, and the menace to Italy against which the terms of the treaty were intended to provide had largely diminished. They therefore entirely associated themselves with the efforts of President Wilson to negotiate a settlement between Italy and Yugo-Slavia, which would be consonant with the new conditions and which was acceptable to both sides. But throughout these proposals they never concealed from him the fact that they regarded themselves as bound by the treaty of London, in the event of a voluntary agreement not being arrived at. The fact, therefore, that when they made their proposals of January 20 they informed both the Italian and the Jugo-Slav Governments that, in the event of their not being accepted, they would have no option but to allow the treaty of London to come into force, can have come as no surprise, and was indeed the obvious method of bringing this long controversy to a close. They would point out that this declaration is not, as the American Government would appear to think, an ultimatum to Yugo-Slav on behalf of Italy. Under the treaty of London, Italy has had to abandon Fiume altogether and hand it over to Yugo-*Slav*. This part of the treaty is as unacceptable to Italians as is the transfer of Dalmatia and the islands to Yugo-Slav. The declaration, therefore, in regard to the enforcement of the treaty was an attempt to promote a prompt settlement of this dangerous controversy by pointing out to both sides that if they could not agree upon a settlement, which after long negotiation seemed to be a fair compromise between their conflicting views, the only alternative was an arrangement which was less palatable to both.

"Finally, the Governments of France and Great Britain feel bound to reply to the general observations contained in the latter part of the United States' memorandum. They know well the sincerity of President Wilson's desire for the establishment order providing real guarantees against a repetition of the terrible events of the last five years. They are reluctant to believe that the President can consider that the modifications which they have made in the memorandum of December 9 can constitute in themselves a justification for a withdrawal from all further cooperation with them in the attempt to adjust peaceably the world's affairs. They feel confident that the explanations contained in this reply will remove any misunderstandings as to the nature of the Adriatic proposals. At the same time they are deeply concerned that the United States should even contemplate the action to which they refer. One of the principal difficulties encountered by the heads of Governments during the negotiations of peace was that of reconciling treaty obligations with national aspirations which had changed or come into being since the date on which the treaties were signed. It was obviously impossible to ignore these latter aspirations, many of them born during the war, and formulated with unexampled clarity and elevation by the President of the United States himself. It was equally clearly impossible to ignore treaties, in fact the war began in order to enforce upon Germany respect for the solemn treaty she had made nearly 80 years before in regard to the neutrality of Belgium. It is the task of the statesmen of the world to endeavor to adjust national aspirations and ideals, many of which are only transitory and ephemeral with one another and with international treaties. The difficulty of the task, the patience required in order to effect it successfully, the uselessness of endeavoring to enforce preconceived ideas on refractory material has been recognized by the one more clearly than the other, and in his address at the opening session of the peace conference he pointed out how impossible it was to expect imperfect human beings and imperfect nations to agree at once upon ideal solutions. He made it clear that in his judgment the only course before the peace conference was to do the best it could in the circumstances and to create machinery whereby improvements and rectifications could be effected by reason and common sense under the authority of the League of Nations instead of by resort to war.

"Accordingly, not only was the League of Nations established but article 9 was specially inserted in the covenant providing that the assembly may from time to time advise us of reconsideration by members of the league of treaties which become inapplicable and the consideration of international conditions whose continuance might endanger the peace of the world, thus an essential part of the treaties of peace has been the constitution of machinery for modifying and correcting those treaties themselves where experience shows it to be necessary. The Governments of France and Great Britain, therefore, view with consternation the threat of the United States Government to withdraw from the comity of nations because it does not agree with the precise terms of the Adriatic settlement. The difficulty of reconciling ethnographic with other considerations is certainly not greater in the Adriatic case and does not produce more anomalous results than in the case of other parts of the general treaties of peace difficulties which were recognized by President Wilson and his colleagues where they agreed to the best settlement practicable at the time because their machinery for peaceful readjustment had come into being; also ethnologic reasons can not be the only ones to be taken into account is clearly shown by the inclusion of three million Germans in Czecho-Slovakia and the proposals so actively supported by the United States delegation for the inclusion within Poland of great Ruthenian majorities, exceeding three million five hundred thousand in number, to Polish rule. Though the British representatives saw serious objections to this arrangement, the British Government have not thought themselves justified in reconsidering on that account their membership in the League of Nations. The Governments of France and Great Britain, therefore, earnestly trust that whatever the final view of the United States Government as to the Adriatic settlement may be, they will not wreck the whole machinery for dealing with international disputes by withdrawing from the treaties of 1919 because their view is not adopted in this particular case. That would be to destroy the hopes now entertained by countless millions of people all over the world that the most enduring and most beneficent part of the treaty of peace was the constitution of machinery whereby the defects of treaties could be remedied, and that changing conditions and requirements of mankind could be adjusted by processes of reason and justice instead of by the balancing of armaments and resort to war. The Governments of France and Great Britain can not believe that it is the purpose of the American people to take a step so far-reaching and terrible in its effects on a ground which has the appearance of being so inadequate.

"MILLERAND.
"D. LLOYD-GEORGE.
"DAVIS."

PRESIDENT WILSON'S NOTE OF FEBRUARY 24.

The following is the text of the President's note of February 24 sent in reply to the joint memorandum of February 17 of the prime ministers of France and Great Britain:

"WASHINGTON, *February 24, 1920.*

"The joint memorandum of February 17 of the prime ministers of France and Great Britain has received the careful and earnest consideration of the President. He has no desire whatever to criticize the attitude of the Governments of France and Great Britain concerning the Adriatic settlement, but feels that in the present circumstances he has no choice but to maintain

the position he has all along taken as regards that settlement. He believes it to be the central principle fought for in the war that no government or group of governments has the right to dispose of the territory or to determine the political allegiance of any free people. The five great powers, though the Government of the United States constitutes one of them, have in his conviction no more right than had the Austrian Government to dispose of the free Jugoslavic peoples without the free consent and cooperation of those peoples. The President's position is that the powers associated against Germany gave final and irrefutable proof of their sincerity in the war by writing into the treaty of Versailles article 10 of the covenant of the League of Nations, which constitutes an assurance that all the great powers have done what they have compelled Germany to do—have foregone all territorial aggression and all interference with the free political self-determination of the peoples of the world. With this principle lived up to, permanent peace is secured and the supreme object of the recent conflict has been achieved. Justice and self-determination have been substituted for aggression and political dictation. Without it, there is no security for any nation that conscientiously adheres to a nonmilitaristic policy. The object of the war, as the Government of the United States understands it, was to free Europe from that cloud of anxiety which had hung over it for generations because of the constant threat of the use of military force by one of the most powerful governments of the Continent, and the President feels it important to say again that in the opinion of the American Government the terms of the peace settlement must continue to be formulated upon the basis of the principles for which America entered the war. It is in a spirit of cooperation, therefore, and of desire for mutual understanding that the President reviews the various considerations which the French and British prime ministers have emphasized in their memorandum of February 17. He is confident that they will not mistake his motives in undertaking to make plain what he feels to be the necessary conclusions from their statements.

"The President notes that the objections of the Italians and Jugoslavs were made the basis for discarding the project of the Free State of Fiume. It would seem to follow, therefore, that the joint consent of these two powers should have been required for the substitute project. The consent of Italy has been obtained. He does not find, however, that the Jugoslavs have also expressed a willingness to accept the substitute plan. Are they to be required now to accept a proposal which is more unsatisfactory because they have raised objections to the solution proposed by the British, French, and American Governments in the memorandum of December 9? The President would, of course, make no objection to a settlement mutually agreeable to Italy and Jugoslavia regarding their common frontier in the Fiume region provided that such an agreement is not made on the basis of compensations elsewhere at the expense of nationals of a third power. His willingness to accept such proposed joint agreement of Italy and Jugoslavia is based on the fact that only their own nationals are involved. In consequence, the results of direct negotiations of the two interested powers would fall within the scope of the principle of self-determination. Failing in this, both parties should be willing to accept a decision of the Governments of Great Britain, France, and the United States.

"The British and French Governments appear to find in the President's suggestion that the latest proposals would pave the way for the annexation of the city of Fiume an implication that the guarantee of the League of Nations is worthless and that the Italian Government does not intend to abide by a treaty into which it has entered. The President cannot but regard this implication as without basis and as contrary to his thought. In his view the proposal to connect Fiume with Italy by a narrow strip of coast territory is quite impracticable. As he has already said, it involves extraordinary complexities in customs control, coast guard services, and other related matters, and he is unable to detach himself from the previous views of the British and French Governments, as expressed jointly with the American Government in the memorandum of December 9, that 'the plan appears to run counter to every consideration of geography, economics, and territorial convenience.' He further believes that to have Italian territory join Fiume would be to invite strife out of which annexation might issue. Therefore, in undertaking to shape the solution so as to prevent this he is acting on the principle that each part of the final settlement should be based upon the essential justice of that particular case. This was one of the principles adopted by the allied and associated powers as a basis for treaty making. To it has been added the provisions of the League of Nations, but it has never been the policy of either this Government or its associates to invoke the League of Nations as a guarantee that a bad settlement shall not become worse. The sum of such actions would of necessity destroy faith in the league and eventually the league itself.

"The President notes with satisfaction that the Governments of Great Britain and France will not lose sight of the future interests and well-being of the Albanian peoples. The American Government quite understands that the threefold division of Albania in the British-French agreement might be most acceptable to the Jugoslav Government, but it is just as vigorously opposed to injuring the Albanian people for the benefit of Jugoslavia as it is opposed to injuring the Jugloslav people for the benefit of Italy. It believes that the differences between the Christian and Mohammedan populations will be increased by putting the two sections under the control of nations of unlike language, government, and economic strength. Moreover, one part would be administered by the Italian Government, which is represented on the council of the league, the other part by the Jugloslav Government, which has no such representation. Therefore, to alter or withdraw the mandate at some future time would be well-nigh impossible.

"Regarding the treaty of London, the French and British prime ministers will appreciate that the American Government must hesitate to speak with assurance, since it is a matter in which the French and British Governments can alone judge their obligations and determine their policies. But the President feels that it is not improper to recall a few of the arguments which have already been advanced against this treaty, namely, the dissolution of Austria-Hungary, the secret character of the treaty, and its opposition to the principles unanimously accepted as the basis for making peace. In addition, he desires to submit certain further considerations. In the northern Italian frontiers agreements have already been reached which depart from the treaty of London line and which were made with the understanding that negotiations were proceeding on quite a new basis. It has been no secret that the parties to the treaty did not themselves now desire it, and that they have thus far refrained from putting its provisions into effect. In mutually disregarding their secret treaty commitments the parties to the treaty have recognized the change in circumstances that has taken place in the interval between the signing of the secret treaty and its proposed execution at the present time. For nearly eight months discussion of the Adriatic problem has proceeded on the assumption that a better basis for an understanding could be found than those provided by the treaty of London. The greater part of the resulting proposals have already received Italy's assent. These proposals in some cases affected territory beyond the treaty of London line, as in the Tarvis and Sexton Valleys; in others, the territory fell short of the treaty of London line, as in the case of the islands of Lussin, Unie, Lissa, and Pelagosa—to mention only a few of the many proposals upon which tentative agreements have long been reached and which would be upset by an application of the treaty at this late day.

"The coupling of the treaty of London as an obligatory alternative to the Adriatic settlement proposed on January 14 came as a surprise to the American Government, because this Government had already by the agreement of December 9 entered into a distinct understanding with the British and French Governments regarding the basis of a settlement of the question. By their action of January 14, the Government of the United States was confronted with a definitive solution, to which was added on January 20 a threat to fall back upon the terms of the treaty of London. This course was followed without any attempt to seek the views of this Government or to provide such opportunity of discussion as was easily arranged in many other matters dealt with in the same period.

"The President notes that the memorandum of February 17 refers to the difficulty of reconciling ethnographic with other considerations in making territorial adjustments, and cites the inclusion of three million Germans in Czechoslovakia and more than three million Ruthenes in Poland as examples of necessary modifications of ethnographic frontiers. He feels compelled to observe that this is a line of reasoning which the Italian representatives have advanced during the course of negotiations, but which the British and French have hitherto found themselves unable to accept. There were cases where, for sufficient geographical and economic reasons, slight deflections of the ethnographical frontier were sanctioned by the conference, and the American Government believes that if Italy would consent to apply the same principles in Istria and Dalmatia, the Adriatic question would not exist.

"The American Government heartily subscribes to the sentiments expressed by the Governments of Great Britain and France regarding Italy's participation in the war. It fully appreciates the vital consequences of her participation, and is profoundly grateful for her heroic sacrifices. These sentiments

have been repeatedly expressed by the American Government. But such considerations can not be made the reason for unjust settlements which will be provocative of future wars. A course thus determined would be shortsighted and not in accord with the terrible sacrifices of the entire world, which can be justified and ennobled only by leading finally to settlements in keeping with the principles for which the war was fought. The President asks that the prime ministers of France, Great Britain, and Italy will read his determination in the Adriatic matters in the light of these principles and settlements and will realize that standing upon such a foundation of principle he must of necessity maintain the position which he arrived at after months of earnest consideration. He confidently counts upon their cooperation in this effort on his part to maintain for the allied and associated powers that direction of affairs which was initiated by the victory over Germany and the peace conference at Paris."

"POLK, *Acting*."

PERSONAL EXPLANATION.

Mr. THOMAS. Mr. President, the Evening Star yesterday contained a brief reference to an address which I had the honor to deliver the night before to the Society of the Order of George Washington. In that account I am reported as having assailed the Volstead Act. That act was not only not referred to in what I said on the occasion mentioned, but it did not even occur to me during the progress of my address. With that exception the article in the Star is otherwise correct.

REPORT OF NATIONAL ACADEMY OF SCIENCES.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the annual report of the National Academy of Sciences for the year ended December 31, 1919, which was referred to the Committee on the Library.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the President pro tempore:

H. R. 6863. An act to regulate the height, area, and use of buildings in the District of Columbia and to create a zoning commission, and for other purposes; and

H. R. 12351. An act to extend the time for the construction of a bridge across the Roanoke River in Halifax County, N. C.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

Mr. PHIPPS. I send to the desk a telegram from citizens interested in stock raising in the State of Colorado, which I desire to have read and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Denver, Colo., February 24, 1920.

Hon. L. C. PHIPPS,
Senate, Washington:

We learn the new Kendrick-Kenyon bill is before the Senate and Senator Kendrick pushing strong the passage of this bill. We attended the American National Live Stock Association convention at Spokane during January of this year and the principal subject under discussion there was packer legislation. Senator Kendrick publicly stated his future action at Washington would be governed largely by the action of the convention. The resolution calling for "prompt Federal legislation" was defeated and it was clearly the sense of the convention that no further agitation of the question be had until the Palmer agreement be given a fair trial. We returned to our people with this news. Again we learn the agitation is up and causing cattle feeders and producers untold losses. Twenty-five to $50 per head on cattle. Use your efforts to stop this bureau legislation and let our industry return to a sound and fair basis, thereby encouraging production. We know that further agitation of this question will drive many people out of the live stock business and we seriously protest against this bill with its bureau registration rules and regulations.

Cattle and Sheep Producers of Colorado, Ben Kemper, W. A. Snyder, A. G. Prey, Mark Beetham, Charles Clayton, Frank Wherren, John O. Hall.

Mr. LODGE. I present a memorial from the Legislature of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts and ask that it may be printed in the RECORD without reading and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The memorial was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE COMMONWEALTH OF MASSACHUSETTS.

Order relative to the establishment by the United States Department of Agriculture of a forest experiment station in the White Mountain National Forest.

Whereas there is pending in the Congress of the United States a bill (S. 3822 and H. R. 12188) authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to establish and maintain a forest experiment station in the White Mountain National Forest for the purpose of conducting in New England and the Northeastern States silvicultural, dendrological, and other forestry experiments and investigations to determine the best methods for the conservative management of forests and forest lands; and

Whereas New England is now dependent upon outside sources for 70 per cent of its lumber and 30 per cent of its pulpwood, involving freight charges alone amounting to over two and one-half million dollars, which are added to the cost of production, while not more than 30 per cent of its own timberland is producing what it might, and at least 20 per cent, or over 3,000,000 acres, are waste land producing nothing; and

Whereas the wood-using industries of New England represent invested capital of nearly $300,000,000, producing products worth $240,000,000 each year, and employ 90,000 wage earners; and

Whereas for the best interests of our people it is essential that New England should become self-supporting in timber production; and

Whereas such a forest experiment station would study forest problems throughout New England, in cooperation with States, schools, and individuals, and thus benefit the entire people of New England: Therefore be it

Ordered, That the House of Representatives of Massachusetts hereby respectfully requests the Congress of the United States to pass said pending bill, which will provide for the establishment and maintenance of a forest experiment station in the White Mountain National Forest: And be it further

Ordered, That copies of this order be sent by the secretary of the commonwealth to the President of the United States Senate, to the Speaker of the National House of Representatives, and to the Members of the Senate and House in Congress from this Commonwealth.

In house of representatives, adopted February 12, 1920.

A true copy. Attest:

ALBERT T. LANGTRY,
Secretary of the Commonwealth.

Mr. MYERS presented resolutions in the nature of a petition adopted by the State Convention of the Clerks of the District Courts of the State of Montana, favoring the adoption of certain proposed amendments to the law relating to the naturalization of aliens, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. CAPPER presented memorials of sundry citizens of the State of Kansas, remonstrating against compulsory military training, which were ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of sundry citizens of Portland, Me., praying for the passage of the so-called Lehlbach-Sterling bill providing for the retirement of superannuated Government employees, which was ordered to lie on the table.

Mr. PHELAN presented a petition of Karl Ross Post, No. 16, American Legion, of Stockton, Calif., praying that an additional bonus be granted to ex-service men, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

MILITARY ACADEMY APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. LENROOT. From the Committee on Military Affairs I report back favorably, with amendments, the bill (H. R. 12467) making appropriations for the support of the Military Academy for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1921, and for other purposes, and I submit a report (No. 456) thereon.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be placed on the calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEE ON CLAIMS.

Mr. NEW, from the Committee on Claims, to which were referred the following bills, reported them each with an amendment and submitted reports thereon:

A bill (S. 1457) for the relief of Joseph W. Skill (Rept. No. 454); and

A bill (S. 3119) for the relief of Con Murphy (Rept. No. 455).

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. BALL:

A bill (S. 3978) granting an increase of pension to Harriet V. M. Cavenaugh (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KENYON:

A bill (S. 3979) to reimburse Lieut. George D. Graham, dental surgeon, United States Army, for rent of quarters at Honolulu, Hawaii; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 3980) granting a pension to Walter A. Fleming (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 3981) granting an increase of pension to James W. Ellis (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAMBERLAIN:

A bill (S. 3982) to appropriate additional sums for Federal aid in the construction of rural post roads, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

A bill (S. 3983) granting an increase of pension to William A. Reilly; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SPENCER:

A bill (S. 3984) for the relief of Hans Weideman; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RANSDELL:

A bill (S. 3985) for the relief of Mary Frances Landry (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 3986) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Henryetta, Okla.; and

A bill (S. 3987) to authorize the acquisition of a site and the repairing and enlargement of a Federal building thereon at Okmulgee, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. PHELAN:

A bill (S. 3988) for the relief of the estate of I. G. Wickersham; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 3989) granting a pension to Anna Honeycutt; to the Committee on Pensions.

RELATIONS WITH RUSSIA.

Mr. FRANCE. I introduce a joint resolution which I ask may be printed in the RECORD without reading and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 164) providing for the establishment of more friendly relations with Russia, for the lifting of the embargo against shipments to that country, for the extension of trade and commerce with the Russian people, for the arrangement of credits, for the withdrawal of all troops of this country which may still be on Russian soil, for any needed explanations and reparations which may be due from this country for our invasion of Russian territory, for the expression of our gratitude to the Russian people for their heroic part in the defense of civilization, our felicitations to them for having overthrown a despotic government and assurances of the desire of the American people to cooperate with them and to assist them in every proper and possible way in their efforts to establish institutions which will insure to them an ordered liberty, was read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Joint resolution (S. J. Res. 164) providing for the establishment of more friendly relations with Russia, for the lifting of the embargo against shipments to that country, for the extension of trade and commerce with the Russian people, for the arrangement of credits, for the withdrawal of all troops of this country which may still be on Russian soil, for any needed explanations and reparations which may be due from this country for our invasion of Russian territory, for the expression of our gratitude to the Russian people for their heroic part in the defense of civilization, our felicitations to them for having overthrown a despotic government, and assurance of the desire of the American people to cooperate with them and to assist them in every proper and possible way in their efforts to establish institutions which will insure to them an ordered liberty.

Whereas from time immemorial there have existed, with few misunderstandings, most cordial relationships between the Governments of the United States and Russia; and

Whereas because of the devotion of the American people to free institutions the citizens of the United States had long looked forward to the time when the people of Russia would see fit to establish such free institutions for themselves; and

Whereas during the European war the noble Russian people made heroic sacrifices, cooperating with the allied nations in the war against Germany, without which cooperation Germany might have been victorious; and

Whereas it was not because of any lack of devotion to freedom and to the cause of the Allies, but rather on account of the incompetence and corruption of their autocratic government, which failed to supply the munitions of war, that the Russian people made a separate peace with Germany; and

Whereas no unfriendly act against the United States has been committed by the Russian people, but, on the contrary, the Russian people have borne with patience our unlawful invasion of their territory and intermeddling with their internal affairs; and

Whereas the people of the United States desire the continuance of friendly relations and the reestablishment of trade and commerce with the Russian people, and wish by every proper means to assist in the rehabilitation of the industrial and agricultural activities and agencies of Russia for the sake of the Russian people, as well as for the general welfare of the world: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, etc., That the President be, and he is hereby, advised to communicate at once, through the Department of State, with the Government of Russia, assuring the people of Russia of our friendship, sympathy, and desire to cooperate with them and to reestablish with them full and cordial relationships of friendly intercourse, trade, and commerce; and further, that the President be, and he is hereby, advised—

(1) To instruct the Department of State to raise the embargo against the shipment of goods to Russia;

(2) To consider and advise as to the best method of arranging credits which will make possible the shipment of such American goods as may be needed and desired by the people of Russia for the rehabilitation of their country;

(3) To immediately withdraw from Russia any and all American troops which may still be on Russian soil;

(4) To enter upon negotiations, through the Department of State, concerning any explanations or reparations which may be due from this country because of our invasion of Russian territory;

(5) To convey to the people of Russia expressions of our appreciation and gratitude for their heroic part in the war and our felicitations to them for having overthrown a despotic government and assurances of the desire of the American people to cooperate with them and to assist them in every proper and possible way in their efforts to establish institutions which will insure to them an ordered liberty.

AMENDMENT TO AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. RANSDELL submitted an amendment proposing to increase the appropriation for the eradication of the pink bollworm from $288,560 to $588,560 intended to be proposed by him to the Agricultural appropriation bill, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry and ordered to be printed.

ACQUISITION OF BERMUDA ISLANDS.

Mr. KENYON. I submit a resolution, which I ask may be referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

The resolution (S. Res. 315) was read and referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations, as follows:

Resolved, That the President is requested to undertake negotiations with the British Government looking to the acquisition by the United States of the Bermuda Islands.

THE PACKING INDUSTRY.

Mr. KENDRICK. Mr. President, during my absence from the Chamber this morning the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] had read into the RECORD a telegram referring to certain legislation in which I have been interested during the past few months. The message was so wide of the facts and conveys so erroneous an impression, not only of what transpired at the recent convention of the American National Live Stock Association with respect to proposed legislation for the regulation of the live-stock industry, but also of the general attitude of live-stock producers throughout the country, that I wish to ask to have inserted in the RECORD several resolutions that have directly to do with this question.

I want to say, Mr. President, that I have received innumerable telegrams recommending the enactment of a measure similar to that which was recently reported by the Senate Committee on Agriculture, but I am in entire accord with those who are opposed to encumbering the RECORD with such communications, and therefore I have hitherto withheld them. The substance of the telegram which was read this morning and ordered to be printed in the RECORD is so entirely unwarranted by the facts, as I shall hope to show in a minute's discussion, that I venture to depart from my practice in this instance.

At least two of the men who signed the telegram presented by the Senator from Colorado [Mr. PHIPPS] are lifelong friends of mine. They attended the convention of the American National Live Stock Association at Spokane, to which they refer in their message, and they have been usually so reliable that I was at a loss to understand why they should make these assertions until I was reminded of a rumor that was current among the stockmen at the convention that "booze" was being brought from Canada by airship. I did not give the report any credence at that time, but my worst suspicions are now confirmed.

It was my privilege, as president of the convention, to preside over it, to appoint the committee on resolutions, to listen to the reading of the resolutions, and to bring away a copy of them with me. I am not going to ask the Senate, therefore, to take my word with regard to what happened at Spokane. I shall be content to invite attention to the official text of the resolutions adopted by the convention indorsing legislation. The telegram which was presented to the Senate this morning in substance declares that a resolution calling for prompt Federal legislation was defeated by the stockmen assembled at Spokane, and that it was clearly the sense of the convention that no further agitation of the question should be had. The statement is altogether at variance with the facts. Far from opposing the enactment of legislation, the convention went on record in clear and unmistakable language in favor of legislation. If the Senator from Massachusetts will permit, I shall take the liberty of reading this resolution:

FEDERAL LEGISLATION RECOMMENDED.

"Whereas it is necessary that confidence should be established in the operation of marketing agencies, that competition may be developed, that an improved understanding may be created between producer, packer, and consumer, and distribution of meat and meat products guaranteed on a fair and economical basis and along practical lines, so as to cause the least disturbance of existing conditions: Therefore be it

"*Resolved by the American National Live Stock Association in annual convention assembled in the city of Spokane, this 28th day of January, 1920*, That we recommend the enactment of legislation by Congress providing governmental regulation of all marketing, manufacturing, and distributing agencies engaged in handling live stock and its products. And we believe that such regulatory laws should be so specific and plainly expressed as to prevent misunderstanding or the exercise of any arbitrary power, and further recommend that the supervision of such

market agencies provided for by the proposed legislation be made a matter of law such as to occasion the least possible disturbance or interference with existing business conditions."

I now present a copy of a resolution passed by the Kansas Live Stock Association at its annual meeting in Wichita, January 31, 1920, and a resolution passed by the executive board of the New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association on February 4, 1920, indorsing the resolution of the American National Live Stock Association, which I have already read. In addition, I desire to present resolutions passed by the League of Women Voters at the convention of that organization held at Chicago February 16, 1920, and I request that these resolutions may be printed in the RECORD.

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

The resolutions referred to are as follows:

RESOLUTION UNANIMOUSLY ADOPTED BY THE KANSAS LIVE STOCK ASSOCIATION AT ANNUAL MEETING HELD IN WICHITA, KANS., JANUARY 31, 1920.

"That we indorse the action of the Kansas Legislature in the passage of the Burdick bill, creating the live-stock bureau, and we also commend the action of our governor in promptly signing the same, making it effective. We favor the passage of Federal legislation pending in Congress, known as the combined Kendrick-Kenyon bills, similar to the Kansas law known as the Burdick bill."

INDORSING RESOLUTIONS OF THE AMERICAN NATIONAL LIVE STOCK ASSOCIATION.

"Whereas the American National Live Stock Association at its convention at Spokane, Wash., January 29, 1920, adopted resolutions approving the action of the Attorney General in respect to the packers; indorsing the action of its president, Senator KENDRICK, and of the market committee; and recommending the enactment of Federal legislation regulating all marketing agencies; and

"Whereas copies of said resolution have been filed with the secretary of the association: Now be it

"*Resolved by the executive board of the New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association in session at Carlsbad, N. Mex., the 4th day of February, 1920*, That we indorse and approve said resolutions and adopt the policy therein declared.

"EXECUTIVE BOARD THE NEW MEXICO CATTLE AND HORSE GROWERS' ASSOCIATION."

LEAGUE OF WOMEN VOTERS—RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE COMMITTEE ON FOOD SUPPLY AND DEMAND.

"Whereas in addition to the results of inflated currency due to the war the high cost of living in the United States is increased and the production of necessary food supplies diminished by unduly restrictive private control of the channels of commerce, or markets and other distributing facilities, by large food organizations and combinations; and

"Whereas if our civilization is to fulfill its promise it is vital that nourishing food be brought and kept within the reach of every home, and especially of all the growing children of the Nation:

"*Resolved by the League of Women Voters*, First. That the principles and purposes of the Kenyon-Kendrick-Anderson bills now pending in Congress for the regulation of the meat-packing industry be indorsed for prompt and effective enactment into law; and that this declaration be brought to the attention of the leading political parties, both in advance and at the time of their respective national conventions, with an urgent request for corresponding and unqualified platform pledges.

"Second. That the food supply and demand committee be authorized to keep in touch with the progress of the proposed legislation and to cooperate with the National Consumers' League, the American Live Stock Association, the Farmers' National Council, and other organizations of like policy in an effort to promote through legislation the realization of such principles and purposes. Furthermore, that the committee on food supply and demand be authorized to confer with the Department of Agriculture in regard to the extension of its service, with a view to establishing long-distance information to enable shippers and producers to know daily the supplies and demands of the food market.

"Third. That the early enactment of improved State and Federal laws to prevent food profiteering, waste, and improper hoarding is urged, and the strict enforcement of all such present laws is demanded.

"Fourth. That the various State leagues of women voters are requested to consider the advisability of establishing public markets, abattoirs, milk depots, and other terminal facilities.

"Fifth. That aid be extended to all branches of the League of Women Voters in spreading knowledge of the methods and benefits of legitimate cooperative associations, and that indorsement be given to suitable national and State legislation favoring their organization and use."

Mr. KENDRICK. I ask that a telegram which I received this morning from the Buyers' and Sellers' Live Stock Association at Amarillo, Tex., may be read at the desk.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the Secretary will read as requested.

The Secretary read the telegram, as follows:

AMARILLO, TEX., *February 26, 1920.*

Senator JOHN B. KENDRICK,
Washington, D. C.:

The Buyers' and Sellers' Live Stock Association in session at Amarillo, several hundred cattlemen being present, voted unanimously for the following resolution:

"Whereas there is now pending in the National Congress what is known as the Anderson redrafted Kendrick-Kenyon bill, having for its object the regulation and supervision of the meat-packing industry of the United States, such embodying clauses providing for the creating of a commission to supervise the operations of packing houses and the marketing of live stock and the finished products therefrom, the functions of the said commission to be along a line similar to those of the Interstate Commerce Commission in its regulatory control over the national railways, and other such features as will safeguard the best interests of the producers, the consumers, and the packers: Therefore be it

"*Resolved*, That the Buyers' and Sellers' Live Stock Association, of Amarillo, Tex., embracing as it does many men foremost in the Nation's beef production, go on record as favoring and indorsing the Anderson redrafted Kendrick-Kenyon bill and pledge its faithful and earnest efforts in the final passage and enactment into law of the aforesaid bill."

R. B. MASTERSON, *Chairman.*
WM. E. HERRING.
LEE BIVINS.
B. T. WARE.
BAEKLEY DAWSON.
JOHN LANDERGIN.
W. H. FUQUA.
W. OVRIEN.
A. S. STINNETT, *Secretary.*

ADDRESS BY SENATOR ROBERT L. OWEN.

Mr. POMERENE. I ask unanimous consent to have incorporated in the RECORD a copy of an address delivered by the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. OWEN], February 5, 1920, at Muskogee, Okla., before the Democratic State convention.

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

AN ADDRESS DELIVERED BY HON. ROBERT L. OWEN BEFORE THE DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION OF OKLAHOMA ON FEBRUARY 5, 1920, IN THE CITY OF MUSKOGEE, OKLA.

"Mr. Chairman and fellow citizens, it gives me great pleasure to pay my respects to you, and, through you, to pay my respects to the Democracy of Oklahoma and to the Democracy of the United States.

"True Democracy is a religion. It is not completely monopolized by the members of the Democratic Party. Many of its loyal disciples find themselves affiliated with other parties. Democracy truly believes in the rule of the people, in their wisdom, in their common sense, in their common honesty, in their justice, in their patience and steadfastness, in their right and ability to govern themselves. It thinks in terms of the greatest good to the greatest number. Its disciples should be 'Soldiers of the Common Good.' Its great patron saint was Thomas Jefferson, who stood for freedom of religion, freedom of speech, freedom of the press, the education of the people by free schools, the right of every citizen to vote.

"On these principles Jeffersonian Democracy took control of the Government in 1801 and held it for many decades. When the party organization became weakened by selfishness and fell under the control of those who believed in human slavery, it passed from power by a revolt of Jeffersonian Democrats, who would not stand for human slavery. They organized a new party and took the name which the followers of Jefferson had employed in 1800, calling themselves Republicans.

"When the wise and kind Lincoln, on the field of Gettysburg, prayed that the Government of the people, for the people, and by the people should not perish from the earth, he voiced the spirit of true democracy throughout the world.

"When the Republican Party got control of the Government during the Civil War, 1861–1865, every selfish interest that wished to use the powers of government for private advantage

gradually attached itself to the Republican Party, courted its leaders, became busy in its organization, contributed to its elections, promoted its nominations, and steadily obtained an increasing influence in its management. Unhappily it seems to be the history of all parties.

"When in 1912, after many years, it became obvious that an invisible government of organized commercial and financial selfishness had gained control of the organization of the Republican Party and of the governing powers of the people of the United States, the spirit of democracy, that sleeps but never dies, arose in the hearts of the Progressive Republicans, under the leadership of Theodore Roosevelt, and by this revolt there was given to the Democratic Party its first real opportunity since the Civil War to demonstrate that it had, through tribulation, come back to the true principles of Democracy of Jefferson, of Jackson, and of Lincoln, and magnificently the Democratic Party has responded. It was assisted on many occasions by patriotic Progressive Republicans.

"We have thousands of new voters who will seek to know what the party did when it got the power to act. They will ask and our unmindful opponents will ask:

"'What did the Democratic Party do?'

"Let us answer that:

"Immediately *it revised the 'robber' tariff*. It cut down the prohibitive schedules that selfishly sheltered monopoly in the United States. It *put the necessaries of life on the free list*—the free-list importations have increased a billion dollars a year under Democratic management; it *removed unjust tariff* discriminations, and by lowering the tariff *stimulated our imports and our exports*. (38 Stats., 114, Oct. 3, 1913.) Our foreign commerce has increased from four billions in 1913 to ten billions in 1919. Let Democrats always keep in mind that, by logical necessity, ultimately imports measure exports and exports measure imports.

"It established *the Tariff Commission* (39 Stats., 795), to take the tariff out of politics and deal with it strictly as a business matter. The old rallying cry of the Republican Party of the Protective Tariff League, which promoted laws to tax the consumers for the benefit of the selfish members of the league, is gone, because of the necessity now of admitting the commodities of Europe, as the only available means by which the people of Europe can repay the many billions of loans made them by our Government and by our people. It has been demonstrated that a revenue tariff, fairly drawn, is abundantly sufficient to honestly protect American industries against foreign competition.

"The overwhelming majority of American industries, because of the enormous production and productive power of American machinery, can now compete on the most favorable terms with any nation in the world.

"What did the Democratic Party do?

"It placed the taxes on those best able to pay the taxes and from whom taxes were more justly due. It took the tax from the backs of the consumers and placed it upon incomes, by the *progressive-income tax*, so that those who could pay the cost of the Government without distress should do so. (39 U. S. Stats., 756, Sept. 8, 1916.)

"It passed a *progressive-inheritance tax*, so that the wealth of the country should pay for its own protection. (39 Stats., 1091, Mar. 3, 1917.)

"Do the American people want these statutes repealed?

"It passed the *excess-profits tax*, to compel those profiting by war conditions to meet the larger part of the cost of war. (39 Stats., 1000, Mar. 3, 1917.)

"It passed the *war-profits tax* for the same reason. (40 Stats., 1088, Feb. 24, 1919.)

"What did the Democratic Party do?

"It made a resolute effort to benefit the farmers of the country and to improve our agricultural output. For instance:

"It passed *the farm-loan act*, enabling the farmers of the country to obtain cheap money on long time from the investing public, through nontaxable farm-loan bonds. Over $300,000,000 have been loaned to farmers, and under this system ultimately the farmers of the country will get nearly all the money they require at the cheapest rates. (39 Stats., 360, July 17, 1916.)

"The farm-loan act had the effect of compelling land-mortgage banks to lower their interest rates, and thus has been of great value to the farmers.

"The Republican Senate, without a hearing, reported a bill recently to repeal the tax-exemption features of the bonds based on joint-stock bank mortgages authorized under this bill, but withdrew it when protests were filed.

"The Democratic Party passed the *Smith-Lever agricultural extension act*, under which the vast knowledge acquired by the Agricultural Department in agriculture, horticulture, animal industry, bee culture, farm economics, canning and preserving foods, raising poultry, etc., has been put at the service of every farmer in every agricultural county in America by trained men and demonstration farms. (38 Stats., 1086, Mar. 4, 1915.)

"The Democratic Party passed *the good roads act* and appropriated millions to build, by cooperation with the States, hard-surfaced roads connecting the farms with the cities, to the advantage of both. (39 Stat., 355, July 11, 1916.)

"The Democratic Party has vigorously expanded *the rural-route system*—delivering mail to the farms.

"It has built up *the Parcel Post System*, carrying parcels to and from the farm and to and from the cities. Do the American people or the farmers want these acts repealed?

"What has the Democratic Party done?

"It has shown its deep desire to serve those who labor.

"It established *a Department of Labor;* has developed it; has made it useful in steadily improving the conditions of life for those who labor. (37 Stats., 736, Mar. 4, 1913.) It has established *employment bureaus*, to bring the man and the job together. It helps to settle disputes between labor and capital. It has developed the *Bureau of Mines* and the *Bureau of Standards*.

"It passed the *child-labor act*, to prevent employers from denying children their right to be educated, and to have some of the freedom of youth. (39 Stats., 675, Sept. 1, 1916.)

"It passed the *eight-hour law*—one of the great accomplishments desired by organized labor. (39 Stats., 721, Sept. 3, 1916.)

"It passed laws providing for the *minimum wage*.

"It passed the *workmen's compensation act*, for accidents and death in industry. (40 Stats., 961, Sept. 13, 1918.)

"It exempted combinations of laborers and of farmers from the inhibitions of the antitrust act.

"It passed a great act declaring that '*labor is not a commodity*.' This act is regarded as a magna charta for labor, and forbids labor, consisting of human flesh and blood, to be handed about as a chattel. (38 Stats., 731, Oct. 15, 1915.)

"It passed an act providing for *vocational instruction* and is engaged now in giving vocational instruction to many of our young soldiers returning from abroad who have sought this advantage. I heartily wish a larger number were being given these advantages of instruction. (39 Stats., 929, Feb. 23, 1917.)

"Do they who labor desire to rebuke the Democracy for these acts and have these laws repealed?

"It passed the *seamen's act* to give liberty to those who labor on the high seas, to put an end to the slavery practiced on sailors, to provide better conditions of life at sea, and safety at sea for the sailors. This legislation has been of very great value in raising the wages of sailors and making the profession more attractive to young men. It was a necessary step in order to provide men who would be needed for the great merchant marine which the Democratic Party desired. (38 Stats., 1164, Mar. 4, 1915.)

MERCHANT MARINE.

"The Democratic Party has now built up a gigantic merchant marine, with 10,000,000 tons of shipping, big enough and strong enough to take our commerce and our flag to every port in the world. This alone is a monumental service to the American people.

MONOPOLIES.

"What did the Democratic Party do?

"It did many things to abate the evils of monopoly.

"It passed the *Clayton Antitrust Act*, providing various means with which to check the practice of monopoly. (38 Stats., 730, Oct. 15, 1914.)

"It established the *Federal Trade Commission*, with authority to suppress unfair practices in commerce. The Federal Trade Commission is destined, by its example, by its policies, and by its work, finally to teach the American people how to control the abuses of monopoly and of profiteering. (38 Stats., 717, Sept. 26, 1914.)

"The greatest of all monopolies in America was the monopoly of money and credit, known as *the Money Trust*.

"The Democratic Party passed the *Federal reserve act*, established 12 credit centers, with 12 great Federal reserve banks under the control of the Government of the United States through the Federal Reserve Board, so that any citizen having sound credit, based on commodities or on actual commercial transactions, could have his note underwritten by his local bank and get money from the Federal reserve bank. This act took from the Money Trust the monopoly of credits. (38 Stats., 251, Dec. 23, 1913.)

"This act has enabled the 25,000 banks in the United States to accommodate our national commerce without asking permission of any private monopoly. This act has made panics

impossible. It has given great stability to the banks and to credits. Under this act in six years the resources of the national banks have increased from ten billions in 1913 to twenty-two billions in 1919. All the banks included have had their resources increased from twenty-five billions to forty-eight billions under Democratic management in six years. Not a single national bank failed in 1919.

"This act enabled the United States to finance Europe, to organize and conduct and to win the greatest war in history. Those who fought this act are now asking the people of the United States to put them in control.

"Do the business men of America want this act interfered with or to rebuke those who passed the act over persistent Republican opposition?

"The Democratic Party has developed the *postal savings banks* for the accommodation of those timid people who do not deal with the banks but are willing to trust their deposits with the Government, and their deposits are thus made available for the banks. Under these acts the banks of the United States have had the greatest prosperity in their history and at the same time have substantially lowered the rates of interest to American business men.

"What did the Democratic Party do?

"It has passed many acts improving the *Public Health Service* for the conservation of human life.

"It has done many things to promote *popular government*. It was due to the Democratic Party and the Progressives that the *direct election of United States Senators* was put into the Constitution. This amendment has made the Senate of the United States more responsive to the opinions of the people, and will make it still more responsive than it is now.

"Do the people want to vacate or abandon this right or rebuke the Democracy for demanding greater power for the people?

"The Democratic Party *democratized the committees* of the United States Senate by giving the committees control of the chairmen and of conferees.

"The Democratic Party established *modified cloture in the Senate* so that a few men could not by unlimited debate permanently defeat the will of the Senate itself. (1917, vol. 55, p. 19.)

"It passed an act forbidding *bribery in elections*.

"It negotiated *peace treaties with all the important nations of the world except* Germany, Austria, Bulgaria, and Turkey, who wanted war—and got it.

"*It kept this Nation out of war* until it became clear that the liberties of America and of the world were in jeopardy from the aggressive conduct of the Teutonic allies. When war became necessary for the protection of the honor, the dignity, the liberties of the American people, the Democratic administration organized the *Council of National Defense;* organized the Nation for war, down to the very crossroads; passed *the declaration of war* and *the great war measures;* established the *War Industries Board, the War Trade Board,* and *the food and fuel control; financed the entente allies;* passed *the war marine insurance act;* set up the *War Risk Insurance Bureau;* organized over *30,000 four-minute men; called to the colors 10,000,000 Americans; raised an army of over 4,000,000 men; expanded the Navy and merchant marine; provided the munitions of war; trained and transported the required forces to Europe; protected them from disease and vice as far as humanly possible; broke up the German submarine campaign; crumpled the lines of the German troops in France; crushed the morale of the Teutonic forces and compelled their military leaders to beg for an armistice, in effect an unconditional surrender, thus saving the civilization of the world from the greatest military menace in the history of mankind.* (39 Stats., 649; 38 Stats., 711.)

"Mr. Chairman, I wish to express my warm and heartfelt respect for the patriotic Republicans and citizens of other parties who loyally cooperated from the Atlantic to the Pacific in winning this Great War. And I wish to express my deep gratitude to those progressive Republicans who cooperated with the Democrats in the great legislative program of the six years of Democratic control.

"What did the Democratic Party do?

"Why, it passed the '*selective-draft act*,' by which rich man and poor man, educated man and ignorant man, Protestant and Catholic, Jew and Gentile, black and white, took their position side by side on the battle line or in the service of the country where each was best fitted to protect the liberties of their common country. Never was a more democratic act passed. No man was permitted by law to buy a substitute with money, but every man's life and service was put upon a basis of equality in the defense of his country. (40 Stats., 76, May 18, 1917.)

"What man had the impudence to question the 'Americanism' of the Democratic Party in all these great accomplishments? What is '*Americanism*' if it be not the great policies which the Democratic Party has put into execution when it stamped out sedition at home, whipped the Hun abroad, and made America the commercial, financial, and moral leader of all the world, so that all great nations do homage to the United States, and small nations, when they bend their heads in prayer, pray God to bless the American people. America has become the beacon light to all mankind, and no narrow partisan can hide this light under a bushel or question the glorious Americanism of the Democratic Party.

"Under the *War Risk Insurance Bureau* was written insurance for our soldiers abroad of $40,000,000,000, and under our war marine insurance act American commerce was protected without loss to the Government.

"The Democratic Party passed the *War Finance Corporation act* for the protection of our business men under the extraordinary interruption and stress of war.

"It passed the *capital-issues act* in order to safeguard all credits of the country and make them available for war. (40 Stats., 512, Apr. 5, 1918.)

"It organized *the Red Cross movement* down to the crossroads, and in this Great War enterprise the Democratic Party gladly availed itself of the patriotism of citizens of all parties.

"By the combined efforts of the progressive men in both parties two great amendments to the Constitution of profound social and moral significance have been passed—woman's suffrage and prohibition. Of still greater importance is the fact that these great reforms were due to the progressive men and women in the homes of America.

THE ELECTION OF 1918.

"Before the Great War had terminated successfully there came on the election of 1918, in which the party lost many votes because men who were aggrieved by the conduct of the war, by the selective-draft act, by the operation of the Army and naval forces; many men injured by the priority orders and the conduct of the railroads where the administration had to give the right of way for war purposes; many men injured by the Government commandeering materials and men; many men hurt by the sudden raise in prices, due to the Government competing for men in the shipbuilding yards and in munition plants; many offended by high taxes and by the extravagance and waste of war, visited their displeasure on the Democratic Party.

"Many men of German blood or of German sympathy resented the United States going into war.

"Many men who opposed war as a principle were either turned against the Democratic Party or their devotion to the party was weakened.

"There was a general disposition to blame somebody, and the administration was the victim.

"The Democratic Party, with its leading men intensely occupied with the winning of the war, were in no position to present the accomplishments of the Democratic Party to the people of the country.

"Moreover, in 1918 the United States had the extraordinary affliction of 'Spanish influenza,' which killed in that year 447,000 of our people and over 380,000 of them died in the fall of 1918. Under the advice of physicians political meetings were forbidden.

"Was it any wonder the Democrats lost both Houses? Moreover, the result of the war was still unknown. It is now generally conceded that the President's famous preelection letter alienated many liberal or progressive Republicans and vitalized those who were partisans to strenuous activity in resentment of what they construed to be an affront and lack of appreciation of their loyalty in supporting the war activities of the administration.

"Mr. Chairman, I wish it might be truly said that none of our people during the Great War, either Democrat or Republican, had made any mistakes in the management of the war in the Army or Navy, or of the railroads, or of the telegraphs or telephones, or of any of the Government's affairs [Republican and Democratic citizens were almost equally divided in these activities, but the percentage of errors and wrongs was very small considering the magnitude of our operations in the war]; but I can truly say that the record of accomplishments in the last six years of complete executive and legislative control by the Democratic Party is the most magnificent ever made by any party in any country.

"The Democratic Party found the United States in depression in 1913, threatened with a panic. The New York banks declared in the summer of 1913 that they did not expect to be able to furnish the money to move the crops in the fall, and the

country banks were advised not to expect the customary rediscount privileges. The Democratic administration thereupon furnished the money out of the United States Treasury to move the crops and repeated the same operation in 1914, and now, after six years of Democratic management, the country has been brought up to a condition of the greatest prosperity in its history. The banks are crowded with money, the people are living better than ever, business is prosperous, everyone desiring to labor can find the opportunity, the trains are crowded, and the hotels are overflowing.

"Is it possible that the alleged delinquencies of a few individuals, great or small, shall blot out the legislative and executive accomplihments of the Democratic Party?

"Is it possible that the human fability of a few citizens in office will be urged as a just reason for reversing and condemning at the polls the ideals and the progressive, constructive policies of the Democratic Party and rebuking the spirit of loyalty and service by which it has been inspired?

"Mr. Chairman, such a judgment would be as thoughtless and as unjust as the condemnation of our sons who won the battles of the Argonne because some of them blundered and lost their way in the excitement of battle or came out of the carnage with muddy shoes and bloody uniforms.

"The Democratic Party was wounded in the Great War. It was wounded in many ways, but it came nobly through every trial and brought to the American people the most glorious victory ever recorded in all the annals of time. It made America the leader of the world.

"No party in history ever deserved better of the people than the Democratic Party now deserves of the people of the United States.

THE PEACE TREATY.

"Our President, whose leadership and whose sympathies were behind the record of the last six years, went to Paris and brought back a glorious peace treaty, establishing peace among all the nations of the world, by which all the nations of the world pledged themselves to respect and preserve the territorial integrity and political independence of other nations; to settle all international disputes by conciliation, arbitration, and peaceful adjustment; to end competitive armament; to coerce any outlaw nation again attempting to deluge the world in blood by a world-wide economic boycott and by such pressure as should be necessary to restore order.

"After many months of study and acrimonious debate the treaty of peace at last has four-fifths of the Senate in favor of it without amendment or with reservations that, after all, do not seriously change its meaning.

"The covenant of the League of Nations ushers in a new democratic era in which all the great nations have agreed that all just government is based on the consent of the governed.

"The monarchies and autocracies are crushed. The democracies of earth are completely and overwhelmingly triumphant throughout the whole world.

"But to accomplish this magnificent result our people lost a hundred thousand of our best young men, twenty-six billions of money, and dislocated all of our internal affairs.

"Shall we now lose the reward of these sacrifices—the greatest opportunity of service in our history—by refusing to ratify the treaty and thus fail to assume the moral leadership of mankind which is tendered our Republic by the unanimous sentiment of all the free nations? Shall Senators take a small revenge on the President for his alleged neglect of the Senate, reject the treaty, wound all the friendly nations of earth, who fought to the death in the cause of liberty side by side with us, and lose our preeminent position with them purchased at such a sacrifice? Shall the beloved youth of the world, our own best beloved, have died in vain?

"If the treaty be not perfect its errors can be corrected without tearing down the entire structure. Justice and reason will prevail in the assembly of the world's best representatives. The treaty should be ratified without delay, with such reasonable reservations as shall put the American people whole-heartedly behind it.

THE FUTURE.

"And now, Mr. Chairman, we are face to face with the immediate future. It is not enough to say what we have done; it is of the greatest importance to say what we shall do. The spirit and purpose, the vision and constructive genius which the Democratic Party has exhibited in the last six years, justifies the faith that this great party can be better relied on than any other party to solve the reconstruction problems following the war.

THE HIGH COST OF LIVING.

"The greatest problem confronting the country is the high cost of living, which deeply concerns those of fixed salaries, fixed wages, fixed small incomes.

"Many causes have combined to bring about the high cost of living and cut down the purchasing power of the dollar. The principal causes are:

"1. Credit expansion in the form of United States bonds and certificates of indebtedness, short-time Treasury notes, exceeding $26,000,000,000.

"Expansion in bank deposits, amounting to nearly $20,000,000,000 from 1913 to 1920.

"Expansion of Federal reserve notes, made necessary to meet rising prices and the consequent increased demand for actual currency.

"Expansion of gold sent to America to balance our excess commodity shipments abroad, amounting to eleven hundred million dollars.

"These expansions of credits make dollars much easier to get and make the exchange or purchasing value of the dollars less because dollars are easier to get.

"Similar foreign credit expansion in foreign bonds, bank deposits, and currency has in like manner reacted on prices abroad and raised the prices of foreign commodities imported into the United States.

"2. Diminished production. European labor for five years, and American labor for two years, has been largely withdrawn from the production of goods and raw materials required for normal peace times. In the United States we withdrew from the factories, fields, mines, forests, and fisheries over 4,000,000 men and put them under arms and in training for war, and we withdrew probably 10,000,000 laboring people from the activities of peace to the activities of war, causing a diminished production of goods.

"3. Increased consumption. The increased consumption by war in the destruction of property on land and sea, by the waste and extravagance of war, emphasized diminished production.

"4. High cost of labor: Because of the urgency of war and strenuous competition, extraordinarily high prices were paid for labor in our factories, in munition plants, in shipbuilding yards, and other Government and private works engaged in war purposes. The withdrawal of millions of men for war added to the scarcity of labor and doubled the prices paid.

"The extraordinarily high pay led many men to work half time—lowering production. They satisfied their wants with half-time labor.

"5. The extraordinary European demand for the necessaries of life added greatly to the demand for American goods and raised prices in America on all the necessaries of life.

"6. Impairment of transportation: Transportation on land and sea was subjected to ruinous losses. Millions of tons of ships were sunk. There was no time to repair or rebuild cars or locomotives, or to keep the railways in good condition, and now transportation is lacking efficiency even where production is available, thus adding to the cost of living.

"7. The excess-profits tax and certain war taxes have been shifted to the price of commodities, and thereby upon the consumer, raising the cost of living.

"High taxes of all kinds are in some degree put on the cost of goods wherever possible.

"8. Interstate monopolies, restricting production, restraining trade, hoarding necessaries of life and raw materials, and exacting unfair profits and high prices has added immensely to the high cost of living.

"9. Profiteering: Many people are taking advantage of unsettled prices and conditions and the absence of a suitable mechanism to control it, to profiteer on those who are compelled to buy.

"10. The unequal distribution of wealth, exaggerated by war, has led to extravagance and waste by thousands who have profited and set a false standard of prices in many lines by the reckless expenditure of those who need not measure the cost, compelling people who can not afford it to pay fictitious and false prices.

"11. Wholesale speculation in stocks, commodities, real estate, and business has led to excessive interest rates—going up on the stock exchange to 20 and 30 per cent; a 6 and 7 per cent rate by the Federal reserve banks, and 7, 8, and 9 per cent for commercial loans. This is one of the most serious factors in the high cost of living, because as goods pass through various hands each adds a merchant's profit to the original high cost. It has also resulted in depreciating United States Liberty bonds, because they bear a reasonable and moderate rate of interest, and seem a poor investment beside current rates much higher.

"Speculation in stocks alone was employing on the New York Stock Exchange within the last few months $1,900,000,000 loaned by banks on call or short terms for speculation. Such credits should be preferably used by the commercial banks for industry and commerce at legal rates.

"Some of the causes of the high cost of living can be almost immediately corrected, and steps should be taken of a concrete character by which to reduce the cost of living. Among the remedies which are obvious is *to stop the expansion of credit for unproductive purposes*, such as pure speculation in stocks, commodities, and real estate.

"The productive power of the people of the United States amounts to approximately seventy billions per annum, and will supply all the credits required for the most vigorous development.

"2. To *stabilize the Federal reserve note issue* and keep the currency at a relatively stable figure.

"The per capita circulation in the United States in 1890 was $22.82; in 1900, $26.93; in 1910, $34.33; in 1914, $34.35; in 1919, $54. The expansion in 1919 included $11 gold per capita sent from abroad in exchange for goods.

"3. *The taxes should be reduced* and *the cost of the war should be extended over 50 years*, so that the cost of the war will be distributed over the future and not fall too heavily upon the present generation or compel high taxes in paying the principal at this time.

"5. *The Federal Reserve Board* should *lower the normal rate of interest* for discounting for member banks to not exceeding 3 or 4 per cent as a normal rate, increasing the rate if banks seek discounts in excess of a fair proportion of the reserves to which such bank is entitled.

"6. The United States Government should be conducted on a strict budget system, limiting expenditures to a moderate income by reasonable taxation. Extravagance and waste in government should be prevented and treated as a serious wrong. Very great economies are possible in governmental administration and should be vigorously worked out under the most improved modern methods.

"7. The people of the United States should demand *reasonable interest charges*, and usury should be checked. The artificial usurious rates charged on call loans in the Stock Exchange in New York should be forbidden by law, and restrained by the powers of the Comptroller of the Currency and the Federal Reserve Board and by act of Congress if necessary.

"*Call* loans on stock exchange collaterals should be converted into *time* loans for the benefit of the stock exchange as a true market place and as a sound public policy. Time loans can not command very high usurious rates.

"It will be impossible for the railroads of the country to get money on their bonds at decent rates unless the normal interest rates are brought down. Unless the railroads can be financed on a fair interest rate for their bonds the public will pay the bill in higher freight rates and passenger fares. If the interest rates are brought down to a reasonable basis, the United States Government bonds will come back to par.

"The *excess-profits tax should be repealed*, and the Government should go out of partnership with those who are charging the American people excess profits. The *Federal Trade Commission should have its powers expanded* as an agency by which to reduce the high cost of living by restraining unfair practices in interstate commerce.

"During the war it was exceedingly difficult to entirely prevent waste and extravagance, but now the Government should enter upon a policy of rigid economy in the management of its affairs. Economy is as essential in Government as it is in private affairs, and if we are to lower taxes it is essential that every expense should be avoided consistent with the efficient conduct of government.

MONOPOLIES.

"The practices of interstate monopolies in limiting production in order to limit supply and charge extortionate prices should be stopped by the Government as an unfair practice. Unfair price fixing and hoarding for speculation should be forbidden. It will be far better for monopolies to turn out five times as much at 20 per cent profit than charge 100 per cent profit on one-fifth of the output. Even those who profit by monopoly should remember that they themselves are the victims of other monopolies, and that their profits would be more valuable if their dollars had a larger purchasing power.

The Sherman antitrust law has failed, because the Supreme Court declared that 'reasonable restraint of trade is not obnoxious to the statute,' and no man knows what a 'reasonable restraint of trade' signifies.

"The Federal Trade Commission should have power to limit interstate monopolies to a reasonable percentage of profit on their turnover, so that the public interest is preserved while not denying an abundant reward to those who transact the business of the country. This has been fairly well accomplished by the Cartel system.

PROFITEERING.

"Profiteering should be dealt with in the same manner by National, State, and local authorities, and public opinion should be aroused so as to make those guilty of profiteering feel the disapproval of the public, and so that suitable remedies may be provided to abate this evil without denying the just rewards for initiative and industry in commerce.

PRODUCTION—LABOR AND CAPITAL.

"It is of extreme importance that production should be stimulated, and this involves many factors. It involves reasonable, stable, low interest rates. It involves equally the rights of labor, of management, of capital, and of the public. Labor is both manual and mental and is entitled to the fullest consideration. The efficiency of labor for several reasons has been seriously impaired. Labor is estimated in many lines to be from 30 to 40 per cent below its productive capacity prior to the war, notwithstanding the high prices paid for labor due to the unrest of labor and the dislocation of labor under war conditions; to the extraordinary prices paid during war times; to extraordinary profits during war by the employers of labor; due to trained men being taken away from the stations in which they were expert to other more profitable lines in making war material. Readjustment is needed. This can be promoted by encouraging frank and free discussion and arranging peaceful methods by which labor will participate in what it produces above a bare living wage. The employee should not be regarded merely as a money-making machine, but altogether as a human being, entitled of right under the Constitution to life, liberty, happiness, and a reasonable participation in the profits arising from labor. This policy is advisable both for the sake of the employer and the employee. When the workman knows that he is working both for himself and his employer he will not indulge in or permit the killing of time, the waste of material, of energy. Labor management and capital should work together on the principle of service to all mankind along lines of cooperation in a spirit of fellowship, sympathy, and mutual support. It will not do in a democracy to rely solely on the physical powers of the Government and brute force to control human unrest. That remedy is a two-edged sword, dangerous alike to capital and to labor, and to the stability and peace of the Government itself. The doctrine of mere arbitrary force should not be seriously entertained by thinking men who love liberty after the lessons of this war.

"Neither labor nor capital can be expected to render willing service unless it receives a just and satisfactory compensation.

"To prevent strikes and lockouts, the causes should be found and removed.

"Increased productivity should be for the service of all, and not exclusively or unduly for profit.

DISTRIBUTION.

"Much can be done in promoting improved methods of distribution through improved organization, through terminal warehouses and distributing centers and a central board of information through which sound advice can be given to those engaged in the process of distribution.

"The improved use of warehouse receipts as a basis of credit through the expansion of the acceptance system in furnishing credit for goods in process of actual distribution.

GOOD ROADS.

"The building of hard-surfaced roads and the use of motor trucks and automobiles is a very important part of cheapening the process of distribution and lowering the cost of living. The United States should vigorously promote this development in conjunction with the States.

LAW AND ORDER.

"The powers of the Government should not be subjected to the dictation of organized minorities, whether representing capital or representing labor or any special group, but the right of men to organize and petition the Government should not be denied. The right of men to organize for collective bargaining is a just and reasonable right which should not be interfered with, but conflicts arising between organizations of men representing capital and representing labor should be adjusted by means provided for conciliation, mutual accommodation, and by public opinion. In such controversies the public is entitled to a substantial representation, so that the interests of the public shall not be disregarded by those who are merely seeking their own interests. A just settlement of such disputes can be arrived at and is one of the great problems remaining to be solved in a manner just to the public and to those who serve the public alike.

SEDITION LAWS.

"The existing statutes are sufficient to punish those guilty of overt acts against the dignity of the national statutes, and there is no need for the passage of extreme laws based on excite-

ment and fear of bolshevism in the United States. The punishment of the advocacy and organization of actual conspiracy to change the forms of our Government by assassination should be vigorously inflicted, and additional law should be provided to cover such conspiracies, if it actually prove to be necessary. The people of the United States are overwhelmingly honest, loyal, patriotic, and can be relied upon at all times to protect the country against sedition and treason.

"We saw during the war the best evidence of this. The only danger was that the people themselves might go too far and act on suspicion in dealing with the ignorant and thoughtless who exercised the American privilege of occasionally indulging in foolish speech.

"It has taken a long time to build up our great Government, based on its ideals of liberty, justice, and humanity, and the people of the United States will not permit any man or set of men by violence and force to tear down constitutional Government in America. Law and order must be and will be rigidly enforced. It can be and should be enforced without extreme sedition laws which might destroy liberty and break down freedom of speech and freedom of the press. Ignorance should be controlled by education where possible, and force should only be used where milder remedies fail.

"Our Constitution provides a peaceful, reasonable way for its amendment, and those who by organized societies are secretly engaged in advocating the overthrow of our Government and social institutions by fire and sword should be treated as guilty of criminal conspiracy and sedition.

"It is my opinion that political prisoners guilty of no overt criminal act should be released immediately and all others brought to summary trial and not subjected to indeterminate imprisonment awaiting trial.

CONSERVATION.

"The great policy of the conservation of our natural resources is another means by which the high cost of living can be abated by increasing production through the use of these great natural resources. It should be vigorously maintained and extended to bring into use these values.

UNITED STATES BONDS.

"The United States bonds which were sold to the people under the Liberty loan and Victory loan campaigns ought to be brought back to par, and this can be done by insisting upon lower rates of legal interest through the Federal reserve banks and through the member banks and forbidding the high usurious rates on the stock exchanges—which run up to 30 per cent on call loans—which have the effect of raising the commercial rates throughout the United States. Even the reserve banks under this influence raised rates to 6 and 7 per cent. It logically follows that United States bonds bearing moderate rates are discredited and brought below par, when contrasted with very high commercial rates, and when banks and citizens borrowing on 4½ per cent Government bonds are charged 6 per cent for credits. If Government bonds plus the credit of a citizen or bank are not entitled to credit at the rate of interest the Government bond bears, it need not surprise the country if the bonds sell for a 10 per cent discount.

"For 50 years before the war the normal rate of interest in France and Belgium was 3 per cent. In Great Britain the acceptance rate during the war was only 3½ per cent. United States bonds bearing 2 per cent, with the circulation privilege, have been selling at par for years.

POPULAR GOVERNMENT.

"The policy of the Democratic Party in promoting popular government should be steadily adhered to in order that the sovereignty vested in the people of the United States may have a concrete mechanism through which it may exercise the governing power. The popular-government process is of the greatest importance to accomplish this and to enable the people to so control the Government that it may function in their interest and be comparatively free from the organized selfishness that is continually exerting itself to lay its hands upon the governing powers of the people in a thousand crafty ways.

"Even now a majority of the people's representatives in the United States Senate can not control the Senate because of its minority serving rules that permits a minority to control its acts. Unqualified cloture or 'the right to move the previous question' is a reform absolutely necessary to deprive the special interests of undue power in the people's Senate. It ought to be demanded by the people.

"You have seen in Oklahoma the value of *the initiative and referendum*, which has now been adopted by more than 20 States, including such Commonwealths as Massachusetts, Ohio, California, Mississippi, and Missouri. This law puts the powers of government into the hands of the people and enables them to initiate any law they do want and veto any law they do not want.

"The *primary law*, the *short ballot*, the *preferential ballot*, the *corrupt practices prevention acts* are essential in preventing organized minorities and plutocratic influences, through machine-rule methods, getting control of the governing power.

"The *publicity pamphlet* issued by the Government to each citizen giving the argument for and against candidates and public measures is necessary for the information of the citizen that he may vote intelligently and escape the undue influence of the press columns too largely controlled by selfish interests.

"When these processes of popular government shall have been perfected and the people are in complete control of their own Government, the powers of monopoly and of profiteering can be effectively controlled and the high cost of living reduced. When this is accomplished we shall have had an answer to Lincoln's great prayer that 'A Government of the people, for the people, and by the people should not perish from the earth.'

"To accomplish these great ends the liberal elements of America should unite.

"It will surely be conceded by thoughtful and just men that the Democratic Party is very substantially controlled by the progressive and liberal elements of the country, and that the Republican Party can not hope to make itself the liberal party of America. We, therefore, have a just right to appeal to Progressive Republicans and liberal men of other parties to cooperate with the Democratic Party. We have a right to invite them to join us on terms of equality in order that the progressive elements of the Nation through the Democratic Party may control the laws of the country along progressive and liberal lines. If this cooperation can be accomplished, the liberal elements of America will be able to control the Government in the election of 1920, and the prosperity which has been brought about under the liberal and progressive statutes of the last six years will be continued and improved upon.

"Those who love democratic and progressive ideals, who love the common good, who love liberty, justice, and humanity, should do so 'in spirit and in truth,' and not be diverted by partisan pride, far less by sordid or selfish motives, from faithful service to the great cause.

"Hundreds of thousands of progressive men affiliated with the Republican Party in former elections believe in our ideals, and reluctantly follow the reactionary leaders who are continually protecting or favoring monopoly. These progressive citizens belong with us. They can be made to know that their ideals can best be obtained through the Democratic Party.

"The just solution of our vital domestic problems require progressive citizens to unite. I appeal to you to lay aside all partisan bitterness and invite to your support forward-looking citizens of other parties. Let us work harmoniously together in promoting social and industrial justice and human happiness."

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVAL.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had on this day approved and signed the act (S. 3202) granting leave of absence to officers of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

CANADIAN WOOD PULP.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore (at 12 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.). The morning business is closed.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I desire to ask for the consideration of Senate joint resolution 152, in reference to wood pulp, which we had before the Senate on Wednesday.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, resumed the consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 152) authorizing the appointment of a commission to confer with the Dominion Government or the provincial governments of Quebec, Ontario, and New Brunswick relative to the claims of the American interests now holding leases of Crown lands acquired prior to the passage of restrictive orders in council of the said Provinces.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ball	Dillingham	Hitchcock	Lenroot
Beckham	Elkins	Johnson, S. Dak.	Lodge
Brandegee	Fernald	Jones, N. Mex.	McKellar
Calder	Gay	Jones, Wash.	McLean
Capper	Glass	Kellogg	McNary
Chamberlain	Gronna	Kendrick	Moses
Colt	Hale	Kenyon	Myers
Culberson	Harding	Keyes	Nelson
Cummins	Harris	King	New
Curtis	Harrison	Kirby	Norris
Dial	Henderson	Knox	Nugent

Overman	Ransdell	Smoot	Underwood
Page	Sheppard	Spencer	Wadsworth
Phipps	Sherman	Sterling	Warren
Pittman	Simmons	Sutherland	Watson
Poindexter	Smith, Ga.	Thomas	Williams
Pomerene	Smith, Md.	Trammell	Wolcott

Mr. DIAL. I wish to announce that my colleague [Mr. SMITH of South Carolina] is detained from the Senate by illness.

Mr. McKELLAR. The Senator from Rhode Island [Mr. GERRY] and the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] are detained from the Senate by illness.

The Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is detained by illness in his family, and the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. WALSH] is detained by the illness of a member of his family.

The Senator from California [Mr. PHELAN] and the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] are absent on official business.

The Senator from Arizona [Mr. ASHURST] is detained at home by illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Sixty-eight Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not know what the RECORD shows, but I reported the joint resolution from the Committee on Rules with an amendment in the nature of a substitute. I desire to have the amendment adopted. If it has not been read, I ask that it be read.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed substitute has been read and it appears in the RECORD. The question is upon agreeing to the substitute reported by the committee.

Mr. KING. I should like to ask the Senator from Alabama a question.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. KING. Does the Senator think that the object which he seeks to accomplish by the joint resolution may not be brought about through the interposition of the State Department? It occurred to me that the State Department could take up this matter with the other countries.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator from Utah that the very purpose of the joint resolution is to avoid that complication. My understanding is that this question has been attempted to be worked out in that way, but when the State Department takes up the matter it must of necessity take it up at the Court of St. James and then indirectly with the Dominion of Canada. Of course, the home British Government is not likely to insist on a question of this kind, and the treatment of it can not be as direct through the State Department as it could by this method. It is purely an industrial matter, and the purpose of the joint resolution is really to avoid the diplomatic channel. The people who are interested are hopeful that by way of a direct contact some result may be accomplished.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will still pardon me, I would not interpose any objection to the speedy determination of this matter. I made the suggestion because I thought perhaps, through the State Department, the matter would be much more quickly accomplished than by the appointment of a commission. I understand, furthermore, if the Senator will pardon me, that in matters relating to Canada and other possessions of Great Britain arrangements have been made by which we could deal directly with their representatives rather than through the home Government.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. To some extent that is true, but in the ultimate analysis it must go through the other channel.

Mr. McKELLAR. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. McKELLAR. On page 6, line 10, where the word "newsprint" occurs, does the Senator think that is broad enough to cover other print paper?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think it does.

Mr. McKELLAR. On page 5 the second whereas reads:

> The whole content of newsprint and other printing paper is composed of mechanical and chemical products of pulp wood.

Ought not the same expression to be used in the joint resolution that is used in the whereas on page 5?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think the joint resolution as it stands is broad enough. It was drawn with the idea of making it broader, and I think it is broad enough; but if the Senator does not agree with me, I have no desire not to broaden it, and I am willing to accept an amendment.

Mr. SMOOT. I will say to the Senator that it is broad enough to cover all paper made in Canada.

Mr. McKELLAR. There has been some question raised about that, and I should like to offer an amendment, if it is not seriously objected to.

Mr. SMOOT. The only other kind of paper would be parchment paper and paper which is made from rags, and such paper is not made in Canada. Indeed, there is very little of it made anywhere in the world to-day, and it cuts no figure in the paper market at all. Of course, if the Senator wants to use those words, well and good; but the resolution itself covers all the paper that is made in Canada.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am satisfied in my own mind that it does; but I do not care to raise any question about a matter of that kind, for I have no objection to the viewpoint the Senator from Tennessee is taking.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then I move to amend the substitute by inserting after the word "newsprint," on page 6, line 10, the words, "and other printing paper composed of mechanical and chemical products of pulp and pulp wood."

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will state the amendment proposed by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. McKELLAR] to the substitute reported by the committee.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. In the proposed substitute of the committee, on page 6, line 10, after the word "newsprint," it is proposed to insert "and other printing paper composed of mechanical and chemical products of pulp and pulp wood."

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, let me suggest to the Senator from Tennessee, if he desires those words to go in, to strike out the word "printing." I understand he desires to include all classes of paper.

Mr. McKELLAR. I desire to include all classes of printing paper.

Mr. SMOOT. But does not the Senator want to include all classes of paper in the manufacture of which wood pulp is used?

Mr. McKELLAR. No.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to the amendment.

Mr. McKELLAR. Then, if the Senator has no objection to the amendment, let it be adopted.

Mr. SMOOT. I have no objection to the amendment, but it is a limitation; that is all.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. I wish to suggest an amendment in section 2, on page 7, line 2, after the word "action," to insert the words "in its opinion," so that it will read:

> SEC. 2. That in the event the cancellation of said restrictive orders in council can not be agreed to by mutual arrangement of the Governments of the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada, that said commission shall invstigate, consider, and report to the Congress what action, in its opinion, should be taken by the Congress.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think that amendment is proper, and I accept it.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the amendment to the amendment is agreed to.

Mr. SMOOT. There is only one other question which I desire to ask the Senator from Alabama. Does the Senator really think that it will take $50,000 to do this work?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I do not think it will take $50,000, or any large part of it, if the commission is able to work out a conclusion with the Dominion of Canada; but if they fail in reaching such a conclusion and it shall become necessary for them to make a report as to their conclusion, it will probably take all of the $50,000. It is a matter of such grave importance to the country I think it is the part of wisdom to give them sufficient funds at this time with which to operate.

Mr. SMOOT. I want them to have sufficient funds, I will say to the Senator; but the Senator is fully aware that whenever an appropriation is made for a commission they base their estimates for clerks and expenses of all kinds upon the appropriation which is made, with the idea of expending it during the time within which they may decide they can make their report.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I think, unfortunately, that is very often true; but the Senator can see that it will take no large portion of this appropriation if we can work the matter out through a conference with the Dominion Government. If, however, it shall become necessary for the commission to report back to Congress, I think it will require the sum named in the resolution.

Mr. SMOOT. Very well.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment as amended.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I should like to have the substitute as amended read. I have not been able to be present in the Chamber, and I should like to know what the joint resolution as it now stands contains.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The proposed substitute as amended will be read.

The Assistant Secretary read as follows:

> *Resolved, etc.*, That the President of the United States be, and he is hereby, requested to appoint a commission of five persons and, by appropriate authority, to confer on this commission the power, on behalf of the administration and the Congress, to negotiate with said Dominion Government, or with said Provincial Governments, in respect to the cancellation of said restrictive orders in council, and as well any other restrictions on the exportation of pulp wood and newsprint and other

printing paper composed of mechanical and chemical products of pulp and pulp wood from the Dominion of Canada to the United States.

SEC. 2. That in the event the cancellation of said restrictive orders in council can not be agreed to by mutual arrangement of the Governments of the United States of America and the Dominion of Canada, that said commission shall investigate, consider, and report to the Congress what action, in its opinion, should be taken by the Congress that will aid in securing the cancellation of said restrictive orders in council, or their modification so that they may not continue to militate against the interests of the people of the United States.

SEC. 3. That for the necessary expenses of said commission the sum of $50,000 be, and it is hereby, appropriated from the moneys in the Treasury of the United States not otherwise appropriated.

Mr. KIRBY. Mr. President, I had hoped the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] would, to some extent, explain the necessity for this new commission. It does not seem to me to be necessary to appoint a commission to negotiate with another government. Recently the chief newspaper in Arkansas wired me that because of an embargo in Canada on newsprint paper 60 per cent of their supply of paper would be cut off, which would put that paper out of business. I immediately took the matter up with the State Department that afternoon and by next day the embargo had been raised. If the State Department was effective in that instance, why could it not be effective in all these matters? If we are going to deal with the Canadian Government, why could not our department of the Government which is organized for that purpose do the dealing? It did it, and did it most effectively, the other day in the particular instance which I have cited, and it did it within 24 hours. I do not see the necessity for a $50,000 commission, under the circumstances, and I wish the matter might be explained.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, my attention was temporarily diverted while the Senator from Arkansas was making his statement, and I desire to ask him what was the instance to which he referred?

Mr. KIRBY. A leading newspaper in my State had a contract for newsprint paper which had to come from Canada through Fort Frances, and the Canadians had notified that newspaper that because of an embargo 60 per cent of their print paper could not be delivered under the contract. The newspaper called my attention to the fact; I took the matter up with the State Department in the afternoon; within less than 24 hours the embargo had been removed; and the paper was continued to be delivered under the contract as previously. If the State Department could be so effective in reference to that one particular matter, and could secure the raising of the embargo on print paper at that place, why could it not do so at all other places? Why could not our State Department, which is organized for that purpose, deal with the Canadian Government in reference to the subject.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think there is some misapprehension regarding that feature of the situation. In the matter of temporary orders issued by one of the officials of the Canadian Government, my understanding is the State Department has secured an abatement by appealing to the British Embassy in this city, which, through their Canadian connections, have brought about a change, there being some question as to the validity of such orders in the first place. As I understand, however, the joint resolution offered by the Senator from Alabama involves a radical change of the policy which the Canadian Government has adopted; and for us to approach the Canadian Government through the British Government is rather a roundabout way, particularly as at this time Canada is desirous of taking to a larger extent the control of her foreign relations and foreign affairs, and is even contemplating, as I understand, at the present time establishing in the United States her own diplomatic representative. I believe, inasmuch as this is a matter of policy which is fixed now in Canada and which involves possibly some legislative changes, it would be wiser to take it up directly with the Canadian Government. I believe that will be the shortest way to do it and the one most likely to result favorably.

Mr. KIRBY. The matter to which I referred was taken up directly with the provincial government through our consul general there, and the result was as I have stated. I have no objection to the joint resolution, if there is any good reason for it, but it looks to me like a proposal to provide for the appointment of a commission for which there is no great necessity.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator from Alabama if he thinks it is necessary to appropriate $50,000 for this purpose? I presume he does, or he would not ask for it.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I stated to the Senator from Utah [Mr. SMOOT] a few moments ago that if this matter can be worked out through the commission treating with the Dominion Government of Canada, I do not think that $50,000, or any considerable part of that sum, will be necessary to be used; but there are two clauses in the resolution. It is provided that the commission shall endeavor to work out the problem with the Dominion Government, but if they can not do so that they shall report to Congress their conclusions as to what should be done to relieve the situation. That will require somewhat of an investigation and somewhat of an extended report, and if it is necessary for them to spend money for that purpose I think it will require at least the $50,000 provided for in the joint resolution.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, of course I shall not take up any time of the Senate to oppose the joint resolution. I think it is wholly unnecessary. I believe, as has been stated by the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. KIRBY], that this whole matter could be straightened out if it were taken up through the Department of State.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator that this is not a new matter with me. The first time that I myself came in contact with it was in 1913, when the present tariff law was written. We attempted at that time to pass legislation that would relieve this situation. Some years prior to that time Representative MANN of Illinois, of the House of Representatives, was the chairman of a committee that worked on this question for months, and tried to solve it. The situation was somewhat relieved by the present tariff law, which put newsprint paper below 5 cents a pound on the free list; but it has become very acute since that time.

It has been attempted to work this matter out through diplomatic channels and in the ordinary course. It is hardly worth while to call attention to the fact that, with the great influence the newspapers of the United States have in relation to the Government, they have not neglected any reasonable opportunity to solve this problem along existing lines. The question has become so acute with many of the newspapers of the country that it is really difficult for them to obtain paper with which to publish their editions, and unless there is some relief afforded it will be a serious calamity to the newspaper companies of the United States. It is not a question that has been pending for days or weeks but it has been pending for years, and the newspapers of the United States would not request this relief unless the matters had reached such a point that something along this line should be done.

As I have already stated—the Senator from North Dakota may not have been in his seat at the time—when we appeal through diplomatic sources we have got to go through the channel of the British Government and the British Embassy. As this is a business question, those who are interested in it are of the opinion that direct contact with the Canadian Government will be more successful than efforts directed through the ordinary diplomatic channels. I will say to the Senator, from the information I gather, that the newspapers of the United States are almost, if not entirely, unanimous in their desire for the passage of this joint resolution, and for some relief to be granted along these lines.

Mr. GRONNA. Of course, I believe what the Senator has stated to be true; but I want to call his attention to one instance which I have in mind. We have very few large newspapers in the State which I have the honor in part to represent, but I received a protest from the managers of a number of papers there in regard to the print-paper situation. They appointed a man and sent him to International Falls, which seems to be the place where they secured their paper. I took the matter up with the Department of State here—all I did was to write a letter and give the information—and in the course of a very few days the whole matter was settled satisfactorily to those interested in North Dakota, and I have had a number of letters from them stating that they are now securing all the paper they need.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will say to the Senator that I think there is a misapprehension about that matter. I know that there was an embargo placed on the shipment of certain paper into this country, but I understand that it grew out of the claim of the Canadian Government that some particular newspaper in this country had been violating the regulations. It was for that reason that the embargo, so called, was placed; but really when you come down to the last analysis there has not been any embargo placed at all. There was about to be an embargo, but, after an explanation, the situation was relieved. That situation, however, was not one to which the main body of the joint resolution was directed, but was in relation to some particular newsprint paper manufactured in the Dominion of Canada.

Mr. NELSON. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me for a moment?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. NELSON. The situation to which the Senator from North Dakota refers, and which was acute, was in connection with what transpired at Fort Frances and International Falls in respect to a company there that was manufacturing paper. They utilize water power extending across the international

stream and operate on both sides of the stream; and the grievance of the Canadians was that they shipped all of the paper to this side of the line and refused to supply the Canadian papers at Winnipeg. That was the whole matter in controversy there, and the situation was instantly cured, as the Senator from North Dakota has stated; but that is not involved in this question at all.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. No; I think not.

Mr. NELSON. It is not involved in this joint resolution. That situation simply grew out of the fact that the company, in disregard of the Canadian papers, sent all their print paper to this side of the line and left Winnipeg papers without any supply for the time being. I think the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] knows that is the situation.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I think the Senator from Minnesota is entirely correct so far as he goes, but I believe the grievance was even a little deeper than would be inferred from his remarks. The regulations in Canada, as I recall, require the mills of Canada to reserve 15 per cent of their product for home consumption; they are not permitted to export to the United States more than 85 per cent of their product, although the prices are higher in the United States. The mill to which the Senator refers, part of which, I believe, is in his State, although I am not sure about that, violated, as was claimed, contracts which it had with Canadian papers.

Mr. NELSON. Yes, sir.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Being tempted by the higher prices in the United States, and, as a matter of penalty, was estopped from shipping paper to the United States until the inequality had been removed. I am inclined to think that, as some papers were in distress, the man who was temporary regulator of the matter in Canada went so far as to order other paper mills to come to the relief of the Winnipeg publishers, and that resulted in those mills being unable to comply with their contracts in the United States. But the short and long of it was that it was a temporary matter, merely intended to bring relief to the Canadian papers, and did not involve any matter of permanent policy of Canada, as involved in the pulp-wood proposition which the Senator from Alabama desires to cure by negotiation.

Mr. NELSON. The Senator from Nebraska has stated the matter more fully than I have. It is exactly as the Senator from Nebraska stated.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President——

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield to the Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. GRONNA. I have no objection to the passage of any joint resolution which will correct mistakes; but I think I realize, and of course every other Senator realizes, that the mere appointment of this commission is not going to relieve the situation. I take it that the Senator from Alabama does not insist that this commission, regardless of who the commission may be, can adjust matters without legislation.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; I think they can. I do not think that there is any doubt that if this commission can convince the Government of Canada of the necessity for relief in this matter, it will not require further legislation, because all that is required is that an embargo by certain of the Provinces of Canada be raised. Of course, if these Provinces insist on this embargo, and will not raise it, then it may necessitate legislation on the part of this Government that will probably reach the situation, and the joint resolution provides for this commission reporting along what lines the Congress had best act if we can not work it out through agreement with the Canadian Government. As the first step, however, when our case is properly presented to the Government of Canada and the Provinces, we may, and I hope that we will, accomplish the relief desired, because all that is necessary is to raise an embargo that has been placed on the shipment of wood pulp to this country, and that can be accomplished by an order in council. It does not require legislation.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, I want to say to the Senator that pulp wood is not the only question which has affected the American people. The question of grain has been much agitated, and it is a much larger question, of course, than that of pulp wood. If the Senator will permit me further, if the men who have been appointed to deal with this question are performing their duty, they have been able to do so with respect to cereals of all kinds, and, of course, our laws are such that they may, if necessary, resort to retaliatory measures, and that applies to pulp wood as well as it does to cereals.

So far as the grain question is concerned, it has been regulated by one man. There was no necessity for the appointment of a commission and for the further expenditure of $50,000. If the law is such that a commission may adjust the matter by insisting to the authorities of the Canadian Government that they are making a mistake, and that their action is burdensome to the Government of the United States, it seems to me it would be possible for the present officials of our Government to bring about that result.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I will call the Senator's attention to this fact: Of course I am not as well informed about matters relating to the grains of the Northwest as he is, and do not pretend to be, but the present tariff law, in putting certain grains on the free list, made provision for a reciprocal treaty that is already provided for by law. That is in the law. There is no law at present with reference to this question. A law may be necessary in the end, but until we have a treaty——

Mr. GRONNA. May I ask the Senator if it is not true, then, that if a law is necessary, this commission would not be able to adjust the matter without further legislation?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Yes; they can adjust it without further legislation if the Canadian Government will yield on this embargo, and that is what the commission are going to ask them to do. If they can persuade the Canadian Government to yield, or can persuade the Province of Quebec to yield on the present embargo, no further action will be necessary; but if that can not be accomplished the commission are asked to report to the Congress what action should be taken in the matter, and then legislation will have to follow.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. President, my objection to the creation of these commissions is this: We are asked to reduce expenditures, and I believe it is absolutely necessary that we should keep down appropriations to the lowest possible amount. We are asked to cut appropriations for agricultural purposes to the very lowest possible amount; and yet every once in a while we get an idea that some other commission ought to be appointed, and instead of asking for a reasonable amount we ask for a large amount.

I consider that $50,000 is a tremendously large amount. I remember that when a commission was appointed to go to Europe and investigate rural credit conditions we allowed them only $25,000 for the purpose. Here we are providing $50,000 for a commission to go across the line between the United States and Canada. One-half of that, in my judgment, is a large amount, and regardless of whether it is voted down or voted up, I offer an amendment reducing the amount of $50,000 to $25,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The amendment offered by the Senator from North Dakota will be stated.

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. On page 7, line 7, it is proposed to strike out "$50,000" and in lieu thereof to insert "$25,000."

Mr. KENYON. Mr. President, I should like to ask the Senator from North Dakota why $25,000 is necessary. Is not that a very large sum for the commission to spend?

Mr. GRONNA. I agree with the Senator that it is a very large amount.

Mr. KENYON. I will ask the Senator from Alabama why such a large appropriation should be made?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The Senator from Iowa, I am sure, was not in the Chamber a moment ago when I made the statement. I stated then, in answer to a question, that if the commission that is sought to be appointed under this joint resolution can work out the problem with the Dominion Government of Canada, I am satisfied that it will not take the $50,000, or that it will not take a large part of it; but there are two clauses in this joint resolution. The second clause is that if it can not be worked out amicably with the Government of Canada, then this commission shall report to Congress what in their judgment is the best thing to do. I have no doubt that that will require an investigation; it will require clerk hire; it will require a more or less voluminous report, and considerable printing, probably; and I do not think $50,000 is a large sum if that contingency arises.

The Senator must remember that not only is one of the great industries of this country involved, but to a certain extent its very existence is threatened by the fact of the limitation of newsprint paper. The newspapers of this country can not proceed with their business unless they have an adequate and a reasonable supply. The vastness of the industry I can not say offhand, but the Senator knows that aside from the newspaper feature of the matter, this is one of the very large industries of the United States, and here is an order in council of the Dominion Government of Canada that is absolutely preparing to throttle its life, or force the manufacturers of all newsprint paper across the Canadian line; and if they go across the Canadian line our Government will lose control of the industry absolutely. The newspapers of this country will be absolutely in the hands of the manufacturers of newsprint paper in Canada.

With this great question confronting one of the great industries of this country, I can not conceive how the Congress can hesitate to allow a commission to use $50,000 when we consider

the vast expenditures that are made here every day about minor matters. I sincerely hope that the Senate will not agree to the amendment, but will allow the appropriation to stand as it is proposed in the joint resolution.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on the amendment proposed by the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. GRONNA] to the amendment of the committee.

The amendment to the amendment was rejected.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question now is upon agreeing to the amendment, in the nature of a substitute, proposed by the committee, as amended.

The amendment as amended was agreed to.

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

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

The title was amended so as to read: "A joint resolution authorizing the appointment of a commission to confer with the Dominion Government or the provincial governments of Quebec, Ontario, and New Brunswick as to certain restrictive orders in council of the said Provinces relative to the exportation of pulp wood therefrom to the United States."

The ASSISTANT SECRETARY. The committee also recommends a complete substitute for the preamble of the joint resolution, as follows:

Whereas newsprint and other printing papers are commodities of universal use and are indispensable in the educational process of modern civilization, and the paramount importance of a sufficient production of such newsprint and other paper to supply the needs of the people of the United States is a self-evident proposition; and

Whereas practically the whole content of newsprint and other printing paper is composed of mechanical and chemical products of pulp wood, the supply of which in the eastern part of the United States is being rapidly exhausted by the growing demand and the price of which is being advanced to unprecedented levels; and

Whereas the existing scarcity of pulp wood and its threatened total exhaustion in the United States has become a matter of such grave concern to the paper industry, the users and manufacturers of forest products, the Federal Government, and the general public that the Forest Service, the lumber and pulp and paper associations, and the forestry authorities of the country are now formulating a broad and comprehensive national forest conservation and reforestation plan for early adoption; and

Whereas the lieutenant governors of certain of the Provinces of Canada, in council, did issue orders prohibiting the exportation of pulp wood cut from Crown lands, the chief source of supply of pulp wood, unless manufactured into lumber, pulp, or paper, thereby tending to create a monoply beyond our borders in the manufacture of paper, to the great detriment of the people of the United States:

The amended preamble was agreed to.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate in open executive session proceed to the consideration of the German treaty.

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

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, in the discussion of the treaty of peace with Germany to-day I shall confine my remarks almost entirely to that part of the treaty referring to Egypt. In order that what I may say may be the better understood, I desire to refer briefly to some Egyptian history.

For a great many years Egypt was a part of the Turkish Empire. Some time about 1840 Egypt waged a war against Turkey for her independence. Her armies were successful. She was on the verge of establishing her independence, and Constantinople would soon have fallen, when Great Britain and France interfered in order to preserve the so-called balance of power. In 1840 or 1841 a treaty was negotiated which, while it gave to Egypt practical independence, nevertheless left a nominal suzerainty by Turkey, by virtue of which Egypt was compelled to pay Turkey about $3,500,000 annually. With this exception and with the other exceptions provided for in the treaty, that the victories which her armies had achieved were not given her by way of territory, Egypt became an independent nation.

Now, Senators, I want you to bear with me while I read some of the pledges made by the British representatives in the name of that Government and extracts from some of the treaties that Great Britain made, in order that I may lay the foundation for my claim that Great Britain has not only violated every pledge made by her and her allies during the war for a new and a free, regenerated world, but she violated the most sacred pledges that can possibly be given by one nation to another in regard to the independence of Egypt.

Before I read those I ought to say that in 1880, or somewhere thereabouts, the English fleet attacked Alexandria and English soldiers were landed on Egyptian soil. The ostensible reason for this course by Great Britain was to protect the Egyptian Government and also to safeguard some financial transactions and debts accruing in the construction of the Suez Canal, but England announced then, and, as I shall show, has announced a great many times since, that the object of this occupation of the Egyptian territory by her forces was only temporary; that she had no ambition upon Egyptian territory; and that she desired at all times to preserve the independence and the integrity of the Egyptian nation.

I desire to read to the Senate some, but not all, of the pledges made by British statesmen in the name of the English Government, and extracts from some of the treaties that England made with other countries, by which she pledged herself to the absolute integrity of the Egyptian nation and that she had no ambitions of her own in any way or at any time to interfere with that independence.

November 4, 1881, Lord Granville, speaking for the British Government, announced the policy of that Government toward Egypt as follows:

The policy of His Majesty's Government toward Egypt has no other aim than the prosperity of the country and its full enjoyment of that liberty which it has obtained under successive firmans of the Sultan. * * * It can not be too clearly understood that England desires no partisan ministry in Egypt. In the opinion of His Majesty's Government a partisan ministry founded on the support of a foreign power or upon the personal influence of a foreign diplomatic agent is neither calculated to be of service to the country it administers nor to that in whose interest it is supposed to be maintained.

Later, on June 25, 1882, England, together with the representatives of five other great European powers, entered into an agreement in regard to Egypt, from which I quote the following:

The Governments represented by the undersigned engage themselves, in any arrangement which may be made in consequence of their concerted action for the regulation of the affairs of Egypt, not to seek any territorial advantage nor any concession of any exclusive privilege, nor any commercial advantage for their subjects other than those which any other nation can equally obtain.

In the very next month after that treaty was made, on July 26, 1882, the British admiral, Sir Beaucamp Seymour, in an official communication to the Khedive of Egypt, used the following language:

I, admiral commanding the British fleet, think it opportune to confirm without delay once more to your highness that the Government of Great Britain has no intention of making the conquest of Egypt, nor of injuring in any way the religion and liberties of the Egyptians. It has for its sole object to protect your highness and the Egyptian people against rebels.

On August 10, 1882, Mr. W. E. Gladstone spoke as follows in the House of Commons:

I can go so far as to answer the honorable gentleman when he asks me whether we contemplate an indefinite occupation of Egypt. Undoubtedly of all things in the world that is a thing which we are not going to do. It would be absolutely at variance with all the principles and views of Her Majesty's Government, and the pledges they have given to Europe and with the views, I may say, of Europe itself.

On February 6, 1883, Lord Dufferin used the following language in an official dispatch:

The territory of the Khedive has been recognized as lying outside the sphere of European warfare and international jealousies. * * *

The Valley of the Nile could not be administered from London. An attempt upon our part to engage in such an undertaking would at once render us objects of hatred and suspicion to its inhabitants. Cairo would become a focus of foreign intrigue and conspiracy against us, and we should soon find ourselves forced either to abandon our pretensions under discreditable conditions or embark upon the experiment of a complete acquisition of the country.

On August 9, 1883, Mr. Gladstone, speaking in the House of Commons, again referred to the Egyptian question and used the following language:

The uncertainty there may be in some portion of the public mind has reference to those desires which tend toward the permanent occupation of Egypt and its incorporation in this Empire. This is a consummation to which we are resolutely opposed and which we will have nothing to do with bringing about. We are against this doctrine of annexation, we are against everything that resembles or approaches it, and we are against all language that tends to bring about its expectation. We are against it on the ground of the interests of England; we are against it on the ground of our duty to Egypt; we are against it on the ground of the specific and solemn pledges given to the world in the most solemn manner and under the most critical circumstances, pledges which have earned for us the confidence of Europe at large during the course of difficult and delicate operations, and which, if one pledge can be more solemn and sacred than another, special sacredness in this case binds us to observe. We are also sensible that occupation prolonged beyond a certain point may tend to annexation, and, consequently, it is our object to take the greatest care that the occupation does not gradually take a permanent character.

Lord Derby, in the House of Lords on February 26, 1885, said:

From the first we have steadily kept in view the fact that our occupation was temporary and provisional only. * * * We do not propose to keep Egypt permanently. * * * On that point we are pledged to this country and to Europe, and if a contrary policy is adopted it will not be by us.

On the 10th day of June, 1887, Lord Salisbury, speaking for the British Government in the House of Lords, said:

It was not open to us to assume the protectorate of Egypt, because Her Majesty's Government have again and again pledged themselves that they would not do so.

Again, Lord Salisbury, in the House of Lords on August 12, 1889, said:

When my noble friend * * * asks us to convert ourselves from guardians into proprietors * * * and to declare our stay in Egypt permanent, * * * I must say I think my noble friend pays an insufficient regard to the sanctity of the obligations which the Government of the Queen have undertaken and by which they are bound to abide. In such a matter we have not to consider what is the most convenient or what is the more profitable course; we have to consider the course to which we are bound by our own obligations and by European law.

On the 8th of April, 1904, the British Government entered into another treaty known as the Anglo-French agreement, and in that agreement Great Britain declared as follows:

The Government of His Majesty declares that it has no intention of altering the political status of Egypt.

On the 3d day of March, 1907, in Lord Cromer's report, he referred to this Anglo-French agreement as follows:

There are insuperable objections to the assumption of a British protectorate over Egypt. It would involve a change in the political status of the country. Now, in article 1 of the Anglo-French agreement of the 8th of April, 1904, the British Government have explicitly declared that they have no intention of altering the political status of Egypt.

On October 24, 1908, Sir Eldon Gorst, in a public interview, speaking of a rumor that Great Britain proposed to proclaim a protectorate over Egypt, made the following denial:

The rumor has no foundation, and you may contradict it categorically. Great Britain has engaged herself by official agreements with Turkey and the European powers to respect the suzerainty of the Sultan in Egypt. She will keep her engagements, which, moreover, she reiterated in 1904 at the time of the conclusion of the Anglo-French agreement. England stipulated in that agreement that she has no intention to change the political situation in Egypt. Neither the people nor the Government wish to rid themselves of these engagements.

In August, 1914, Sir Edward Grey, speaking in the House of Commons, said:

England stretches out her hand to any nation whose safety or independence may be threatened or compromised by any aggressor.

Premier Asquith, in a public speech at Guildhall, in November, 1915, after the war had commenced, asserted:

We shall not pause or falter until we have secured for the smaller States their charter of independence and for the world at large its final emancipation from the reign of force.

Premier Asquith again, on November 9, 1916, while the war was in progress, declared:

This is a war, among other things—perhaps I may say primarily—a war for the emancipation of the smaller States. * * * Peace, when it comes, must be such as will build upon a sure and stable foundation the security of the weak, the liberties of Europe, and a free future for the world.

Again, on December 20, 1917, Premier Asquith, speaking in the House of Commons, said:

We ought to make it increasingly clear by every possible means that the only ends we are fighting for are liberty and justice for the whole world, through a confederation of great and small States, all to possess equal rights.

You will notice that some of these protestations in regard to Egypt and the rights of small nations were made during the war; they were made, Mr. President, at a time when Egypt was fighting on the side of the Allies. It must be remembered that many of these pledges were made years before; that they were continually made; that England entered into at least two treaty obligations by which she solemnly and specifically pledged herself as to the integrity of the Egyptian nation. During the war, when the war was on, the protestations of her leaders and her statesmen in the House of Commons and House of Lords, before the world, in public addresses, applied generally to all weak nations.

When war commenced, in August, 1914, in less than 30 days—yes, in less than 20 days—Egypt went into the war on the side of the Allies. She declared war against Germany on the 6th day of August, 1914. She fought that war through from the beginning to the very end. No one has questioned her loyalty; no one has questioned the sacrifice that she has made. She did it in part because she was opposed to the methods of the German Empire, because she wanted freedom from Turkey; and she knew that Turkey was closely allied with Germany, although at the time she went into the war Turkey was still neutral. She did it, in the third place, because she relied upon the pledges, upon the promises made by England not only before the war but later on. After she got into the war she renewed her energies, because she relied on the pledges that were made during the war that it was being fought for the rights of the small nations. She believed when the war was over she would be entitled to her independence from Turkey, never dreaming at that time, at the beginning, at least, that she would have to compete with one of her allies rather than with one of her enemies in order to gain and to establish her independence amongst the other nations of the world. More than a million—about 1,200,000—Egyptians took part in the war on the side of the Allies. Egypt turned her standing army over to the Allies. Not all her men were engaged in the trenches—many of them were laborers—but they were on all of the fronts and in some cases bore the brunt of the major part of the fighting in the trenches.

Later on, in 1914, Turkey entered the war. When Turkey entered the war England declared a protectorate over Egypt, the thing she had always said she would not do and that she had no right to do; but, as I shall show, she did it partially with the consent of the Egyptian Government, the Egyptian Government relying upon the English pledges then that the protectorate was only a war measure; that it was only temporary. Egypt continued in the war, as loyal as ever, clear to its close, fighting upon practically all the battle fronts in behalf of the allied cause.

When Turkey went into the war the most natural thing would be for her to attack Egypt, to attempt to capture the Suez Canal. It will be remembered that the first attempt to capture the Suez Canal was very nearly successful. It was Egyptian soldiers, in the main, who prevented the capture of the Suez Canal. It was at the sacrifice of Egyptian blood and Egyptian lives that Turkey was driven off and defeated. Later on the Egyptians fought on the other eastern fronts. A great many Egyptian soldiers were under Allenby in Palestine, and in Mesopotamia, Bulgaria, and Greece; others, mostly as laborers, were in France and in Belgium. A writer in a London magazine, who was personally present, said that during the fighting on the Gallipoli Peninsula, which proved so disastrous for the Allies, the Egyptian soldiers died like flies. Gen. Allenby has officially stated that he was very materially assisted in his capture of the Turks by the Egyptian Army. Thousands and tens of thousands, and, indeed, hundreds of thousands of Egyptians died on the battle field.

That was not all, Mr. President. On all those eastern fronts Egypt furnished a great portion of the food that kept the armies on the battle front. It is doubtful if the Suez Canal could have been kept from being captured by the Turks had it not been for the Egyptians, and God only knows what kind of a catastrophe might have been the result of that. Egypt furnished food, as I have stated, to all the armies; she furnished wheat; she also furnished cotton, which was so much needed by the Allies.

As I have said, when Turkey went into the war, which was, I believe, in December, 1914, England proclaimed a protectorate over Egypt. She did so under the guise of protecting the Egyptian people from capture by the Turks. She announced to the world that Turkey had attacked Egypt, and to convince the Egyptian people that her protectorate was only a war measure and was intended only for temporary purposes, the King of England at the time of proclaiming the protectorate sent the following message to the new Khedive of Egypt:

On the occasion when Your Highness enters upon your high office I desire to convey to Your Highness the expression of my most sincere friendship and the assurance of my unfailing support in safeguarding the integrity of Egypt and in securing her future well-being and prosperity.

Your Highness has been called upon to undertake the responsibilities of your high office at a grave crisis in the national life of Egypt, and I feel convinced that you will be able, with the cooperation of your ministers and the protection of Great Britain, to successfully overcome all the influences which are seeking to destroy the independence of Egypt and the wealth, liberty, and happiness of the people.

That official message is signed by the King. It seems to me that no man can read it without being impressed with the thought that England at least pretended to Egypt that she was taking this step in the interest of Egypt, for it will be noted that in the letter of the King it is stated:

I feel convinced that you will be able, with the cooperation of your ministers and the protection of Great Britain, to successfully overcome all the influences which are seeking to destroy the independence of Egypt.

There is nothing there to indicate that the independence of Egypt would be destroyed by the same hand that was offering this beautiful bouquet; but if there be any doubt as to the sense in which it was received by the Egyptian officials and the Egyptian people, let me read the response to that beautiful message that was sent to the King by the Khedive of Egypt. To the King of England he replied:

I present to Your Majesty the expression of my deepest gratitude for the feelings of friendship with which you see fit to honor me, and for the assurance of your valuable support in safeguarding the integrity and independence of Egypt. * * *

If England had had any other design except the independence and the protection of Egypt—independence as well as protection; in fact, protection involved independence, because, with the exception of the suzerainty which Turkey held over Egypt, Egypt was then independent—if there could be any other possible construction placed upon the letter from the King of

England to the Khedive of Egypt, then the answer of the Egyptian officials to that King must have shown him, as it showed to the world, that Egypt was relying upon England's word; that she construed it to mean the independence of Egypt. If the British Government had had any other design, if they had any covert purpose that was not shown to the public, and they were honorable and fair, they would at once have replied to this message, "We do not intend to preserve the independence of Egypt; we are going to destroy it ourselves; when we get to the peace table we are going to deny to you that independence for which you think you are now fighting."

Great Britain gave notice to the world of her protectorate over Egypt, and I desire to let the Senate and the country understand what view we took of it at the time officially. She gave notice to the United States, among other nations, of this move on her part to protect Egypt from the assaults of Turkey. The official notice from the British Government to our State Department reads as follows:

BRITISH EMBASSY,
Washington, December 18, 1914.

SIR: I have the honor under instructions from my Government to communicate to you, sir, for your information, the accompanying copy of a telegram stating that His Majesty's Government consider that the suzerainty of Turkey over Egypt is terminated—

That is what Egypt claimed also—

and that they have advised the King to place Egypt under his protection.

I have the honor to be, with the highest consideration, sir,
Your most obedient, humble servant,
CECIL SPRING RICE.

The Hon. W. J. BRYAN,
Secretary of State, etc.

The telegram which this official message says was inclosed with it reads as follows:

You should communicate the following to the Government to which you are accredited—

And I assume that this was sent to all Governments as well as ours—

In view of the state of war initiated by Turkey against Egypt His Majesty's Government consider that the suzerainty of Turkey over Egypt is terminated, and they have advised His Majesty to place Egypt under his protection and to order the adoption of all measures necessary for the safety of the inhabitants, the defense of the country, and the protection of the many and various important interests existing there. Official notifications to this effect have been issued in London and Cairo. The unprovoked nature of the Turkish aggression has prevented any discussion of this matter with the powers beforehand, but His Majesty's Government have no intentions of impairing foreign interests and wish to act in harmony with the powers in making those changes affecting their interests which are rendered unavoidable by the aggression of Turkey.

Meanwhile the Egyptian Government will arrange for the issue of a khedivial decree providing that the consular and other foreign courts shall continue to exercise in Egypt their accustomed jurisdiction to the extent to which the arrangements which will have to be made by the military authorities for the maintenance of public order are not inconsistent therewith. You should add that His Majesty's Government have appointed a high commissioner for Egypt who will also be the minister of foreign affairs in the Egyptian Government, and His Majesty's Government would therefore ask that the Government to which you are accredited will be as good as to instruct their representative in Cairo to address all his official communications in future to the high commissioner as minister for foreign affairs.

After our Government had received this official notice it acted on the suggestion that its representative in Egypt should be notified. This is the notice contained in the letter written by our consul general at Cairo after he had received the official notice:

AMERICAN DIPLOMATIC AGENCY AND CONSULATE GENERAL,
Cairo, Egypt, April 22, 1919.

I have the honor to state that I have been directed by my Government to acquaint you with the fact that the President recognizes the British protectorate over Egypt, which was proclaimed by His Majesty's Government on December 18, 1914.

In according this recognition the President must, of necessity, reserve for further discussion the details thereof, along with the question of the modification of any rights belonging to the United States which may be entailed by this decision.

In this connection I am desired to say that the President and the American people have every sympathy with the legitimate aspirations of the Egyptian people for a further measure of self-government, but that they view with regret any effort to obtain the realization thereof by a resort to violence.

(Signed) HAMPSON GARY.

Mr. President, article 147 of the pending German treaty reads as follows:

Germany declares that she recognizes the protectorate proclaimed over Egypt by Great Britain on December 18, 1914, and that she renounces the régime of the capitulations in Egypt.

This renunciation shall take effect as from August 4, 1914.

It follows, Mr. President, if we are going to require of our enemy in the treaty a permanent recognition of the protectorate of Great Britain over Egypt that we of necessity recognize it ourselves. It can not for a moment be claimed that we will require that this protectorate shall be recognized by Germany and that we shall not recognize it. It follows that all other nations signing this treaty and approving it without reservation do the same thing that we have required the enemy to do—recognize the British protectorate over Egypt to remain as a permanent proposition. In other words, this treaty wipes the national integrity of the Egyptian people off the face of the earth. Egypt becomes a part of the British Empire.

It is true, I presume, that in carrying out this protectorate Great Britain will select, when she can, minor officials who are Egyptians; but there will be no one, from the top to the bottom, administering affairs in Egypt who does not obey the decrees of the British Government. It is one of the steps, perhaps the last and the final step, by which the British Government takes over Egypt. If there be remaining any Egyptians in official life after the protectorate of England is firmly established, they will be only rubber stamps. They will be only tools to carry out the word and the command of their masters. They will bear the same relation to England that the Secretary of State bears to the President of the United States under the present administration.

I might add that the Austrian treaty, which has not yet been officially submitted, contains this same provision in regard to Egypt.

Under this treaty, as I construe it, if unamended and without any reservation with regard to this article, we pledge our honor and our money to the support of the British protectorate over Egypt. American lives and American blood are mortgaged in order to add Egypt to the British Empire contrary to every pledge, contrary to the most sacred promises that have ever been made in the history of civilization. The carrying out of this article gives the lie to every pledge that I have read to-day—and I did not read all of them—made in the course of the last few years by the British Government and the British statesmen speaking for that Government. It gives the lie to every proclamation that was ever made and every sentence that was ever uttered by our President in his famous 14 points, in all the pledges that all the leaders of all the Allies made to the world during the progress of the war.

The President has asked for the ratification of the treaty without change; and, while the President in his speeches to the American people has said that we are not bound to maintain the new divisions of the earth, I desire to call attention to a speech that he himself made in Paris at the English plenary session of the peace conference in speaking to the premier of Roumania, who, it will be remembered, was not taking kindly to the program of the peace conference. I quote the President's speech from the advance sheets of a magazine article written by Herbert Adams Gibbons. In this article Dr. Gibbons says that he has in his possession the original stenographic notes of the President's speech, and from these notes he gives us the President's speech, as follows.

Said the President to the premier of Roumania, who, as I said, was objecting to some of the provisions of the treaty:

You must not forget that it is force which is the final guaranty of the public peace. * * * If the world is again troubled, if the conditions that we all regard as fundamental are upset and contested, the guaranty which is given you means that the United States will send to this side of the ocean their Army and their fleet. Is it surprising that, this being the case, we desire that the settlement of the different problems appear entirely satisfactory to us?

The judgment of the President as he gave it then, while he was on the ground and while he was talking to the Roumanian premier, is right, and no student of this treaty can successfully contradict it. If it follows that we must send our Army and our fleet to protect Roumania, will it not follow that for the same reasons and on the same grounds we must, under that treaty, send our Army and our fleet to protect Great Britain in the enjoyment of Egypt as a part of that great empire?

Now, Mr. President, I want to read from two speeches made by Mr. Balfour, the great English statesman. He made one before the armistice was signed, while the war was on, while he was anxious to get the support of the Egyptian people. He made it at a time when he knew the Egyptian people were fighting with the Allies because they desired at the peace conference to be consulted as to their own future and their own life; and the next speech he made after the armistice was signed and after Great Britain had thrown off the disguise and come out in her true colors.

On November 19, 1914, when England was about to declare her protectorate over Egypt for these war purposes, while Egypt was valiantly fighting for the allied cause, and when it was desired that she should not become suspicious because of this protectorate, Mr. Balfour made this speech. As I say, it was on November 19, 1914:

We fight not for ourselves alone but for civilization drawn to the cause of small States, the cause of all those countries which desire to develop their own civilization in their own way, following their own ideals, without interference from any insolent and unauthorized aggressor.

Mr. President, that speech went all over Egypt. There was some feeling in Egypt, when England declared this protectorate after Turkey went into the war, for fear that she might try to make it permanent; but it was such protestations, such speeches, and promises as Mr. Balfour made that I have just quoted from, as well as the others that I have previously quoted from, that kept Egypt loyally fighting for the allied cause from day to day, with a firm and an honest and, in my judgment, a justified belief that when the war was over and victory was won, she would be admitted to the peace council and she would be recognized as an independent nation, as in reality she was as soon as the suzerainty of Turkey was dissolved.

Compare that speech, made by this great British leader, with another speech that he made on December 10, 1919, after the peace, after the war was over, after this treaty had been signed, and when Egypt was commencing to object. She had been objecting from the very beginning of peace negotiations, but her voice had not gotten outside of Egypt because of the censorship of Great Britain; but it had gotten to England by this time, in December, 1919. Some of the British people—and, in my judgment, the great majority of the British common people—are just as bitterly opposed to this provision of the treaty as I am. They know that it is a sin; they know that it is dishonorable; they know that it is a broken pledge; they know that the word of honor of England was given in the opposite direction; and so, when there was some agitation about it, Mr. Balfour made another speech. Compare this with the one that I have just read. This speech was made in the House of Commons. I am not going to read all of it, but I want to read an extract that shows just exactly where he stood, as representing the British Government on this question, now when Egypt was down, now when they had no more use for her armies, now when the great powers had divided up the earth and put a fence around it and England had fenced into her corral the Egyptian nation of 13,000,000 people, without their consent. He said, speaking of Egypt:

> British supremacy is going to be maintained, and let nobody, either in Egypt or out of Egypt, make any mistake on that cardinal principle.

The mask is now off. The British Government has put behind her all the pledges she has made and the treaties she has made in regard to the independence of Egypt. She has cast aside all the beautiful speeches made during the war by her leaders, her statesmen, in proclaiming that they were fighting the war for the benefit of weak nations, for human liberty, and for human freedom. She has taken over now by this treaty 13,000,000 unwilling people, contrary to the doctrine of self-determination, contrary to the agreement upon which the armistice was based and the war actually ended.

I wish to read further from Dr. Gibbons's article. Dr. Gibbons was there, and is speaking from personal observation on Egyptian affairs. In referring to the message of the King that was sent to the Egyptian people and the reply of the Khedive, both of which I have read, Dr. Gibbons said:

> Sultan Hassein told me personally that the British Government promised him that the Egyptians would naturally participate in the peace conference and would have their say in establishing the new international status of Egypt.

And that is the most natural thing in the world. No man can read what I have already put into the RECORD in the way of official communications and public addresses by those who represented the British Government and reach any other conclusion.

Dr. Gibbons said at another place in his very interesting and able article:

> The Egyptians use against Great Britain the same points the races we have liberated use against Germany when they deny the assumption that they owe their material blessings to British rule and when they affirm that the Government which held them in subjection has exploited them. The Suez Canal was dug and the railway and irrigation system planned and partly constructed before the British came. Mohammed Ali and his successors were enlightened rulers, and they were responsible for the Europeanization of Egypt. They freed the country from the Turkish yoke, successfully defended its independence, and laid the foundations of the present economic prosperity. The British have reimbursed themselves richly for what they have done in developing irrigation and transportation facilities. Not only have the Egyptian people paid in taxes every cent spent upon them, but they were mulcted for a large portion of the expense of the reconquest of the Sudan, and the graft of big salaries and pensions to British officials and of the maintenance of the British garrison and police system has come out of the pockets of the Egyptian people. An appalling sum in gold goes from Egypt each year to be spent in England by the families of British officials and by the large roll of pensioners. The story of how Great Britain has used her position in Egypt to prevent the establishment of a native cotton textile industry for the benefit of Manchester and to cheat the Egyptian peasants out of the open market price of their cotton for the benefit of Liverpool is a telling refutation of the smug and comforting theory that the British occupation of Egypt is an altruistic burden unwillingly assumed by the British Government for the benefit of the Egyptians.

It has been said that there might be some danger on religious lines if the independence of Egypt were recognized, and I desire to read what Dr. Gibbons said in regard to that. As I said, he speaks, after having been on the ground, from a personal acquaintance with conditions.

> The British speak of the "nationalist faction" in Egypt and hint darkly at massacres of Christians and Europeans if the British relax their strong military control. This can fool only the uninitiated. So far as I have been able to see, and I have enjoyed exceptional opportunities, the native Christians are fully as nationalistic as the Mohammedans. If they have any fear of massacres the high clergy of the Coptic Church—

Which is the Christian church—

> If they have any fear of massacres the high clergy of the Coptic Church and the intellectual elements among the Copts act most queerly. They have assured me that they are heart and soul with the Mohammedans in demanding independence; Christian priests have preached patriotic sermons in mosques, and hundreds of Coptic young men and boys defied the British machine guns in the streets of Cairo and Assiut. When I visited the Presbyterian College at Assiut in 1916 one of the seniors, who had high standing, came to me secretly and begged me not to believe the stories of religious antagonism. "It is the old trick of 'divide et impera,'" he explained. "All educated Copts realize that our interests are with our Mohammedan fellow countrymen against the British. As long as we are under the régime instituted by Lord Cromer there is no hope of happiness for an educated Egyptian. The British are killing our souls. But with education we awake to self-respect and we can not help challenging foreign rule. We are all willing to die for our freedom."

This, Mr. President, was after the armistice, after England had taken possession as she has done, after she has murdered hundreds and thousands of Egyptian people for simply taking part in peaceful demonstrations demanding the independence of their own soil and their own country.

In another place in this article Dr. Gibbons speaks of an interview with the head of the British Government. He quotes the Khedive as saying to him:

> The British Government asked me to take the Sultanate when they deposed my nephew. I accepted the post and the war-time protectorate because we do not want the Turks and Germans in Egypt. Britain's interests and ours are identical when it comes to winning the war. But I do not want my people to think that I was unfaithful to the independence of Egypt. We have the definite promise of the British Government, only this is not the time to discuss the question in public. We shall have to wait until the end of the war.

In another place in this article he stated, quoting again from the Egyptian official:

> Our principal indictment of British rule is its utter disregard of the obligation of spending a fair part of the money derived from taxes on the education of the people. The British are deliberately keeping the Egyptians from getting an education, and then they tell the world that we are incapable of self-government.

On the religious question I desire to read from an article written also by a man who was on the ground, who talked personally with the people, an article by Dr. William T. Ellis, which was printed in the New York Herald December 23, 1919. It is an interesting article throughout, but I shall only read a part of it:

> November 13—

That was November 13, 1919.

> November 13 was the anniversary of the formation of the Egyptian delegation to Paris to plead for national rights—

And I will have something to say about that delegation later on—

> It has been agreed by the Egyptians to observe this day as a national holiday. Demonstrations of Egyptian patriotism, solidarity, and unity of purpose are always to be features of the commemoration.
>
> This year on November 13 a great company of Egyptions, officials, notables, students, business men, and fellaheen, estimated to number 20,000, marched in a body to the leading Coptic Church, the seat of the Patriarch, and then to El Azhar, the world-famous Mohammedan mosque. In both places as many persons as could enter united in public prayers for the independence of Egypt. Moslems led in prayers at the Christian church, and Christians led in prayers at the Moslem mosque.

This day, when the Egyptian people selected their official representatives to go to the peace conference to represent them as an independent nation, is sacred to them. It is the Egyptian Fourth of July and is as sacred to them as is the immortal Declaration of Independence sacred to the heart of every American.

Mr. President, at this point probably I might as well speak of the Egyptian delegation that is referred to by Dr. Ellis. When the war was over and the armistice signed, Egypt, naturally relying upon the pledges and all the circumstances surrounding her participation in the war, supposed that she would be admitted at the peace table when peace was made. She selected delegates, she selected her official representatives, and then for the first time she discovered that England had been false in all the pledges that she had made. Then she realized that she had been fooled, deceived, and that the lives of her soldiers on the battle fronts had been sacrificed in vain.

These delegates selected by the Egyptian people were arrested—no charge of any crime, no complaint that they had disobeyed any law, but they had been selected by the Egyptian people to go to Paris as the representatives of the Egyptian nation to make the peace for which they had been fighting dur-

ing all the war. No sooner had she taken this step than British Army officials arrested those representatives. They threw them in jail; they took them to Malta and put them in prison, and, let me repeat, without ever a charge of any kind being made against them. This brought about an eruption in Egypt. When the Egyptian people learned that before their official representatives could leave their own soil they were arrested and thrown into prison and were not going to be permitted to go to the peace conference, they rose almost as one man, demanding the release of these men and the freedom of Egypt.

They realized then that they had been tricked. They realized that all the blood that Egyptians had spilled upon the various battle fields had been shed in vain so far as the independence of Egypt was concerned. They realized that the promises made by the British statesmen on behalf of the British Government, those glittering generalities proclaimed by the President of the United States outlining the basis of this peace, were all bunk. They realized that they had been deceived, that their nation was going to be denied independence, and, notwithstanding their sacrifices, notwithstanding their loyalty, they were going to be turned over to another nation and their nationality absolutely destroyed.

When these people came out upon the streets of the villages and cities of Egypt, what happened? They were met with machine guns, they were attacked by bombs from British airplanes, their houses were burned, many of their women ravaged, men were tied at the stake and whipped, hundreds of them were shot down unarmed while they were engaged in the peaceful pursuit of trying to demand publicly before the world that the integrity of the Egyptian nation should be respected. Old men were killed, little children were killed. I have here photographs of 18 Egyptians, showing the naked bodies where they have been lashed until great welts have come out over their breasts and their backs, not because they committed a crime, not because they were charged with the commission of a crime, but because by this reign of frightfulness, following the precedent of the Kaiser, Great Britain wanted to coerce the people into submission. These 18 pictures that I have are not all. More than 500 men were flogged on their naked bodies. I shall read later on from official correspondence of the official representatives of the Egyptian people to the peace conference. Pictures were taken only of those who were able to get to the place where there was a photographer. I do not see how any liberty-loving man, woman, or child can look over the record that is made and reach any other conclusion than that it would be a crime, an international crime, a dishonor to civilization, if we would give our approval to conduct such as that, even though done by one of our allies.

After the Egyptian representatives had been imprisoned and the English Army had fired upon innocent gatherings and assemblages of people and killed them in cold blood, it was discovered that they could not stop the protestations in that way. Men and women, imbued with the spirit of freedom and human liberty, rushed pell-mell in the face of machine guns, knowing that death was going to be the result.

Gen. Allenby himself recommended to the British Government that these men be released, and after they had been held in prison in Malta for some time they were released. They were permitted to go to Paris. They never got into the peace conference. I will take that up later when I come to discuss the official correspondence of these representatives of the Egyptian people. At the present time I desire to call the attention of the Senate to the truth of a fact that I asserted a while ago—that the great mass of British citizenship have no sympathy with this kind of procedure.

I wish to read an article from the London Nation printed on November 29, 1919. I will not read the entire article, because it is lengthy. It is all interesting and all has a direct bearing, but I will read only some quotations from it:

> The proclamation of a protectorate in December, 1914, was a staggering blow to the hopes of the nationalists. So long as our status in Egypt was legally undefined and unrecognized they clung to the dream that the occupation might one day end. They have their register of our promises to withdraw. There are, they say, no less than 60 official repetitions of that pledge, which, in Mr. Gladstone's famous words, "If one pledge can be more sacred than another," were invested with "especial sanctity." In 1914 we wiped that pledge finally from our consciences even more decidedly than we had done 10 years before in the Moroccan treaty.

It is time—

Says this article in another place—

> It is time that we asked ourselves to state honestly why it is that we insist on breaking our promise to withdraw from Egypt, or why we refuse to apply "the right of self-determination." That right is not satisfied by conceding some guarded form of consultative assembly. It means, if it means anything, the right of a people to choose under what rule it will live. Even if we elect to say that Egyptians, after a generation of our tuition, are still political minors, have we not laid down the principle that such races may choose the power which is to receive a "mandate" to watch over them? We seem to remember that Mr. Lloyd-George proposed to consult the negroes of German Africa before he transferred them to our rule. To refuse a right to Egyptians which we allow to nomad Arabs and the Cameroon tribes is sorry trifling. What is it that deters us? There are three possible answers—the strategic argument of the road to India, the financial argument of the investor, and, of course, the general reluctance to surrender power. Power that results in scandal is no precious possession. There are ways of insuring financial stability which fall far short of a protectorate. As for the Suez Canal, if we were in earnest with the idea of the League of Nations, we should ourselves propose to safeguard its neutrality by the same régime which we shall apply to the Turkish Straits. In any event it would be easy to police the canal without administering or even garrisoning Egypt.

It has been difficult, Mr. President, to get any reliable information out of Egypt because of the censorship maintained by the British Government over everything coming from there. I wish to read on that subject a dispatch that came from Cairo, Egypt, dated December 20, 1919, which was printed in the New York Times on December 25, 1919. I will read only a part of that dispatch. I think it has an important bearing upon the information which we do get from Egypt. It shows that we do not get it all. There is not any doubt but the worst is yet to be told in regard to Egypt. Now, remember, this is from Cairo, Egypt, where since the armistice Great Britain has been in control:

> Owners and editors of newspapers have received official warning to refrain from printing matter likely to excite the public. Recent disorders were attributed, the warning stated, to certain newspapers. Announcement is made that in the future a newspaper is liable to suspension under martial law if it prints:
>
> 1. References to the political opinions or activities of schoolboys or other irresponsibles.
> 2. Political protests addressed to the authorities or to the British mission without the consent of the censor.
> 3. Anything calculated to encourage public servants to strike for political reasons.
> 4. Reports or aspersions calculated to inflame the populace against the British or Egyptian Governments;
> 5. Newspaper men are assured that there is no intention to prevent reasonable criticism and are advised to submit doubtful matter to the censor before publication.

That shows, Mr. President, the desperate means that are being now employed to suppress public discussion there. Newspapers must not print "political opinions or activities of schoolboys or other irresponsibles," the dispatch says. Some of these uprisings were led by students from the universities. They are called "schoolboys" and "irresponsibles." Educated people in Egypt are suppressed. "Anything calculated to encourage public servants to strike" must not be published. The newspapers are assured that there is no intention of interfering with the right kind of criticism, but if they have any doubt to leave it to the censor. We know from censorship in our own country what that all means.

Mr. President, England's course in Egypt since the armistice is almost parallel with Japan's course in Korea and China before the armistice. Japan paved her way to her barbarous and inhuman treatment of Korea by the most profound expressions of friendship and love for the Korean people and the Korean nation. She entered into the most solemn engagements with nearly all the civilized nations of the world that she would respect Korean national integrity. Every time she robbed Korea of her sacred soil she made additional protestations of friendship and love, and when she finally took Korea over and abolished the Korean Government in violation of every pledge she had made to Korea and the balance of the world she still protested her friendship and her love for her helpless victim.

Japan gave the same kind of assurances as to the integrity of China and for her firm friendship for the Chinese people. As her friendship grew, the itching of her palm also grew, and the greater love she seemed to possess for China, the greater was her ambition to rob China of her nationality, her railroads, her harbors, her commerce, and her freedom.

For more than 30 years England has been giving to Egypt and to the world her solemn pledge of national honor that she had no ambitions in Egypt, and that she had no intention of depriving the Egyptian people of their territory or of their national integrity. She, like Japan—with reference to Korea and China—has entered into treaties with other nations, in which she has solemnly declared that she desires the perpetuation of the Egyptian Government and the Egyptian nation. During all those years her statesmen and her premiers, speaking in her Parliament, have proclaimed the honesty of her intentions in Egypt; always claiming that the integrity of the Egyptian nation was the ultimate object of her intentions.

It might be remarked parenthetically, Mr. President, that at the peace conference England forgot all about Persia and did not put her into the treaty. So when the peace conference adjourned, England took Persia over without consultation with anybody.

These two allied nations—England and Japan—received the support of China and saw Chinese shed their blood in behalf of the allied cause, knowing at the time that at the peace table

China would be carved and her most valuable territory and possessions given to her worst enemy. England, with the other allies, received the support of more than a million Egyptians on the battle field in eastern Europe. She ate from the hands of Egyptian peasants the food that made her great victory under Allenby possible, knowing when she did it that Egypt would be denied a place at the peace table; that her country would be despoiled; that her nationality would be blotted from the face of the earth; that the blood of thousands of her loyal citizens had been shed for the allied cause in vain; and that the freedom which Egypt thought she would eventually attain would be denied.

Japan loved Korea because she coveted the Korean farms for her own people. Japan loved China because China had coal and iron that Japan needed. She loved China because she needed Chinese ports for her commerce, and the railroads and territory in Shantung for her expansion.

While not directly a part of the discussion of the pending treaty as it refers to Egypt, yet, as it has a relation to that subject because of the similarity of the treatment accorded the people, I might digress to say that India furnished more than a million men upon the various battle fronts in behalf of England's cause, and when the soldiers of India went home, imbued with a spirit of liberty, believing in the proclamation of self-determination that were made by England and the allies of England, believing thereby that she had fought to make the world more free and that in the end she might share some of that freedom—when those soldiers went home and undertook to demand it, in peaceable assembly, they were shot down in cold blood by British machine guns. I will insert, Mr. President, at this point in my remarks an article from London giving a report of an investigation that was made by English officials of one of these murderous assaults upon innocent and unarmed Indian subjects.

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

Mr. NORRIS. I desire first to know whether I have permission to insert in the RECORD the article to which I have referred?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GRONNA in the chair). Without objection, permission is granted.

The article referred to is as follows:

OFFICIALS O. K'D BIG SLAUGHTER, PROBE SHOWS—GENERAL IN COMMAND TELLS BOARD PROBING APRIL RIOTS IT WAS "HORRIBLE DUTY," LONDON LEARNS—EVIDENCE REVEALS LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR APPROVED BLOODIEST SLAYING IN LATE WESTERN HISTORY.

[By L. R. Murdoch, Staff Correspondent, Universal Service.]

LONDON, *December 13.*

A bloodcurdling story of massacre has been revealed by the British commission investigating the recent riots in India. It shows a British general deliberately ordering 50 troops to attack a crowd of 5,000 civilians and to fire until their ammunition was exhausted. The command was obeyed to the letter.

Five hundred persons were killed and 1,500 wounded. It was the bloodiest slaughter of civilians by western troops in modern history.

The evidence shows that this act was approved by the British lieutenant governor. News of the affair has just reached London from India with the reports of the Government commission's hearings at Lahore. The slaughter took place at Armitsar last April and was ordered to put down the riots there which were part of a general uprising that threatened to engulf the whole surrounding districts and spread all over India.

MARCHES ON CROWD.

Gen. Dyer testified before the commission that he arrived at Armitsar on April 11. Although martial law was not declared, he took over the administration from the deputy commissioner. He was informed that the situation was grave in many districts, including Lahore, and ordered that the alleged seditious meetings cease immediately. On April 13, according to his testimony, Gen Dyer informed crowds at Armitsar that meetings were forbidden and that assemblages were likely to be fired on without warning.

Later he was informed of a big meeting, which he judged to be not merely a disorderly meeting but open rebellion. He marched 25 British rifles, 25 Indian rifles, and 40 Gurkhas armed with knives to the scene and discovered an agitator haranguing a crowd of 5,000.

OPENS FIRE AT ONCE.

Continuing his testimony, Gen. Dyer said:

"I deployed my men and within 30 seconds ordered them to fire. The firing continued for about 10 minutes. My object was to disperse the crowd, and a little firing would have been insufficient to achieve that object."

The general admitted he had not warned the crowd, and asked what reason he had for supposing the crowd would not disperse without firing being necessary, he replied: "I think it quite possible that I could have dispersed the crowd without firing, but they would have come back and laughed, and I should have made a fool of myself. My view was that the situation at Armitsar was serious. I looked at the crowd of rebels and considered it my duty to fire and fire well."

Lord Hunter, chairman of the commission, asked the general: "Was there any other course open?"

Gen. Dyer replied: "No, sir. I looked upon it as my duty—a horrible duty."

Gen. Dyer asserted that 1,650 rounds were fired, and between 400 and 500 persons were killed and about 1,500 wounded. The soldiers, he testified, continued firing until they had run out of ammunition. He said he had made up his mind that if order were defied he would shoot straight away, and that he had felt he "had to do something very strong."

Justice Rankin, a member of the commission, asked: "Was it not a form of frightfulness?"

Gen. Dyer replied he figured it was best to "shoot well and strongly, so nobody would have to shoot again." He said there was no "middle course." Asked if his idea had been to strike terror into the hearts of the inhabitants, he answered he had found they had disobeyed his order and he meant to punish them and give them a lesson. From a military viewpoint, he said, the demonstration of force was bound to make a wide impression throughout Punjab.

One of the commissioners then read a telegram from Lahore (seat of the British lieutenant governor) to Gen. Dyer. It reads:

"Your action correct. Lieutenant governor approves.

"LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR."

The lieutenant governor of Punjab is Sir Michael Francis O'Dwyer, who has held that post since 1893.

FORCED TO CRAWL.

The evidence showed that during the riots mobs broke up the telegraph service, damaged the freight yards, and slew one guard and two bank employees, burning the bodies. A bank manager also was killed. The Government offices and an Indian Christian church were set afire and a missionary was outraged and left for dead.

Gen. Dyer testified he avenged the outrage on the missionary by picketing the streets and not permitting a single Indian to pass without crawling.

Mr. NORRIS. I now yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. The Senator stated a moment ago, as I recall, that India furnished 1,000,000 soldiers during the war for the purpose of fighting for England and saving England. Does not the Senator think—and I do not propound this question by way of criticism of his position or his statement—if Germany had triumphed in the great World War that India would have been one of the objects of attack and that Germany would have superimposed her autocratic form of government upon India?

Mr. NORRIS. That may be.

Mr. KING. And does not the Senator, therefore, think that the Indians in fighting side by side with the Britishers, with the French, with the Italians, and with the Americans, were fighting for their own liberty and for the cause of civilization?

Mr. NORRIS. They thought they were; there is no doubt about that; but, as will be shown in this article, things that have happened in India almost demonstrate that they were mistaken. The Egyptians thought—no man doubts it; English statesmen led them to think so—that they were fighting for Egyptian liberty, for the integrity of the Egyptian nation; but they have found out since that they were not; that they were fighting for more territory for England. Before the war, Egypt, with the exception of a nominal suzerainty, was an independent nation. Her independence now has disappeared from the face of the earth, and she is part of the British Empire.

Mr. KING. Will the Senator yield further?

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

Mr. NORRIS. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. KING. I am not propounding the question or making the statement which I am about to submit with a view of defending Great Britain, but I desire to call the attention of the Senator, very briefly, to what England has done in Canada, in Australia, in New Zealand, and in South Africa. She has given to those dominions of hers autonomy, local self-government; indeed, such a liberal form of government that they might be denominated governments in and of themselves and separated from the English Crown; at any rate, the chains which bind them to the parent Government are as thin as gossamer thread; they are chains of love, affection, and loyalty to the mother country rather than those of force and power.

Does not the Senator think that the Anglo-Saxon race, which finds its highest expression, of course, in this great Nation and finds high expression in the English people, in the end will deal justly by the Egyptians and by the Indians and will give them local autonomy and perhaps independence? I merely suggest that to the Senator for his consideration.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, with what the Senator says about Canada, Australia, and New Zealand I find no fault. So long as Canada, Australia, and New Zealand or any other dependency desires to be under the British Empire I am the last man to interfere; that is where they ought to be, if they want to be there, and the other side wants them there. That, however, does not excuse England or us or anybody else for subjecting by force a people who have a right to their independence and to reduce them practically to the position of slaves.

The Senator asks do I think they will ultimately be treated right? Probably—I do not know—in a thousand years from now, if conditions continue that long; but, in my judgment, this treatment can not be continued very much longer, because the treatment that has been accorded Egypt since the armistice was signed is such that it is revolting to every man who loves human freedom and who has in his heart any feeling of brotherly

affection toward his fellow man. Because England treats Canada right is no defense of England when she abuses India or when she mistreats Egypt. I am not complaining as to Canada; I am not complaining as to Australia or New Zealand; I am complaining of taking over a nation of 13,000,000 people without their consent, against their will, in violation of every pledge that ought to be sacred between man and man and particularly between nations.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, just one further suggestion, if the Senator will pardon me.

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

Mr. NORRIS. Yes.

Mr. KING. Does not the Senator think that the work of Great Britain in Egypt, in the physical and material development of the land, in the building of dams at stupendous cost, exhibiting the highest engineering feats that the world has seen, and which has resulted in bringing under cultivation thousands of acres of land in order to bring prosperity to the people, and, indeed, have brought the greatest prosperity to Egypt that she has ever enjoyed, together with the work which she has done in an educational way, her efforts to Christianize the people and to serve humanitarian impulses there, deserve one little word of commendation?

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, the Senator has overstated the case; the statement he has made is taking the matter a little too far. England did not build the Suez Canal——

Mr. KING. I was not speaking of the Suez Canal; I was speaking of the Assouan Dam.

Mr. NORRIS. The Suez Canal was completed and the great Assouan Dam was partially completed before England's efforts began. It was the Egyptians, as stated in the article of Dr. Gibbons which I have already read, who Europeanized the Egyptian people and the Egyptian nation. But, Mr. President, is it the Senator's assumption that because one nation goes into another nation and says, "We will develop some natural resource that you have and that you have not developed," therefore it has the right to take possession of its country and to deny its nationality? Even if that were true common honesty would have demanded that England proclaim her intentions at the beginning and not practice deception.

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

Mr. NORRIS. Let me finish now.

Mr. KING. The Senator inadvertently——

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CURTIS in the chair). The Senator declines to yield.

Mr. KING. I think the Senator inadvertently did me an injustice.

Mr. NORRIS. I will yield to the Senator, then, if he thinks that. I do not want to do him an injustice, of course.

Mr. KING. I knew, of course, that the Senator did not.

The question I propounded was this: Did not the Senator think there ought to be one word of commendation for England? I did not justify England in the retention of the territory. I asserted that England had done certain things which contributed to the material prosperity of the Egyptian people. Then I asked, With that record, did not the Senator think that England was entitled to a word of commendation? I did not state, as I understand the Senator now to affirm, that England, by reason of having taken possession, and notwithstanding she has done a great deal of good, was entitled to retain possession and to superimpose her form of government on an unwilling people. I do not affirm that. I did not intend to affirm it.

Mr. NORRIS. In my judgment, as I said, the Senator has overestimated and overstated what England has done. As I have already shown, and as I think nobody can successfully deny, everything that England ever did in Egypt the Egyptians paid for. They did the work; by taxation they paid for it; and they have not been allowed, for instance, and are not allowed now, to send their cotton out to the world in the open market, because England needs it.

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

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

Mr. NORRIS. I will yield, although I should like to answer one suggestion made by the Senator before he puts another question to me.

Mr. KING. All right. I will just ask this question, and then I will not bother the Senator again.

Mr. NORRIS. I do not object to being bothered.

Mr. KING. The Senator spoke about the cotton of Egypt. The Senator knows that Egypt never raised so much cotton as at the present time and never received so much for her cotton as at the present time, and that England has paid those very high prices and brought great prosperity to the people of Egypt.

Mr. NORRIS. Mr. President, if I do not forget it, I am going back to answer the other suggestions; but let me ask the Senator a question on that point. The American cotton producer never received so much for his cotton. Are you going to give England credit for that? Are we going to give England credit for the high wages that American labor receives? And if we are, are we going to charge her up with the profiteering? Are we going to put on the other side of the ledger, then, if you want to assume that for England, all the crimes that have been committed everywhere, all over the world, in the name of human freedom?

I was about to say when the Senator interrupted me the last time, Is it any reason for us, for instance, to take control of another people against their will, particularly after we have promised we will not do it, because they have some industry that we think we can develop better than they? How would we feel if England or Egypt came to the United States and went out here a few miles beyond the Capitol and saw Great Falls, where the water of the Potomac rolls down to the sea, and has been rolling down to the sea since the beginning of time, all the power that it might develop wasted and gone, and said to us, "You have never developed that great possibility there for the benefit of humanity. We are going to do it. In order to do it we will take possession of the Government," and then they would take possession of the Government; and after a while somebody like the Senator from Utah would come along and say, when we were claiming our independence and were being shot down by machine guns, "Why, Great God! did not England or Egypt develop Great Falls? Have you not got a word of commendation for her? You never did it."

Where are we going to draw the line, Mr. President? Why, England placed the line, President Wilson placed the line, the whole world drew the line when we were fighting in this war, when they outlined what the terms of peace should be—self-determination; no people should be ruled without their consent. Nobody denies that Egypt is competent for self-rule. She has ruled herself in the past for many years. England has said so. She has promised that she had no other motive than the preservation of that nation and of that people; and it is no defense to say that she will develop the agricultural lands, raise more wheat and more cotton, and dam some of the streams—none whatever.

But, Mr. President, every development that has ever taken place in Egypt has been made by the toil of Egyptian citizens, paid for by the taxpayers of Egypt. That is the reason why England wants Egypt. It is the financial profit that she is getting out of it. As Dr. Gibbons says, there is a long list of pensioners in England living on the taxes that are wrenched from the toilers of Egypt, and she wants it to continue, and under this treaty it is going to continue.

Let me return now, Mr. President, to the point where I deviated from my address when I spoke of England in India. I was speaking of the love and the friendship that great nations have for little nations when they are about to gobble them up.

During the centuries that have passed England has kept Ireland in practical subjection, under continual professions of national friendship. She is now deporting Irishmen to England on the ground of all imaginable kinds of crimes, always professing her sincere friendship for the Irish people. England loved Persia because she wanted to corner the oil fields of the earth, and I have put into the RECORD, in a prior discussion of this treaty that she made with Persia, by which she practically takes over the Persian Government and loans to Persia $10,000,000 that the Persian people must pay back with 7 per cent interest in order to develop English commerce and safeguard these oil fields.

She loans to Persia, at 7 per cent, money that she borrows from the American people at 4¼ per cent and upon which she has not even paid the interest up to date. England loved Egypt because Egypt is on the road to India; because her agricultural lands are the most fertile of all the earth; and because Egypt possesses cotton that England needs to keep her spindles turning and her world commerce afloat.

These historical incidents, Mr. President, almost prove that when an autocratic monarch professes his passionate love for a weak nation and reaches forth his mighty hand to shower upon the poor and helpless the blessings of his favor, the wise man will brush aside the silken folds of the royal mantle to discover the stiletto.

Mr. President, the official representatives of the Egyptian people, as I said a while ago, were finally released from prison and went to Paris. They attempted to get into the peace chamber and they wanted to represent their Government at the peace

council, and although the King of the Hedjaz was there, and all kinds of nomadic tribes were represented by various kinds of personages, Egypt was denied admittance. They refused to permit Egypt even to be heard when she was being tried for her own life. When these official representatives of 13,000,000 people who had been fighting loyally during the entire war were denied admission they had nothing left except to send official communications to that conference. They wrote official communications, asking to be heard, to Clemenceau, the president of the council; to Lloyd-George; and, last but not least, to President Wilson; and in every instance their communications were ignored. The only exception to that is an acknowledgment of those sent to President Wilson by his private secretary, saying that the communications had been received.

These official representatives then issued an appeal to the nations of the world setting forth what they believed to be their rights. They have been gathered together by these official representatives, and I have in my hand a copy of all these communications, given to me in person by one of these official representatives, and it would be interesting if it could be read from cover to cover.

Men who love liberty, men who believe in our system and in our own Government, who love the Declaration of Independence, who sympathize with the fathers who issued it and believe in the pronouncements of that immortal document, can not read these messages coming from this much-abused, faithful ally without tears coming to their eyes.

I am not going to read anything but extracts. First of all, let me say that in that council of peace was the King of the Hedjaz. Nobody knows yet who he is. We only know that he does not amount to anything. A whole lot of other insignificant nations were represented there. I am not complaining that their representatives were admitted. I am only calling attention to the fact that the representatives of only 200,000, 100,000, or 300,000 people, if they were fighting on the side of the Allies, were admitted with two exceptions, and those exceptions were Egypt and China. Japan was there; and if you compare the sacrifices made by Japan and those made by Egypt in this war, it is like comparing the noonday sun with the weakest star in the firmament. These representatives issued an official document, an official address, to the diplomatic representatives of all of the foreign countries represented in Egypt. I am going to read just one sentence from that, because it shows that if there was any question—they do not admit that there was any—about the stability of British investments—about the Suez Canal, for instance, which England did not dig, but took after somebody else did dig it—if there was any question about her holdings, they were willing that any provision protecting them might be put in. The world knows that there is not any. Ever since the Suez Canal has been dug Egypt has protected it, and by the sacrifice of her own blood and her own soldiers she saved it from being taken by Turkey in this war. So I will read from this official pronunciamento of these officials just one clause. It is No. 5. I wish Senators could read them all, because they show that Egypt is willing to do anything, to make any guarantee about the protection of anybody or anything in Egypt, and are willing that they should put into the treaty anything that will safeguard such protection if they would only maintain the integrity of the Egyptian nation. This clause reads:

> Egypt is disposed to accept every measure that the powers will judge useful for safeguarding the neutrality of the Suez Canal.

I am going to read from the official letter of these representatives to Lloyd-George. In that they say:

> Do you refuse to believe that Egypt has been a precious aid to you? The enormous sacrifices that we have made during the war in blood and treasure for the triumph of your cause were indispensable to you, and, moreover, you have recognized many times that these sacrifices were one of the principal factors of the victory in the Orient.

Further on they say:

> At whatever point of view we place ourselves, we can find, neither in the law nor in pretended military necessity, any excuse for the measure of which we are the victims. A single explanation remains that we ought not to allow ourselves to adopt, for it impugns your good faith—that you desire to make our silence, imposed by force, appear at Paris as the acceptance by Egypt of the protectorate and the political régime which it comports.

They practically said in there, "You have tried to keep us away; you have put us in prison, you are trying to shut out from the world the very fact that we have tried to be heard."

They also sent an official communication to Gen. Allenby, and I am going to read from that just a quotation:

> The military authorities summoned us finally and warned us that we were obstructing the functioning of the Government in trying to prevent the formation of a cabinet; and two days later were arrested and deported to Malta our president, Saad Pasha Zagloul, and three of our colleagues.

Further on they say in this same letter:

> Scarcely was the news of the arrest and deportation of our colleagues known than a numerous group of students of the higher schools came to inform us that they had decided to make manifestations. We advised them earnestly to give up their project and go back quietly to their studies. But it seems that their youth could no longer stand the policy of oppression and that in this state of mind they were unable to reflect seriously about our advice or persuade their comrades to listen to us.
>
> The day after the arrest the students made peaceful demonstrations. Nearly 300 were arrested. The following day, March 10, the students of Al-Azhar University participated in manifestations. Some hoodlums profited by this to attack tramcars and break the windows of several shops. On the 11th another peaceful manifestation of students was received by a volley of shots which killed a certain number of them. On the 12th similar peaceful manifestations were suppressed by machine-gun fire, which caused the death of more young people. The same day at Tanta a peaceful manifestation of students was met by continuous machine-gun fire, which made numerous victims killed and wounded. On the 13th and the 14th the British army in Cairo intervened to put down further peaceful manifestations by firing directly into the groups in the streets, who were without arms and who were committing no acts of violence.
>
> There is no doubt that this firing on unarmed students by the British troops, when the students were orderly and were simply making manifestations, provoked serious disturbances throughout the country. This was the last straw which broke the camel's back. In fact, on March 15 news began to arrive of an attempt to cut the railway lines, and immediately the entire country participated in those outbreaks. The discontent arising from the cruel treatment inflicted, in the interest of peace, upon a peaceful and unarmed people was not alone shown by the men. The most distinguished women in Egyptian society were not able, on their side, to see their fellow countrymen treated in this way and keep silent about it. The curtain that ordinarily separates our women of the upper classes from the outside world did not prevent them from expressing their sentiments. In fact, nearly 300 women of the most important families of Cairo organized on March 20 a simple and dignified manifestation after they had read in the morning paper that permission had been granted them. But when they got out of their carriages and reached the home of Saad Pasha Zagloul, the British soldiers surrounded them on all sides, with fixed bayonets pointed toward them, and compelled them to remain two hours under a broiling sun without allowing them either to walk or to go home in their carriages. The permission to return home was granted only after they had been seen in this situation by the personnel of the American and the Italian diplomatic agencies. This was another proof of the policy of harassing and humiliating the Egyptians, which, in justice and equity, must alone be held responsible for all the events that followed.

Now, Mr. President, when these Egyptian representatives were unable to get into the conference and were unable to get any answers to the communications to the members of the conference they sent an official communication to the members of the House of Commons in England. They said in part:

> To the Briton the most precious possession is his individual liberty and the independence of his country. Is it possible for him to deny to others that for the defense of which a million Britons have given their lives since August 1, 1914? We ask you simply to listen to us and then to decide whether the establishment of a British protectorate over Egypt, against our will and without our consent, is consonant with the traditions, individually and collectively, of your race.
>
> When Great Britain declared war against Germany, Egypt immediately followed her example. We Egyptians were in entire sympathy with the ideals in defense of which the British nation took up arms. We felt sure that the great conflict between the forces of democracy and the forces of autocracy, between principles based on right and fiats based on might, would end in securing for small and weak nations a brighter future. We believed with Mr. Asquith and Mr. Lloyd-George that the triumph of Great Britain and her associates would establish the world on a new foundation. For this reason we were glad to ally ourselves with the powers that promised to fight until the sanctity of the treaties, the rights of small nations, the existence of an international morality were recognized throughout the world.

Mr. President, I call attention to that language. Does it not appeal to every liberty-loving person? Do they not there call attention to pledges and promises that, if we are square and honest, ought to be kept sacred and inviolate, and has it not been demonstrated that they have been cruelly thrust aside and held for naught and these people subjugated and their nation destroyed without their consent and without an opportunity to be heard at the judgment seat of the court where the judgment was rendered?

They say further:

> During long years of war, in which we suffered with you and helped you to bear the burden, we were repeatedly told that when the final settlement came none who had helped in the common cause would be forgotten. Gen. Sir Edmund Allenby, the most competent man in the world to make the statement, declared publicly that the aid of Egypt was the most important factor of success in the decisive British campaign against the Turks. Had we not reason, then, to look forward to the defeat of Germany as our day of independence?
>
> Another cause of encouragement was the recognition of the independence of our brothers of the Hedjaz, who speak the same language as ourselves and are of the same religion as most of us. The Arabs of the Hedjaz did not have before a separate political existence like ourselves. In fact, within a century they were under our political control. We watched the dealings of Great Britain with the Hedjaz with keen interest and we registered with satisfaction the statement of the British cabinet, made in the House of Commons and reiterated at the opening of the peace conference, that the action in regard to the Hedjaz was inspired solely by the desire to help a subject nation to free itself from a foreign yoke and was not due to considerations of expediency. Was it illogical for us to expect from the British Government, in view of the oft-repeated assertions of its members, treatment at least as generous as that accorded to the Arabs of the Hedjaz?

Further on they say:

The only crime of which we have been guilty is the ardent desire to be consulted concerning our own destinies.

* * * * * * *

At the peace conference—

They say—

that was to be convened in Paris we wanted only what every other race of the Near East asked for and obtained—a hearing of our case. Permission was denied us, the representatives of Egypt, to go to London or to Paris. When the Egyptian cabinet resigned in protest against the refusal of the British military authorities to allow us to go to England, the president of our delegation and three of its members were arrested suddenly and were deported to Malta without any charge having been preferred against them.

In Paris we have received no answer to our communications to the peace conference.

I desire to read a quotation from the official message that these representatives sent to Mr. Clemenceau, the president of the peace conference:

In the name of liberty, of which you have been during your whole life, by word and pen, the untiring champion; in the name of justice, which you have promised to make the basis of the deliberations and decisions of the conference; in the name of humanity, which can not permit that a people pass from hand to hand like vulgar merchandise, we implore you not to interpret our silence and failure to appear in person at Paris as our acceptance of the domination imposed upon us, nor to decide the future of our nation without having heard us.

No response. Silent as the grave. No answer. Would that appeal strike an honest American citizen as being worthy of consideration when it comes from people representing 13,000,000 associates in the war, hundreds of thousands of whose fellow citizens have died to bring about the victory that this peace conference was called to put into actual force in the way of a treaty?

They sent an official communication addressed to the peace conference itself. After they got out of jail and got to Paris, they tried every means and every avenue to reach the men who were holding the world in their hands, to reach the three men who had the destiny of the world in their hands, every one of whom had made to the world the most beautiful promises for weak nations, for human freedom, for liberty, and for self-determination; every one of whom, singly and collectively, denied them a right even to be heard, and condemned them without a hearing. In this communication they say:

The anxiety of the Egyptians will be easily understood. They see all the races—even simple tribes—whose political status the war has changed, invited to make their voices heard at the conference, while they alone of the nations affected by the war had been deprived of this right. It is difficult, in order to justify such an equality of treatment, to invoke any plausible reason in harmony with the principles consecrated by the war and that the conference had taken upon itself the obligation to follow.

* * * * * * *

On August 5, 1914—

I think it is August 6, because that is my recollection of the day they declared war, but they say in here August 5—

On August 5, 1914, we declared that we were in a state of war with Germany. When, several months later, Turkey intervened in the conflict as an ally of Germany, the situation of Egypt, her vassal, became very delicate. It is then that the authorized representatives of the nation proposed to the British authorities that the independence of Egypt be proclaimed. With the political situation thus arranged, Egypt would be able to fight, at the side of the Allies, on any of the battle fields. This suggestion was not listened to. Great Britain decided upon another solution in declaring propriu motu, at the beginning of the war, and because of the war, her protectorate over Egypt, in spite of our national aspirations. Nevertheless, the country made, for the cause of the Allies, very heavy sacrifices. Gen. Allenby has recognized that the Egyption factor was one of the most decisive in the victory against the Turks. Is it possible, after that, to say that the Egyptian problem is not within the competence of the conference?

They close this memorable epistle to the conference by saying:

The Egyption delegation request the peace conference, in the name of the Egyptian people, that it be admitted to formulate the demands of the country in accordance with the rules of right and justice that are the foundation of the deliberations of the conference.

Under all the circumstances, Mr. President, what honest, honorable, or fair right had the peace conference to deny that simple request?

They wrote another communication to Mr. Clemenceau, and in it they said:

The conference of the allied and associated powers, regardless of the fact that Egypt had played a great part in the triumph of the principles of right and justice, and therefore deserved the application of these principles to her case, has refused to apply to Egypt these same principles.

The conference refused to listen to the voice of Egypt, which, from the very outset, declared herself in a state of war with the enemies of the Entente, and participated loyally in the struggle of the Allies.

The conference has refused to discuss, with the representatives of the Egyptian people, the political future of their country, in spite of the fact that the status of Egypt had been changed owing to the war.

They wind up that communication to M. Clemenceau by saying:

"Peace," said President Wilson, "can only be lasting if it extinguishes resentment in the hearts of nations, and if there be only one justice for the strong and the weak alike."

Yet the Egyptian people have been sacrificed on the altar of diplomatic understandings between the great powers. One can hardly imagine why such a sacrifice has been inflicted on a nation like ours, with such a glorious history.

For these considerations, we, the representatives of the Egyptian people, must raise the voice of that poor nation which has been treated as if it did not belong to this universe, and which had worked against herself by throwing her lot on the side of the Allies. Egypt protests most strongly against such a decision, which has deprived her of the benefit of peace after having been a most faithful collaborator during the war. A nation which respects herself, is firm in her ideals and conscious of her rights, can not allow others to dispose of her destiny, a destiny of which she is alone mistress.

In another part of the letter to M. Clemenceau they say:

It will not be easy to make the Egyptians understand by what cruel trick of fate they must be excepted from the rule which lays down that every people has the right to dispose of itself.

Even were Egypt reduced to slavery by a permanent decree of the peace conference, should she not still have the right to choose her master and indicate the mode of government she would like to live under, seeing that she must live in tutelage?

In other words, if the peace conference is going to say that Egypt can not longer live as a nation but must be turned over to some one of the great powers, can not her executioners even give her the simple right of choosing the master who is going to rule over her? But she was denied even that. They further state in the same letter:

In the name of the Egyptian nation we protest against the measure that it is proposed to apply to us—a measure unjust, illegal, prejudicial to the interests of Egypt and of the world peace. Once more we ask the peace conference to hear the voice of Egypt, as it has heard the voice of other peoples. We ask it in conformity with the spirit of the noble principles established by the victory in order to spare further shedding of innocent blood and in order to establish peace.

In another communication to the president of the peace conference they say:

We desire to present to the conference a brief statement of the different forms of atrocities committed in our country. The conference will thus be in a position to judge whether, after such treatment, the Egyptians should be expected to live under the British protectorate. Since our race aspires to assume its own part of the obligations that humanity is imposing upon all civilized peoples, we hope that the conference will reexamine our case.

The Egyptian people hesitate to complain of the cruel vengeance of which they are the victim, vengeance meted out in the name of the great English democracy, but certainly without its knowledge. The Egyptian people hesitate to brand with such atrocities the glorious British Army at the very moment of its leaving the battle fields crowned with a laurel wreath of victory. But our hesitation is not due to the lack of the importance of the facts which constitute our grievance or to lack of proofs to establish our charges. We know that the great bulk of the British people consent to what is being done in Egypt only through ignorance of the case of the Egyptian people and of the shameful daily facts of the occupation. The truth has been rigorously suppressed. The British public does not know; the British Parliament does not know. Is there not reason for us to doubt the triumph of justice, when we are confronted with diplomatic combinations of statesmen who mold the policy of the great powers and who, by constantly giving in to each other on questions of principle, are sharing at the expense of justice and right the spoils of the weak? * * *

We refuse to believe that in this solemn hour of history, when there is a possibility of a new world arising from the ruins of the war, sordid, material interests can completely stifle the most elementary sentiments of humanity. Certainly, public opinion in Great Britain and her self-governing dominions, in the United States, in France, and in Italy will listen to our grievances and examine the statement of atrocities committed against the Egyptians and of humiliation imposed upon the Egyptians—our reward for the aid we have given the Allies to bring about the happy end of the war.

We refuse to believe that the British people are against us. We doubt if they realize why their Government is against us. The hostility of the military authorities in Egypt against the people of the country and the barbarous acts of their troops are the result of our having taken British statesmen at their word. During the war we helped against the common enemy. After the armistice we simply asked for the reward others were receiving, including our nearest neighbors—our independence.

We based our claim on our natural right, on the reiterated promises of the British Government, on the principles of the Allies, and on the enormous sacrifices we made for the cause of the Allies, and which were, according to Gen. Allenby, the principal factor of victory on the Asiatic front. It is painful to us to impute atrocities to the soldiers of the greatest civilized nation; but can we Egyptians remain with folded arms and keep absolute silence in the presence of the different forms of martyrdom the British military authorities are inflicting upon us, especially when our conscience is free from having committed the slightest crime? We know that the strong has always a tendency to abuse his strength, and that it is regarded only as a regrettable weakness or as unavoidable in scattered instances to exceed the limit of reasonable treatment of the enemy; but, as for us, we have never been the enemies of Great Britain; we have never been in a war against Great Britain; on the contrary, we aided her with our strength up to yesterday. Then if excesses committed against the enemy are reprehensible, what is to be thought of excesses committed against a friendly and allied people, and of attacks against its liberty and against its life? Can we hold our peace and not complain when it is decided that every Egyptian, of whatever rank, must stand up and salute passing British officers? Can we preserve our serenity when our women are violated, our villages burned, the innocent assassinated en masse?

Mr. President, these representatives submitted to the peace conference with this letter and others like it evidence upon which the statements are based. Not only were the inhuman acts which they have outlined committed by British soldiers, but the most tantalizing arrangements were made, by which the Egyptian, as he stood on the street, had to salute every English officer when he came in sight, and if he did not do so he was arrested. The occurrences in Egypt are almost impossible of belief, even when you read the testimony that was submitted. I confess, Mr. President, that I hesitated before I thought it was proper even to produce the evidence to the Senate, because I could not make myself believe that Great Britain, our ally, would stoop to perform the barbarous and inhuman acts that have been committed by British soldiers in Egypt after the armistice, particularly when we remember that Egypt was our friend, our ally, and, according to her numbers and her ability, sacrificed almost as much as any other nation, and at least nearly as much as any other nation if we exclude France.

They submitted some evidence of an English woman which is contained in a letter. This was official; it was sent to the peace conference; it is something which is backed up and vouched for by the official representatives of the Egyptian nation. They have sent hundreds and hundreds of names, of affidavits, all kinds of evidence, sustaining the charges, and they say in one of their communications that no charge is made by them, no evidence submitted, where there is any doubt as to its truthfulness. Here was an English woman who was in Egypt after the armistice when the British took possession of the Egyptian nation by force. Like other communications, I shall only read a part of it, because I can not take the time of the Senate to read all these communications, but I wish the Senate to understand that I am not omitting parts of them simply because they do not bear out what I am claiming. It would be just as interesting if they could all be read, if all could be told, although the story would be long and perhaps tiresome. In the letter which this woman wrote she first stated that she was in Egypt for five months. The letter was printed April 2, 1919. In her letter she says:

In the canteen in which I worked a very good native servant was kicked and knocked about simply because he did not understand an order given him by a soldier. An educated native in the town was struck in the mouth and his inlaid walking stick snatched from him by a soldier who wanted it. More than one English resident said to me, "It will take years to undo the harm that has been done here by the army." Personally—

Listen to this, Senators. Here is an English woman, a loyal English citizen, speaking, and she says:

Personally I feel that were I an Egyptian I should have spared no effort to evict the British. I felt ashamed of my country—bitterly ashamed.

She winds up her letter with this sentence:

Small wonder if they hate and dread us.

Some time ago the junior Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] interrupted me by telling what the English had done in Egypt, and, among other things, he said they had taken the Christian religion there. Mr. President, this letter and hundreds and hundreds of others show under what difficulties a poor Christian missionary would be laboring in Egypt with British soldiers performing the inhuman, dishonorable acts that have been going on there ever since the British took possession after the armistice. Can we expect to spread the Christian religion by such treatment as is narrated by this Christian woman? Can we expect to spread the doctrine of the lowly Nazarine by taking those who do not agree with us and flogging them, as this evidence shows was done with hundreds and hundreds of innocent Egyptians? Can we expect to spread the Christian religion if we burn the villages, outrage the women, and steal the property of unoffending, innocent citizens living in their own country? Is that going to help the Christian religion? Every Christian missionary and every Christian throughout Christendom will blush with shame when they read the story of British cruelty in Egypt since the armistice.

In one of these official communications they say:

Consequently, when the armistice was concluded and Turkey found herself in a situation that no longer permitted her to maintain her claim to the suzerainty of Egypt, and Egypt thus became ipso facto independent, our people named this delegation for the purpose of asking the conference to establish in fact the independence we possessed in law, for the situation of England in Egypt rests on no foundation other than the presence there of an army cowing the people into submission. Great Britain is in Egypt not by right of conquest nor by right of any international agreement.

Mr. President, I do not believe any man can doubt the ability of Egypt to govern herself when he reads these communications from her official representatives. In all the diplomatic correspondence of the world, including that of the most enlightened and most powerful nations of the world, there is nothing that excels them in eloquence or in logic of argument. Such a people are not ignoramuses; people who can write the story that is printed in these letters should not be denied the right of self-government, especially when the denial of that right breaks a sacred promise made to the civilized world.

They say further:

The answer of the British military authorities to the official request of the Egyptian Government was to order the arrest and deportation to Malta of the president of the delegation and of three of his colleagues.

That is a repetition of what I have already read; but they go on in this communication at great length and tell about the suppression of all the meetings by the machine guns, and so forth, the burning of villages, and in one place they say:

The manifestations were suppressed by machine guns, which mowed down dozens of the unfortunate demonstrators. Since the Egyptians had no arms the order to fire was totally unwarranted, but frightfulness could not now stop the Egyptians from persisting in the determination to make the effort to obtain their independence.

Notwithstanding, Mr. President, they were shot down in cold blood, they still were so much imbued by the spirit of human freedom and liberty that they went on with their manifestations, knowing that it meant death.

They had firm faith in the principles of President Wilson—

Great God, how they were deceived—

which had been solemnly accepted by the Entente Allies. They felt that if their delegation could only get to Paris, justice would be accorded them. So, in spite of death that awaited them, they advanced in groups in ecstasy, making the sacrifice of their lives to the cause of liberty. According to figures given in the House of Commons on May 15, the number of those who fell in this way for the triumph of their ideal was more than a thousand.

Further on they say:

No longer content to stop the demonstration by the use of rifles and machine guns, they were guilty in several places of rape, of the assassination of peaceful villagers—

They are speaking of the British soldiers—

of pillage, of arson—all with the most trifling pretext or even without pretext.

Later they say:

Those who rule us have no thought of the pride of the people. The general commanding the British forces of upper Egypt decreed that every Egyptian must salute British officers passing in the streets under penalty of being dragged before a court-martial. These orders were no sooner put into effect than the dignitaries and high officials shut themselves in their homes and abandoned their personal affairs and those of the State.

* * * * * * *

On March 30 an armored train transporting several hundred British soldiers stopped above the village of Chobak. A certain number of soldiers penetrated the village, pillaging everything that was within their reach without encountering the slightest resistance. They attacked the honor of women. A husband who wished to interfere was immediately shot. Soon the soldiers spread themselves throughout the village and committed the most shameful excesses upon the women. Woe to her who wished to defend herself; she was immediately struck down. Woe to the man who wished to intervene; he underwent the same fate.

After the village was burned a hundred and forty-four houses were destroyed. There remain standing of this village only 56 houses. Twenty-one people were killed and 12 wounded. Some underwent a refined martyrdom. The soldiers buried the assistant mayor, his son, his brother, and two other persons up to their waists, and cut them up with their bayonets until they were dead. * * *

A detachment of more than a hundred soldiers, conducted by their officers, went to the village of Azizia, while another detachment of the same size went to Bedrechien. Motive? Searching for arms. The soldiers, after having pillaged the two villages, burned a large number of houses. * * *

In certain quarters of Cairo the soldiers attacked the inhabitants, ransacking their homes, and stealing everything they found, like silver and precious objects. In a single quarter and in one night the crimes reported to the police amounted to 32. The victims belonged to all classes of society—generals, notables, working people.

And then they refer, at these various places, to the annex attached, in which is the evidence upon which these charges are based:

See Annex No. 6. Annex No. 7 tells the history of a woman who, chased by the soldiers, succeeded with the aid of her husband in fleeing and arriving at her door. But the soldiers fired on her and killed her. * * * A little girl of 10 years was violated by several soldiers and was finally found dead.

* * * * * * *

Under pretext that in the neighborhood of the village of El-Chabanat an Indian soldier was killed, a detachment of English soldiers entered the village and, after having pillaged it, burned it, leaving more than 4,000 people without shelter, all this without investigation and without the slightest proof of an actual crime.

In that case, Mr. President, an English soldier, an Indian—some of the English soldiers were Indians—was killed, and there was no investigation made as to the cause of his being killed; and, Mr. President, you ought to expect some of them to be killed. There would be a good many of them killed if those things were going on in America. Every man who had an opportunity would kill one or two or three or four, or as many as he got an opportunity to kill. So an English soldier was killed, and in order to get the man who killed him they destroyed the whole village by burning it.

Under pretext that a shot had been fired at a British patrol which was passing at a certain distance from the village of Kafr Moussaed, the soldiers entered the said village, and also in the villages of Choubra-El-Charkieh and Kafr-El-Hagga, as well as in the hamlets that depend upon them. They compelled the whole masculine population to appear, and condemned them to be flogged on the stomach and on the back. * * *

And they were flogged.

The whole of Egypt rejects the British domination. The unanimous will of an entire people, homogeneous and having the ethnological conditions necessary to form once more its national unity, is the best proof that the people are worthy of independence. * * * It will be a crying injustice if the conference sanctions the loss of the autonomy we acquired a hundred years ago. * * *

We demand only the right to live. In virtue of what laws or of what principles of politics and morality should we be rewarded for the aid we have furnished the victors by the application of the treatment worse than that inflicted upon the vanquished enemies? Is it conceivable that the Egyptian people can be treated like ordinary merchandise in the political market, and this in the twentieth century, by the will of a conference that has not ceased to proclaim as its raison d'etre the liberation of small nationalities and the laying down of world-wide conditions which will insure a durable peace? * * *

Do you believe that our independence and our self-respect are less precious to us than your independence and your self-respect are to you?

In view of these considerations, we have the right to count on the equity of the peace conference. As the principal aim of the peace conference is to prepare a durable peace, we hope that our case will be reexamined, and that we shall be invited to present the wishes of the people of Egypt. In this way will acts be brought into agreement with principles. In this way alone will the allied and associated powers arrive at the peace they desire to attain.

Mr. President, they speak of the Egyptians that were flogged, and they send a photograph of 18 men whose pictures were taken a day or two after they were flogged. They say, in another communication, that these were the only men who were able to get to Cairo, where their photographs could be taken; so they do not represent the worst of the flogging. But no man can look without indignation and horror at these photographs of the naked bodies of innocent Egyptians, flogged not because they were armed, not because they had been even charged with committing a crime, but because they were Egyptians, because they wanted to be free, because they wanted their own nation to stand among the other nations of the world, because they wanted the proper reward for the sacrifices of hundreds and thousands of their fellow citizens who had given their lives on the battle field in order that the allied cause might win.

In one of these annexes they give a report of some of the atrocities, and I want to read a very few of them.

After they had described the burning of a town they say:

At 6 o'clock a. m. of the same day the village of Kafr El Hagueh—about 2½ miles from the railway line—and the surrounding villages were encircled. The villagers, who were at work in the fields, were obliged to reenter their homes in the midst of the shots fired upon them by the soldiers. The houses were all searched and all the male population taken to the railway station of Saft El Melouk. There they were encircled by British soldiers with fixed bayonets. The women and children had followed their husbands and parents, shouting and wailing, but dared not approach too near their people for fear of the soldiers.

And so they go on and describe how they were punished.

However this might be, they begged the general to institute an inquiry—

A charge had been made in this case that somebody had shot a British soldier and wounded him, and they were taking these towns in order that they would be sure to get the guilty person.

However this might be, they begged the general to institute an inquiry so as to punish the real author of the crime of which they accused the inhabitants of the region, all assuring him that the person or persons who had committed it could only belong to the lowest class of the population. All this was to no avail, however, the general declaring that unless the culprit surrendered or was indicated he would see that his orders were executed. * * * He refused to listen to us.

They say further:

Just then, however, we heard a terrible tumult, which was entirely dominated by the groaning of the men. The women and children were shouting and crying as they could see the sufferings of their parents from the banks of the canal where they had gathered all together.

Each man was brought before the authorities and was asked if he could indicate the criminal or any place where arms were concealed.

The soldiers' pretext for doing these various things was hunting for arms, hunting for guns and ammunition, which it was alleged had been concealed. I have an idea—I do not know, but I have an idea—that there were guns and ammunition concealed. They ought to have been concealed. They would have been justified in concealing them. They were justified in using them.

Each man was brought before the authorities and was asked if he could indicate the criminal or any place where arms were concealed. When he answered in the negative he was given a card and told to go on to a kiosque situated on the quay. Upon his arrival there he was seized by soldiers, who undressed him, took all his money away, and, as soon as he was naked, placed him with his head through a hole. Four soldiers held him outside this hole while four groups of soldiers, each composed of three soldiers, held his feet and hands in lifting up his body. Two other soldiers then flogged him unmercifully, without taking any care as to where the blows might fall.

This over, he was thrown out of the kiosque and beaten and kicked by other soldiers outside the kiosque. Some of these men fainted from the pain inflicted; others vomited blood. There was no doctor there to take care of those wounded or to prevent those who were ill or feeble already from being thus tortured.

The English did not even respect old age, and men over 50 years of age were tortured.

They give the names and the addresses of hundreds of people that it is alleged were thus treated, and they also attach to their official document to the peace conference a report of the medical authorities who examined the men after they were flogged and after they were abused. They give the names of the doctors.

Mr. President, thus far I have read letters sent by these representatives to the conference as a body, to the president of the conference, M. Clemenceau, individually, and to Lloyd-George as an individual. Now, I propose to read extracts from communications that were sent to our own representative, President Wilson, who was also there, and who joined in this refusal to give them a hearing. I want the Senate to consider what they said to President Wilson in connection with what President Wilson said in his speech at Mount Vernon on the 4th day of July, 1918.

The President in this speech was speaking of the things that must be attained before peace could be procured, and, among other things, he enumerated the following:

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

Let us bear in mind that speech of President Wilson when we read the pleadings that these official representatives sent to him for mercy, for justice, for a hearing, for life. Let us remember, also, that that speech was one of the fundamental principles agreed upon by all of the belligerents upon which the armistice was signed, and therefore all of the members of the peace conference were bound by the sacred honor of the nations they represented to give adherence to that speech. President Wilson was not only bound by the honor of his own country, but he was bound by his own individual honor as a man, to give effect to the proclamation that he himself had put forth, and which rang around the world with the approval of all liberty-loving people everywhere. But, notwithstanding this, he, too, turned a deaf ear to the pleadings of these suffering people.

In the first place, Mr. President, before these representatives of Egypt had been arrested, while they were still in Egypt, they sent a telegram to President Wilson at Paris; and, as I have done with the others, I shall not be able to read it in full. I shall just read extracts. From that telegram, I read the following:

No people more than the Egyptian people have felt strongly the joyous emotion of the birth of a new era which, thanks to your virile action, is soon going to impose itself upon the universe, and to spread everywhere all the benefits of a peace whose calm and durability will no longer be troubled by the ambitions of hypocrisy or the old-fashioned policy of hegemony and furthering selfish national interests.

No people more than the Egyptian people appreciate the admirable disinterestedness with which your country entered into the war—disinterestedness that now enables it to demand that the same justice rule in deciding the affairs of the feeble as of the powerful, of the small as of the great.

The same telegram proceeds:

Unfortunately, the authorities have refused passports to the members of the delegation, and this measure which deprives us of presenting to world-wide public opinion our griefs and our wishes leaves the cause of Egypt at the mercy of insufficient and inexact documentation, and does not permit the realization of the insistent desire of Your Excellency, shared by the Allies, of seeing the destinies of peoples directed in accordance with their own desires.

They wind this up by saying:

Egypt begs Your Excellency to give her the opportunity of having her voice heard in defense of her lawful aspirations.

In another telegram to Mr. Wilson they say:

Egypt is trying to win her independence—the national right of nations—and she respectfully appeals to Your Excellency to help her in attaining this noble end.

In another telegram they say:

In two previous telegrams we have informed Your Excellency of the refusal of the British authorities to permit the departure of the delegation that has been intrusted with the responsibility of defending the interests and presenting the demands of Egypt in Europe. * * *

As we do not cease to be met with a refusal to allow our departure from our own country, the Egyptian delegation renews to Your Excellency its urgent prayer to help us to be in a position to expose the aspirations of Egypt.

They were still in Cairo. They had not yet been arrested. They were not yet in jail. They commenced to communicate with President Wilson by telegram, and the next thing that happened to them they were put in jail where they could not send telegrams. I do not know whether there was any connection between the telegram sent to President Wilson and the fact that the British nation arrested these people, but at first the British nation satisfied itself by refusing passports which said, in effect, "you can not go out of the country," and when they commenced to send telegrams to President Wilson asking

him to intercede as the result of that, or at least following that, came their arrest and incarceration in jail. They sent another telegram, and, very complimentary, all of these were to the President, and very properly so, because they believed the President meant all the beautiful things he had said about the rights of small nations, about human liberty, and about self-determination:

To the great and venerated President who led the people of the United States in their disinterested participation in the European conflict to save humanity and to preserve the world in the future from the horrors of war we send our affectionate greetings;

To the eminent philosopher and statesman who occupies to-day a preponderant place among the leaders of peoples and whose high ideals are imposing themselves upon statesmen and all nations we offer our homage and our admiration;

To the chief of the great American democracy, who left his country in order to bring about a durable peace based upon equal justice for all and guaranteed by the society of nations, we submit the cause of Egypt, which is subjected to a foreign domination that Egypt unanimously rejects.

And yet the only response to that telegram that was sent from Cairo was the arrest and incarceration in prison at Malta of these representatives. But finally, after they had been released, as I have related, and got to Paris, they then took it up again with President Wilson. They sent him a communication from the hotel where they were living in Paris, and I quote from that:

From the beginning of the war—

They said to President Wilson—

the Egyptian nation has never faltered in its loyalty to the Entente Alliance, and especially to Great Britain. To avoid the raising of embarrassing questions the Egyptian leaders decided to work wholeheartedly for the winning of the war and postpone discussion of the future of Egypt until the peace conference.

A delegation has been sent to Paris by the Egyptians to present their case. We represent all elements of the Egyptian population—Mohammedan and Christian alike.

The only thing the President ever did, so far as the Egyptians were concerned, was to send them this letter:

I beg to acknowledge receipt of your letter of April 22 and to say that it will be brought to the President's attention.

Sincerely, yours,

(Signed) GILBERT F. CLOSE,
Confidential Secretary to the President.

Another letter was sent to President Wilson, dated April 29, 1919. I read only parts of it:

Upon your respect for the rights of men we base our hope that the demand will be granted. Our faith in the impartial justice upon which you proposed to make the peace of the world is so great that even your recent intervention in connection with the British protectorate has not shaken it. Whatever may have been the reason that led the United States to recognize the protectorate, we believe that we should now make known the real opinion and aspirations of our country.

The privilege which we ask was not refused to the enemies of the cause of liberty. Can it be denied to those who have contributed to the triumph of liberty?

We make a special appeal to Your Excellency, because the people of all Egypt have placed their supreme hope in you. In no country was your stirring call for justice heard with such response as in Egypt. We are hungering and thirsting for liberty, and in your principles we see the pledge of our deliverance.

We were the first to rejoice over the coming of an era when "all people and all nationalities would have a right to live on a footing of equality, in liberty and security one with the other, whether they be strong or whether they be weak.

We have counted on your promise that in the general settlement the people would have satisfaction. That is why our young men rallied to the cry, "Long live Wilson!"

Only yesterday your solicitude spoke eloquently on behalf of a small nation, refusing to allow her conquerors to rule without the control of the League of Nations. You would not admit that a people who until now had formed a part of the Ottoman Empire should pass from one sovereignty to another like a piece of merchandise. You insisted that their aspirations be respected. Can this solicitude stop at the threshold of our unfortunate country?

Egypt is the cradle of civilization. The people of Egypt have faith in the high mission you assumed when you said that justice and not interest must dominate.

Here is another communication written by the president of the Egyptian delegation on behalf of that delegation to President Wilson. This is in June, 1919, while the President is still at Paris at the peace conference. He said:

I had the honor to request on April 22 last an audience, in which, as the representative of a historic and civilized country, I had hoped to submit to Your Excellency the real state of affairs in Egypt, as well as the national aspirations of my fellow countrymen.

* * * * * * *

My request for an audience was based upon the fact that the hopes of the Egyptian people rested in you as the author of these noble principles, and as the honored President of the great American democracy, which entered the war for no selfish purpose, but merely to serve the cause of liberty and justice.

Again the material and scientific resources of the United States, together with the great moral efforts of the Republic, were utilized—as Your Excellency emphatically declared—not in self-defense, nor for the love of conquest, nor, may I be permitted to add, for the consecration of foreign dominations over unwilling countries, but for the establishment of a system of international justice before which must bow both the stronger and the weaker nations.

These principles—which were declared in the name of the American people as the basis of a democratic and a durable peace—have become so deep-rooted in the hearts of the whole Egyptian people that they revolted, unarmed, for the application of these principles to their country. Their absolute faith in the 14 points, in the speech of September 27 last, and in other declarations was unshakable. And the bullets of the British Army in Egypt were powerless to shake their firm belief in your ability—and in the ability of the American people—to realize the principles for which they had fought and won. In the deportation of my colleagues and myself the Egyptian people saw an attempt on the part of the British authorities to deprive the country of the benefit of your consideration.

Their will prevailed. We were released. And our first duty on arriving at Paris was to request Your Excellency for an audience. This honor was denied to us. And a few days later the recognition by the Government of the United States of America of the British protectorate over Egypt was published throughout the world.

According to information received, the news in Egypt fell upon deaf ears. The Egyptians could not imagine that the principles which promised to the world a new era of political freedom and political equality would consecrate the servitude of a whole nation.

The decision of the peace conference with regard to Egypt resulted in a policy of systematic revenge by the British military authorities throughout the country. Towns and villages have been submitted to most awful exactions. Some villages have been completely burned, and thousands of families are without shelter. People who do not salute British officers are court-martialed. The judge of Kena Province refused to attend court to avoid submitting to such humiliation.

The Courbash is being most freely used. Notables are being maltreated and imprisoned. Women were violated, and in one case a husband (who was present) was shot dead by the troops while attempting to defend the honor of his wife.

And all this because the Egyptian people had dared to demand their political emancipation!

That they will persist in demanding their political freedom goes without saying. They will do so in the firm belief in the righteousness of their cause and in their whole-hearted adherence to the principles enunciated by Your Excellency. They will either succeed through America's help or perish victims to their loyalty and good faith.

For these reasons I beg to request that one of my colleagues and I be received by Your Excellency, so that we may explain to you the state of affairs in Egypt.

That plea, that ought to burn into the heart of every man who loves freedom, of every man who believes in a square deal to his fellow men, that plea that ought to have gone to the depth of every human heart, fell on deaf ears when it encountered Woodrow Wilson. Absolute silence, ignored, no answer, nothing done, no audience allowed.

Again, on June 18 they sent a letter to the President in the name of the Egyptian delegation.

I have the honor to acknowledge receipt of your confidential secretary's letter of the 9th instant, in which he says that you have not had the time to give an audience to one of our colleagues and myself. We note with satisfaction that you do not exclude the hope of an interview in the future.

Still hanging on to the hope, false hope as it proved to be; still hoping against fate that the man whose word had resounded around the world in behalf of human freedom, the man whose advice the Egyptian people had followed and fought for to the very end, believing in the doctrines that he had proclaimed, they still hoped that he might at least give them a hearing.

We feel sure that you realize, Mr. President, the position in which you have been placed on account of the rôle of international leadership which you have assumed.

We wish to impress upon you that it would be the despair of the Egyptian people if their delegation failed to get even a hearing before the exponent of international right and justice.

We do not believe that you wish Egypt to be condemned unheard. And we do not feel that you can form a judgment on the Egyptian situation without giving a hearing to the Egyptians themselves.

We believe you purposely left open the possibility of an audience with us in the future, and we respectfully request that this be granted us as soon as possible in order that history may reflect honor on you in this affair, as in all others connected with the conference.

And, Mr. President, that was the end. That plea that would almost turn a heart of stone failed even to bring a response from the confidential secretary, and thus Egypt was turned over without her consent to the British Empire. There she is to-day, there she will remain if this treaty is approved, as loyal and as true an ally as fought in the Great War.

Is America going to treat this ally in that way? Is the Senate of the United States going to put its official stamp of approval upon the conduct that leaves 13,000,000 people condemned unheard and without an opportunity to speak in their own behalf? Are we going to put our seal of condemnation upon an ally who lost more men than America did in the war, who did, as everybody knows, valiant service from the beginning to the end? Are we going to give approval to the demand of Great Britain that she will be permitted to thrust aside the official promises and pledges that she has been making to Egypt and the world for the last 30 years that she has no ambitions upon Egypt? Are we going to do it? Can we read with approval the speech of President Wilson made at the tomb of the father of our own country; can we remember his beautiful words there at Washington's tomb and give our approval to this act that, in my judgment, will be a disgrace to civilization?

Mr. President, as I said in the beginning, I have confined my remarks mostly to the question of Egypt, but Egypt is not the only sin contained in this treaty. It is only a sample, and it is not the worst sample. It is only an illustration of the general

rule. Almost every page of the hundreds contained in this treaty contains evils and other wrongs as great and as sinful as the crime against Egypt.

The world does not yet know the extent of the evil that is tied up within the folds of this ponderous treaty. The world was weary of war. It had been promised that when the war was over there would come out of it a peace that would be lasting.

The armistice was signed and hostilities ended on the express understanding that a peace should be written that would recognize the beneficent doctrine laid down in the famous 14 points and the other addresses of the President on that subject. All the peoples of the world believed that the sacred pledges so solemnly given by the belligerent nations would be kept inviolate. They had no suspicion when the armistice was signed and this agreement was made that secret treaties had been made by some of the principal allied nations that would result in the violation of every pledge.

The discussion that has gone on throughout Christendom has been confined almost entirely to the League of Nations portion of the treaty. Those who are demanding of the world the approval of this document have discussed practically nothing else.

Censorship in London, in Tokyo, and in other places, including Washington, has kept the world to a great extent in ignorance of the crimes that have been committed at Versailles in the name of peace. Can it be that the patriotic people of this Nation desire the Senate to turn a deaf ear to the pleading cries of many millions of people who by this treaty have been transferred from one nationality to another like chattels? Can it be that posterity will approve our action if we violate every principle for which our forefathers fought and which have made us a great and prosperous Nation? Can we long boast of our freedom and our honor if by our act we hold as chattels and slaves millions of helpless and innocent people and in this civilized day divide up the earth to suit the autocrats of Europe and Asia, without considering the wish or the will of the people whose freedom and liberty are thus denied?

To defeat this treaty it ought to be sufficient to know that every pledge made by which hostilities were ended and the armistice signed has been violated and trampled underfoot. There are those, however, who feel, even though we are violating these pledges, even though we are transferring people like chattels from one nationality to another, that we are excused for so doing because this treaty professes to bring to the hungry world a permanent peace. To those who believe in this doctrine it ought to be sufficient to point to the lessons of history. Every attempt that has been made during the history of the world to carry out such a program has ultimately failed. The history of Poland, of Alsace and Lorraine, and numerous other instances might be cited as guideposts to the statesmen of to-day. We can not build a permanent peace upon a foundation of broken pledges and unjust and inhuman treatment to millions of the human race. Such attempts have always failed, and always will; they must fail because they violate the eternal law of human progress. We can not by any man-made instrument repeal the laws of God, however laudable may be the purpose. All history teaches that such efforts must end in disaster. This treaty, if approved, while containing these inhuman and dishonorable things, will bring misery, suffering, and war to those who shall follow us, because they are in violation of nature's laws which are as immutable and unchangeable as the heavens.

When the representatives of the great nations emerged from their secret chamber they gave to the waiting world a treaty too long for the busy citizen to read and labeled it "perpetual peace." A war-weary world accepted their judgment, and, for a time, in no unhesitating way condemned any citizen who dared to deny the virtue of this unholy document; but when the fair-minded and honest citizenship of civilization had been induced to study this barbarous monstrosity, they began to awaken from their dream of peaceful satisfaction and commenced to realize that humanity had been "buncoed." When the peace-loving world understands what this treaty contains, it will not be slow to condemn the men who have practiced this deception. Already, the self-appointed autocrats who sat in secret judgment at Versailles are receiving a just condemnation in the hearts of their own fellow citizens. Orlando has been defeated in Italy; Clemenceau has been overthrown in France; Lloyd-George sees the handwriting on the wall; and Woodrow Wilson is "watchfully waiting" the coming condemnation of the American people.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ball	Gronna	Lenroot	Sherman
Beckham	Hale	Lodge	Smith, Ga.
Borah	Harris	McKellar	Smith, Md.
Calder	Harrison	McLean	Smoot
Capper	Henderson	McNary	Spencer
Chamberlain	Hitchcock	Nelson	Sterling
Colt	Johnson, S. Dak.	New	Sutherland
Cummins	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Thomas
Curtis	Kellogg	Nugent	Trammell
Dial	Kendrick	Overman	Underwood
Dillingham	Kenyon	Phelan	Wadsworth
Elkins	Keyes	Phipps	Warren
Fletcher	King	Poindexter	Williams
Gay	Kirby	Pomerene	Wolcott
Gerry	Knox	Sheppard	

Mr. GRONNA. I wish to announce that the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] is absent due to illness.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Fifty-nine Senators have answered to their names. There is a quorum present.

DEFICIENCY APPROPRIATIONS—CONFERENCE REPORT.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, as in legislative session, I submit a conference report on the deficiency appropriation bill, being House bill 12046, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be considered at the present time. I desire to say that it is a partial report, certain amendments, three in number, not having been agreed to. I therefore submit the report, and move its adoption. If that motion be agreed to, I shall then move for a further conference.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Secretary will read the conference report.

The report was read, as follows:

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 12046) making appropriations to supply deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1920, and prior fiscal years, and for other purposes, having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 16, 54, 57, 58, and 59.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 8, 12, 13, 14, 15, 19, 20, 23, 24, 26, 27, 29, 33, 35, 36, 37, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 55, 56, 60, 61, 62, 63, 64, and 65, and agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 4, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$45,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$6,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 9, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$11,000,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 10, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended as follows: At the end of the matter retored insert the following: "An itemized statement of the articles transferred hereunder and the cost price thereof shall be reported to Congress by the Secretary of War"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate number 11, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"For the salary of an envoy extraordinary and minister plenipotentiary to Finland at the rate of $10,000 per annum from March 1 to June 30, 1920, inclusive, $3,333.33."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 18, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum proposed insert "$3,500,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 21, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$100,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 25, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following:

"ADJUTANT GENERAL'S OFFICE.

"Not exceeding $500,000 of the appropriation of $3,500,000 for the care and custody of the draft records and for the employment of clerical assistance for the purpose of furnishing to adjutants general of States statements of service of soldiers who served in the war with Germany shall be available for the employment of clerical assistance necessary for the purpose of furnishing such information from the records of the demobilized Army as may be properly furnished to public officials, former soldiers, and other persons entitled to receive it: *Provided*, That the Secretary of War shall reallot the appropriation of $4,000,000 for temporary employees in the War Department in such manner as will provide an allotment of $174,000 for the office of The Adjutant General in addition to the allotments already made for that office for the current fiscal year for work in connection with records of the demobilized Army."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 5 of the matter inserted by said amendment, strike out "$500,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$300,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 30, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: At the end of the matter inserted by said amendment insert the following: " : *Provided*, That in case said bridge is thrown open for public use one-half the cost of the maintenance thereof shall be paid by local interests"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 31, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In line 8 of the matter inserted by said amendment strike out "$6,600,000" and insert in lieu thereof "$5,000,000," and add at the end of the matter inserted by said amendment the following: "*Provided further*, That the construction work hereunder shall be done by contract, let to the lowest responsible bidder, and no bid shall be accepted for any building to cost in excess of $2.45 per square foot for an unlined building or $2.90 for a lined building"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: Restore the matter stricken out by said amendment, amended to read as follows:

"Norfolk, Va., navy yard: For dry dock and accessories, exclusive of any profit to the contractor, $451,047.30."

And the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: in lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$8,000"; and the Senate agree to the same.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 44, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the sum named in said amendment insert "$2,500"; and the Senate agree to the same.

The committee of conference have been unable to agree on the amendments of the Senate numbered 17, 22, and 34.

F. E. WARREN,
CHARLES CURTIS,
O. W. UNDERWOOD,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

JAMES W. GOOD,
J. G. CANNON,
JAMES F. BYRNES,
Managers on the part of the House.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the conference report which has been read. Is there objection?

Mr. KING. Reserving the right to object——

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I have no objection to the consideration of the report, but I desire to make an observation in case it is considered.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection to the present consideration of the conference report?

Mr. KING. I desire to ask the Senator from Wyoming whether he expects to have the report disposed of this evening?

Mr. WARREN. It should be disposed of this evening, because we have to act upon the report before the other House can do so, and quite a number of the amendments provide for sums which should be available by Monday next. There is an entire agreement on all but three items, and as to those three items we shall ask for a further conference.

Mr. KING. I desire to inquire further of the Senator if the consideration of the report were deferred until to-morrow morning, in order that we might have an opportunity to read it and see what are the items in controversy and what have been agreed to, and the report were taken up the first thing to-morrow morning, could it not be disposed of then without involving any delay in the final disposition of the matter?

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator from Utah that there are three items which are still in disagreement, and I will tell him now what they are.

Mr. KING. I am advised as to those three items, but as to the other items which have been assented to there might be some disposition in the Senate to remonstrate a little.

Mr. WARREN. In other words, the Senator desires to send the report back unapproved?

Mr. KING. I do not want to take——

Mr. WARREN. The Senator has the right, of course, to object to the present consideration of the report, but I hope he will not do so.

Mr. KING. I do not want to object, but it seems to me that the Senator will dispose of the matter just as quickly if he will let the report go over until to-morrow morning and give us an opportunity to read it.

Mr. WARREN. Of course, my motion may be voted down, but I move the adoption of the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah object to the consideration of the report?

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair hears no objection.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, as I understand the Senator from Wyoming makes a motion which is subject to debate.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The request is for unanimous consent for the present consideration of the report. The Chair understands that any objection carries the report over for one day.

Mr. POINDEXTER. My understanding was that the Senator from Wyoming withdrew his request and made a motion that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the report.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not understand that the request was withdrawn. He has not heard of such a request being made.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I think the misunderstanding arose in this way: As we were at that time in executive session, I at first asked that the conference report be considered as in open legislative session; but when a motion is made to adopt the report I do not understand that an objection can then be maintained, but that the motion would have to go to a vote.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, upon that motion I desire to say just a few words.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, do I understand the Chair to hold that one objection would carry the report over for a day?

Mr. POINDEXTER. I do not think so.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair so understands the rule.

Mr. WARREN. The objection would only be to considering it in legislative session, because a motion will not apply; that is, the objection does not carry it over if we are by unanimous consent in legislative session for the moment.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I understood the Senator from Wyoming to ask unanimous consent to consider the conference report in legislative session, which, of course, he had to get. That, I understand, he has got—permission to consider it in legislative session. Now he presents his report. That is privileged. He has presented the report, and the privilege is exhausted. The question of consideration is open. The Senate can decide whether they will consider it now or not, as I understand the rule.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, the rule is Rule XXVII, and reads:

The presentation of reports of committees of conference shall always be in order, except when the Journal is being read or a question of order or a motion to adjourn is pending, or while the Senate is dividing; and when received the question of proceeding to the consideration of the report, if raised, shall be immediately put and shall be determined without debate.

Mr. LODGE. Yes; that is right.

Mr. SMOOT. That is the rule.

Mr. LODGE. But the question of consideration can be passed upon.

Mr. SMOOT. Yes.

Mr. LODGE. A conference report has no privilege for consideration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report, being a privileged matter, has been received in accordance with the rule. The question of whether or not the Senate will take up the report for consideration is before the Senate, and, as the Chair understands the rule, a single objection takes the report over until some other time.

Mr. LODGE. Oh, no; I think not, Mr. President. It requires a vote of the Senate. The question of consideration has been raised and must be decided without debate.

Mr. SMOOT. The rule says:

And when received the question of proceeding to the consideration of the report, if raised, shall be immediately put and shall be determined without debate.

That is Rule XXVII.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair did not so understand the rule.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, as the point has been made about my delaying the treaty, I will state that I gave notice that I should hold the treaty before the Senate against everything but a conference report; but I am not going to hold it before the Senate against a conference report, especially when it is necessary that an agreement should be reached between the two Houses before Monday next in order to meet certain of the appropriations that are carried in this deficiency bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Chair believes that under Rule XXVII the question of consideration of the report must be immediately put. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. WARREN] that the Senate proceed to the consideration of the conference report.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on House bill 12046.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The report is now before the Senate for consideration.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, one of the items upon which I understand the conferees have failed to agree is the amendment of the bill which provided $3,000,000 for repair of naval vessels. May I ask the chairman of the committee whether that is correct?

Mr. WARREN. It is.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President, I was present during the debate in the Senate when that amendment was adopted, and at that time there seemed to be some confusion among the Senators who were interested in it as to the reason and necessity for asking for this amount in a deficiency bill. The Senator from Utah [Mr. KING] called attention to the fact that $31,000,000 had been appropriated in the last naval bill for repair of naval vessels, but attention was not called in the Senate to the fact that the Navy Department in its last annual estimate, after a study of the situation and needs of the Navy for repair of its new fleet, had asked for $75,000,000, and that the committee of Congress cut down the appropriation of $75,000,000 to $31,000,000. Several statements were made upon the floor as though a much larger sum than $31,000,000 had been appropriated. I heard $80,000,000 mentioned at one time as the amount that had been appropriated for the repair of naval vessels, but that was an entire mistake. Only $31,000,000 was appropriated, and it was not half of the amount that had been asked for by the Navy. Now, it seems to me that when the estimate of $75,000,000 made by the department for the repair of ships was cut down to $31,000,000 it is not at all strange that there is a deficiency in that appropriation.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, the Senator understands, of course, that the Senate is insisting upon retaining that $3,000,000 appropriation; hence the disagreement.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I understand that, and I very much hope that the Senate conferees will continue to stand upon that; but the particular point that I wished to bring to the attention of the Senate conferees, in order that they might present it in conference, was the fact that in the last annual appropriation bill the estimate for this item was cut down more than 50 per cent. That fact was not brought out in the debate here. That tremendous reduction by Congress in the last naval bill in its efforts to economize is the cause of the present complete tie-up of the work in the navy yards in connection with the repair of our naval vessels. This is a very small item in comparison with the curtailment of the amount that was asked for by the department.

Mr. WARREN. I will say to the Senator that we had those items with us and all of the figures, and that on four different days we went over to a greater or less extent those figures, which, of course, we had before us.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Including the estimates presented in connection with the last annual appropriation bill?

Mr. WARREN. Yes.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I am very glad to know it.

I take it that it will be conceded by every man who takes a business view of this matter that sooner or later our naval vessels must be repaired. If this appropriation is denied in this bill, I assume that it will be agreed by all who take a business view of the matter that it will have to be added to some other bill; so the only question is whether or not we are going to leave vessels rusting and deteriorating in the docks and in the navy yards in a state of disrepair and unfitness for use simply in order to delay making the appropriation from the Treasury and to create some sort of an appearance—a rather false appearance—of economy. It seems to me that true economy would dictate the immediate appropriation of this amount, and the repair of these vessels as soon as possible, in order to prevent the accumulation of the expense that will come from further delay.

Some figures were given, at the time this amendment was adopted, of the percentage of deterioration of vessels tied up at the docks and waiting for repairs—5 per cent a month, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] suggests—all of which will be saved by the immediate appropriation of this amount; and I urge upon the Senate conferees that they insist upon this appropriation.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, it seems to me that nothing less than an emergency will bring the conference committee, and especially the House, to a realization of the necessity of keeping in repair the vessels of the Navy.

We have here the testimony of Admiral Coontz and of Admiral Taylor that it is absolutely necessary to provide in this deficiency bill the sum required simply for the purpose of repairing the ships that are in Atlantic and Pacific waters.

I say that an emergency is the only argument that seems to avail with men who are bent upon economy. Economy and retrenchment are excellent things; but we know very well that when it was important that we should equip ourselves for the war, the expenditure on account of our unpreparedness was overwhelming; so it was very poor economy to wait until the enemy was at our gates.

There are now in the city of Washington the governor of the Hawaiian Territory and a delegation from the legislature, and I learn from them in conversation that the conditions in the islands are very critical; that there is a strike among the Japanese, who comprise one-half of the entire population of the islands; that there are 120,000 Japanese in the islands, and they are on a strike, and their consuls, it has been discovered, have agents in every camp who report to them. In order to make the strike effective notice has been sent out by the unions composed of Japanese that in case any Japanese refuses to join in the strike he shall be reported to the burgomaster of his native cantonment, or whatever political subdivision it is, in Japan; and great pressure, which seems almost to be of an official character, is put upon these men to join the strike—against whom? Against the white planters.

These Hawaiians say that the white planters will not yield. Already, they state, 14 cane fires have been started in the different plantations. They are using the method of sabotage and the destruction of property to bring about the accomplishment of their purposes; and I am told that a Japanese warship has just entered the harbor, ostensibly for the purpose of taking off Japanese who are willing to go back.

That is one condition in the Pacific, apart from many others throughout the world, which have inspired the men who control the Navy with a desire to keep the ships in repair; and I think it is of first importance that we should instruct—if, indeed, they need instruction—our conferees to stand for the insignificant $3,000,000 which we have voted for the repair of our naval fleet. The Secretary of the Navy said that $10,000,000 was necessary, but we have offered him $3,000,000, and now the House conferees refuse to grant even the $3,000,000. I think it is a matter upon which we should stand without doubt or equivocation, because of the extreme necessity of keeping in repair our fleet, our first line of defense, necessary to maintain our prestige and guard our rights.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I wish that the Senate would recede from the item to which the Senator from California has just referred.

We appropriated for the Navy, for the current year, nearly $700,000,000. The direct appropriation was six hundred and some odd millions, and $64,000,000 were authorized in the shape of contracts. Out of that sum, it seems to me, there was ample to meet the expenditures required in any exigency which might arise.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Utah yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. KING. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. The Senator realizes, however, that the large sum of money which he has just mentioned is not available for the specific purpose for which this amendment is needed. The appropriations in the naval bill are specific, and the items which go to make up the amount which the Senator has stated, if the amount is correct, can not be used for the purpose of repairing vessels.

I do not understand that the Senator from Utah disputes the fact that the fleet is badly in need of repairs, and that many vessels are out of commission on account of the lack of money to repair them and put them in a fit condition. If the Senator is not prepared to deny that fact—and I do not think it can be successfully denied—it seems to me that his citation of sums of money appropriated for other purposes has but little bearing upon this immediate question. I do not think the Senator from Utah wants to have our fleet deteriorate, or have it incapacitated from service, and the question presented is simply a direct, plain proposition.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland. A matter of economy.

Mr. POINDEXTER. A matter of economy, as the Senator from Maryland very truly says; a matter of business also; and the circumstances stated by the Senator from Utah do not in any way affect the question.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I understand, of course, that the appropriation bill did not carry the entire amount that I have referred to, namely, nearly $700,000,000, for the purpose of repairing vessels belonging to the Navy. There was a very large item, however, to which I referred the other day; indeed, there were two large items, for repairs and for construction in the yards and the docks. The aggregate of all those appropriations that related to repairs and improvements was nearly $100,000,000. The information that was conveyed in the House, I understand, indicates that that appropriation has not yet been exhausted. On the 1st of July there will be available such sums as may be required for the coming year. The committees now are dealing with this question. I believe from the information which I have that there is a sufficient amount now, if properly utilized, to carry on legitimate and imperative repairs until the next appropriation shall have been made.

Furthermore, Mr. President, after Congress has examined the subject fully, as the Naval Affairs Committees did both in the House and in the Senate, and reached a conclusion as to the appropriation which should be made, I do not approve of the idea that the executive officers of the Government, in the face of action by Congress, in the face of an investigation which had been made, shall go and create deficits without limitation and exercise their own discretion without any limitation. Congress decided what should be expended. As I recollect the debate the other day, there was something which indicated that some of the officials of the Navy Department transcended their authority and had made some improper expenditures, or at least had utilized money not allocated to them, and in so doing had deprived other funds of money which should have been allocated to them.

I think if you ratify the action of the Navy Department by making this appropriation you will confirm them in their acts of usurpation and you will invite them to continue the policy of ignoring the act of Congress and to continue a policy of expenditure regardless of the amount which Congress appropriates. Of course, we are all in favor of maintaining a Navy, and a great Navy, but we are in favor of law and in favor of subjecting executive officials to the laws which shall be enacted by Congress.

I sincerely hope that if this item goes back to conference the Senate conferees will recede.

Mr. LODGE. Mr. President, I only wish to say a single word. I want to express a strong and earnest hope that the Senate conferees will stand for the Senate provision. The total expenses of the Navy have nothing in the world to do with the item that is up now. A refusal of the appropriation under the guise of false economy is simply wasteful and destructive.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I feel so strongly in the matter that I should like to test the sense of the Senate on the subject, and I move that the conferees on behalf of the Senate be instructed to adhere to the item of $3,000,000.

Mr. WARREN. I have no objection to that course. I propose to ask for the reappointment of conferees, and the supposition is that they are instructed by the Senate when the item in disagreement is again sent to conference. However, if the Senator insists upon it, I shall not oppose his motion.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the conference report.

The report was agreed to.

Mr. PHELAN. Did the Chair understand that I had made a motion?

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from California made no motion as the Chair understood.

Mr. PHELAN. The Senator from California moved that the Senate instruct its conferees to stand by the item of $3,000,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The motion was not in order at that time.

Mr. PHELAN. I shall renew the motion when it is in order.

Mr. WARREN. I move that the Senate insist upon its amendment and ask the House for a further conference, and that the presiding officer appoint the conferees on the part of the Senate.

The motion was agreed to; and the President pro tempore appointed Mr. WARREN, Mr. CURTIS, and Mr. UNDERWOOD conferees on the part of the Senate at the further conference.

TREATY OF PEACE WITH GERMANY.

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I ask the attention of Senators briefly to the reservation before the Senate and to the substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. I am opposed to the substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska, and I also wish to suggest an amendment which I think should be made to the reservation. I am deeply interested in the ratification of the treaty with proper reservations protecting American rights, and I think we ought, if possible, to get together upon it.

Before discussing the reservation and the substitute, in just a word I wish to refer to a matter brought to the attention of the Senate on yesterday. It had reference to the length of time war would be delayed and to the effect of a finding by the council. Article 12 provides:

> The members of the league agree that if there should arise between them any dispute likely to lead to a rupture they will submit the matter either to arbitration or to inquiry by the council, and they agree in no case to resort to war until three months after the award by the arbitrators or the report by the council.

This, of course, means that, regardless of the character of the award, regardless of compliance with the terms of the award, regardless of the unanimity of the council in making a decision, for three months there shall be delay, a cooling time, with the hope that by diplomacy or in some way the differences may be adjusted and war prevented.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not desire to yield just yet.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Georgia declines to yield.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I wish to finish what I have to say on this subject first, then I will yield gladly.

The fourth paragraph of article 13 provides that—

> The members of the league agree that they will carry out in full good faith any award that may be rendered—

This refers to an award by arbitration—

> and that they will not resort to war against a member of the league which complies therewith.

The effect, of course, of this provision is that if an award is made by arbitration and one of the members offers to comply and does comply, then the other member will not resort to war.

Paragraph 5 of article 15 provides—and this has reference to the case of a dispute brought to the attention of the council:

> If a report by the council is unanimously agreed to by the members thereof other than the representatives of one or more of the parties to the dispute, the members of the league agree that they will not go to war with any party to the dispute which complies with the recommendations of the report.

The effect, therefore, is this: For three months absolutely the parties agree after the award is made that they will not resort to war. In case of arbitration it is agreed that if one of the parties complies the other will not resort to war at all. In case of a unanimous finding by the council other than the two parties to the dispute; that is to say, if seven of the council unanimously agree upon the terms of settlement between the parties to the dispute and one of the parties complies, the other party will not resort to war.

The seventh paragraph of article 15 carries the provision that this reservation is intended to avoid. Let me say, Mr. President and Senators, that I regard these paragraphs as the heart of the league. I regard them as the valuable portion of the league. They are the provisions that make a league for peace, not an alliance for war. They are the provisions that seek to bring about an adjustment of disputes through peaceful

means, through arbitration, through conference, by an adjustment, and to obligate members of the league to delay war first, and if arbitration settles it, or seven of the council unanimously agree and one of the parties complies with the agreement, then that there shall be no war. I believe in these provisions. I believe they will be of real service to the world to maintain peace. There is no provision for the use of guns. There is no obligation to resort to war in them. They are the league for peace as compared to article 10, which I regard as an alliance for war.

The provision to which I am opposed as it stands in article 15 and to which this reservation applies is the seventh paragraph, as follows:

If the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them, and is found by the council to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the council shall so report, and shall make no recommendation as to its settlement.

By rules of international law solely within the domestic jurisdiction of the parties. I am unable to find established rules of international law that take domestic questions out of the field of internationalism and make them solely domestic questions. I am unwilling that domestic questions be passed upon by any board of arbitration or even by the seven members of the council. Especially I am opposed to having considered by them the question of immigration.

This is no new question in the United States. In January, February, and March, 1912, the Senate had under consideration a treaty of universal arbitration with Great Britain. Reservations were attached to that treaty providing that no domestic question should be the subject of arbitration. The reservation further proceeded to declare that we would not submit to arbitration the question as to whether the question was a domestic question. I desire to say to my colleagues on this side of the Chamber that every Democrat in the Senate at that time voted for the reservation, providing that we would not submit to arbitration our domestic questions and would not submit to arbitration the question whether a question was a domestic question, and we proceeded then to name immigration as one of the domestic questions which under no circumstances we would submit to arbitration.

In supporting this reservation I am simply following the policy declared by the Members on this side of the Chamber in 1912, and unanimously supported by them at that time when the treaty came from a Republican President, when the majority of the Senators were on the other side of the Chamber and when about one-half of them joined with us on this side to put the reservation upon the treaty which saved our domestic problems from foreign interference or from arbitration and saved us from letting any outsider determine for us what was and what was not a domestic question.

Mr. KING. What was the form of the reservation?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not have it before me now. I can give it to the Senator later. I have it in my office.

Now I come to the proposed amendment or substitute of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]. I can not think that the Senator from Nebraska will insist upon his substitute. It is an obstruction to the ratification of the treaty. I would expect the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH] to support it, and if the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] were here I would expect him to support it, because they openly desire to kill the treaty; but I can not see how anyone who favors the treaty will support it. Let me read it:

That no member nation is required to submit to the league, its council, or its assembly for decision, report, or recommendation any matter which it considers to be a domestic question, such as immigration, labor, tariff, or other matter relating to its internal or coastwise affairs.

That is, no member of the league, not the United States, but the domestic disputes of no member of the league, shall be considered by the council, and each member shall alone determine what are its domestic questions. I agree that we should say that we will not submit ours, but it says "no member" shall submit. It not only takes us out but undertakes to amend the league covenant and apply the principle which we, by reservation, can apply to ourselves and applies it to every member of the league, whether the others wish such a privilege or not.

Mr. KING. If the Senator will pardon me——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield to the Senator from Utah.

Mr. KING. The contention has been made by Senators upon both sides of the Chamber, and I think the contention was correct, that the treaty itself as drawn does not commit to the League of Nations the domestic and internal affairs of any signatory to the treaty; that every signatory to the treaty is left free to determine its own purely domestic and internal affairs. With that premise, does the Senator think that the reservation offered by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] or the reservation offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], which the Senator from Georgia is now discussing, affects in any manner the treaty, adds to or subtracts from or confers any additional rights upon the signatories, or deprives the signatories of any rights?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I dispute the premise. I show by the league covenant itself that the premise can not be sustained. The league covenant provides, as I read it a few moments ago—

If the dispute between the parties is claimed by one of them, and is found by the council to arise out of a matter which by international law is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of that party, the council shall so report, and shall make no recommendation as to its settlement.

In the first place, it leaves it to the council to determine whether it is a domestic question. In the second place, the council is not to determine that it is a domestic question unless by international law it is solely within the domestic jurisdiction of the parties. I deny that there are well-established rules of international law which take out of international consideration and make solely domestic all questions that may arise and which we should retain under our exclusive control because they concern our internal policies; but even if it is contended that there are rules of international law upon this subject I am unwilling to submit to the council the question of determining that matter for us; just as in the treaty with Great Britain in 1912 there was a provision that if we had a dispute as to whether the particular question was to be referred to arbitration, a board should pass upon it. Led by Senator Bacon, of Georgia, we rejected that provision in the treaty with Great Britain and we reserved to the United States under the reservation the right to pass upon what was a domestic question, and we reserved all domestic questions from arbitration.

I object to their passing upon what is a domestic question for us, and the rule of procedure by which they are to pass I also object to. I object to the language "solely domestic." Take the case of immigration—take the case of a treaty with Japan. Immigration is in some respects not a domestic question. It involves the interest of the country whose nationals are coming to our country.

I would like to have the word "immigration" expressly named in this reservation, because I would not vote to ratify the treaty under any circumstances if it would permit a question even as to the right of the United States to determine for herself who shall come to this country and who shall stay here. I especially am pleased with the fact that this reservation names immigration and declares that immigration is a domestic question, and no country shall interfere with our action and no council shall interfere with our action and no arbitral board shall interfere with our action when we come to determine who we will let live with us and how they shall live here.

I concede if the Senator's premise were not disputed his conclusions would be right; but I maintain that the seventh paragraph of article 15 is unsatisfactory in its mode of handling the question of domestic problems, that it jeopardizes our control of the problem of immigration. It invites a dispute with Japan, and it invites other disputes. I would never vote for any treaty of any kind that took away from the United States the privilege of controlling that problem.

Now, coming back to the substitute of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK], it is an amendment to the league covenant. It is not a reservation as to ourselves; it is a provision that is to affect all the members of the league; it is to be applicable to every member of the league. It may be that there are members of the league who are perfectly willing to have their domestic problems considered by the council; there are members who have ratified it with the present provisions; there are members of the league whose territories adjoin each other and whose relations are so intimate that it might be desirable for them to submit to the council problems connected with their domestic matters; but we are 3,000 miles away from Europe, and the American people will never consent, I pray and believe, to let any other nation interfere with our domestic problems. When the Senator from Nebraska extends the reservation that we would have as to our own affairs and makes it applicable to every member of the league, he passes away from the field of reservations into a change of the league covenant itself.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the Senator yield to me?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Has not the Senator from Nebraska also passed entirely out of the field of interpretation? By no stretch of the imagination could this be called an interpretative reservation.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I thank the Senator from Wisconsin for the suggestion. I am not one of those who pretend that they are simply for interpretations. I do not care whether you call them interpretations or reservations, but we must be freed in some respects from the structure of the league. It is not a matter for us to consider that somebody else thinks; it is not a matter for us to consider what the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE] wants or what the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] wants or what the President wants, but it is for us to determine what we think is right. It is not for us to play politics in the interest of any party, but, laying parties aside and party interests aside, each Senator for himself is called to determine what he thinks is best for his country. I am one of those who believe that when a Senator takes that course he is doing what is wisest for his party.

Mr. President, I hope the Senator from Nebraska will withdraw his amendment. If we adopted it there would have to be a new conference in Paris and a resubmission of the treaty to every country which is a signatory of it. That is the very thing we have been trying to avoid; it is the thing we on this side—all, I believe, except one or two irreconcilables, or one irreconcilable—think should be avoided.

Mr. BORAH. There are more than that.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I hope not on this side. The Senator from Idaho is more familiar with them than am I, but I had hoped that there was only one irreconcilable on this side. I believe there are some irreconcilables on this side who want the treaty without reservations, and if the Senator from Idaho is counting those he is probably right that there is more than one irreconcilable found on this side.

Every Senator, however, knows that the treaty can not be ratified, and most of them believe it ought not to be ratified, without reservations, and reservations which go beyond interpretations are necessary.

Now I come to the reservation reported by the committee. There was a tentative agreement, I understand, on the part of the bipartisan conference that the word "internal" should be placed before the word "commerce," in line 5, and that in lines 7 and 8 the words "and all other domestic questions" should be stricken out. My own view is that the word "commerce" ought not to be in the reservation at all, and for this reason: We can not class all questions involving commerce as domestic questions; some of them are international; some of them we should be willing to submit to arbitration. It is illogical, it seems to me, to put the word "commerce" alongside the other subjects which we declare to be absolutely domestic questions not to be submitted to arbitration. There are many questions growing out of commerce which are domestic questions and will be held by us domestic questions, and I would not be willing to see any of them referred to arbitration. The language of the pending reservation is:

> 4. The United States reserves to itself exclusively the right to decide what questions are within its domestic jurisdiction and declares that all domestic and political questions relating wholly or in part to its internal affairs * * * are solely within the jurisdiction of the United States.

The reservation names several questions; but in the words I have read there is found an express provision that we intend to handle domestic questions ourselves; that we reserve exclusively to ourselves the right to determine what are domestic questions and what are not domestic questions; and we do not need to insert the word "commerce." If we name some subjects, I do not think we ought to strike out the additional language "and all other domestic questions," because we have not named them all; and I believe in covering those domestic questions which have not been named. But as commerce, it seems to me, may apply to international questions as well as to domestic questions, to say that all questions growing out of commerce are to be treated by us as domestic questions, I fear goes too far. I hardly see how we can sustain the proposition, and I should be glad to see it removed.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield to the Senator from Connecticut?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I yield.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I do not wish to interrupt the Senator, but at that point, if it will not inconvenience him——

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It will not inconvenience me at all at this time.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I desired to ask him how he avoided the point raised by the Senator from Washington yesterday afternoon, to wit, that the Constitution had vested in Congress the exclusive control of commerce among the States and with foreign nations? If that power is vested in Congress, how can we delegate any portion of it to the league?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. We do not delegate it to the league. This is what we do: By treaty we can delegate to arbitration a question which ordinarily would be the subject of legislation. By treaty we can submit a liability that would subsequently require recognition by Congress in the way of an appropriation to arbitration for adjustment and decision. There are many questions about which we may arbitrate, upon which Congress must finally act.

Mr. KELLOGG and Mr. BORAH addressed the Chair.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. But, Mr. President, in addition to that, if the Senator will pardon me——

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator from Georgia yield; and if so, to whom?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I will first yield to the Senator from Connecticut, and then I will yield to other Senators.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Inasmuch as the treaty gives both the council and the assembly jurisdiction over all questions which may affect the peace of the world, if the league, through its council or assembly, finds that a question involving our commerce with a foreign power does affect the peace of the world, why have we not attempted to give the league jurisdiction of foreign commerce instead of Congress, to which the Constitution gave it?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. My view of that question is that the general authority is one of consideration but not of action; the authority of action is specifically limited at certain places in the league covenant, and the propositions I have just been discussing are limited only to the extent that we agree, if the finding is unanimous, that we will not go to war.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, permit me to suggest, in answer to the question of the Senator from Connecticut, that the Constitution of the United States confers jurisdiction upon Congress to regulate commerce only in so far as the United States can regulate it. If we have commerce with Austria, with Germany, or with Japan, the Constitution does not confer upon the Congress of the United States the power to regulate commerce in a foreign country, so that, if we have a treaty with any of those countries containing the "favored-nation" clause, or any other clause pertaining to commerce, a dispute over that treaty may be arbitrated, and should be arbitrated; but the Constitution does not give the Congress any power in case of a dispute with a foreign country to regulate commerce in that country.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. But if the finding was that there was a liability upon our part, it would require an appropriation by Congress, which would simply follow the adjudication, if Congress saw fit to make it. I thank the Senator from Minnesota for his interruption.

Mr. President, I do not desire to detain the Senate any longer. I am deeply desirous, on account of our country and on account of the Senate, to see the Senate act and to see it function. I wish to see 64 Senators vote to ratify the treaty; I believe it is to the interest of our country; I believe it is the demand of the people of our country, and I think if the Senator from Nebraska does not withdraw his substitute we should defeat it.

I hope he will withdraw it, because I do not think it should receive many votes, except his own and those of the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BRANDEGEE] and the Senator from Idaho [Mr. BORAH], the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED] not being present. Then I hope that some Senator on the other side, in the majority, will move to eliminate the word "commerce" from the reservation. We do not need it in, because there are problems growing out of commerce that we can not insist are domestic problems solely, and I do not like to see the Senate add a reservation claiming as purely domestic a matter which may or may not be purely domestic. I believe if we will take the word "commerce" out that we will help to get votes to ratify the treaty.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Mr. President, may I ask the Senator a question?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. In just a moment. I desire the attention of the Senator from Massachusetts and the Senator from Minnesota when I repeat that by taking the word "commerce" out I believe we will remove a cause of just question as to this reservation, help to get votes for the treaty, and yet leave entire control in the United States of all questions affecting commerce which we determine to be domestic. I now yield to the Senator from Connecticut.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I am interested to know what made the Senator from Georgia suspect me of any intention to vote for the amendment proposed by the Senator from Nebraska.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Because I think its adoption would make ratification impossible.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. Oh, not by us; and the treaty has been ratified by the other nations. I voted for every amendment which I thought was proper before the other parties had ratified the treaty, but now that they have ratified it, and it is in existence and in operation so far as they are concerned, I regard it as unwise, if not impossible, for us to amend the treaty which they have already accepted without amendment.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I think I can rely upon the Senator from Connecticut to do anything he can legitimately to kill the treaty, and, if putting an amendment on it would hinder its ratification and tend to kill it, I thought he would favor it.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. The Senator is quite justified in thinking that I would do anything I could legitimately to kill the treaty, but I would want to do it in a wise way, and I would not want folly added to my crime.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I was using the Senator from Connecticut and the Senator from Idaho and the Senator from Missouri and their attitude toward the treaty to emphasize my opinion that this amendment would hinder and not help ratification. I thank Senators for their attention, and I again urge that without pride of opinion or effort to adhere to past action we seek reservations protecting the interests of our country which may still receive the requisite votes for ratification.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to the reservation proposed by the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE].

Mr. KING. Mr. President, at the proper time I shall offer the amendment which I send to the desk as a substitute for the reservation offered by the Senator from Massachusetts. I merely tender it now, and ask that it be printed in the RECORD, and at the appropriate time I shall offer it.

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

The amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by Mr. KING to the reservation proposed by Mr. LODGE is as follows:

Amend reservation No. 4 so that it will read as follows:

"4. The United States understands that the jurisdiction and authority of the council or the assembly of the league do not include any power over the proper domestic, internal, or national police of any member of the league, and that said articles do not confer upon the league any powers with respect to immigration, imposts, property, inheritance, naturalization, citizenship, labor, coastwise traffic, or any other matter of proper domestic policy. This enumeration of matters of policy shall not in any wise be taken to exclude from authority of the United States any other subject of domestic policy properly within the national political powers and sovereignty of the United States, as recognized by the law and custom of nations. The United States will not submit to arbitration or to consideration of the council any question which in its judgment is a question within its domestic jurisdiction and sovereignty."

NOTICE OF CONFIRMATIONS.

Mr. LODGE obtained the floor.

Mr. TRAMMELL. Mr. President——

Mr. LODGE. I yield to the Senator from Florida, who desires to make a request.

Mr. TRAMMELL. I thank the Senator from Massachusetts for yielding, and I shall occupy merely a moment. On the 20th of February a number of post-office nominations were confirmed by the Senate, including several from my State. Under the rule requiring two executive sessions before they can be certified to the President they have not as yet been certified. Therefore, as in executive session, I desire to ask unanimous consent that the post-office nominations which were confirmed on the 20th of February be now certified to the President.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I am reminded that the nomination of marshal for the northern district of Georgia was confirmed a few days ago. I do not think any unanimous consent order was made that the President should at once be notified. The former marshal is going out of office on the 1st of the month, and it has been arranged to change the office on that date; so it is quite important that the President should be notified.

Mr. LODGE. I ask unanimous consent that the President be notified of all confirmations made on February 20.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

RECESS.

Mr. LODGE. I move that the Senate take a recess until to-morrow at 12 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 35 minutes p. m.) the Senate took a recess until to-morrow, Saturday, February 28, 1920, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, *February 27, 1920.*

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast made us and filled our souls with longings, hopes, and aspirations, cleanse us from all guile and imbue us with light to guide us, strength to sustain us, in every laudable ambition.

The world is facing a crisis and our Nation is facing with it great trials. Save us, we beseech Thee, from perils of stupidity and blunders and guide us safely on to the genius inspired by our fathers that we may live and grow in everything that is pure, and noble, and holy. In the Christ spirit. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

SURPLUS MOTOR EQUIPMENT HELD BY WAR DEPARTMENT.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Speaker, I desire to call up Senate bill 3037 and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill S. 3037, insist on the House amendments, and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (S. 3037) to authorize the Secretary of War to transfer, free of charge, certain surplus motor-propelled vehicles and motor equipment to the Department of Agriculture, Post Office Department, Navy Department, and the Treasury Department for the use of the Public Health Service, and certain other surplus property to the Department of Agriculture, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from California asks to insist on the amendments of the House and agree to the conference asked for by the Senate. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is a House bill amended by the Senate?

Mr. KAHN. No. It is a Senate bill amended by the House.

Mr. GARNER. And the Senate disagrees to the House amendments and asks for a conference?

Mr. KAHN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GARD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, the request is to insist upon the House amendments?

Mr. KAHN. Yes. I should have said so.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection; and the Speaker appointed as the conferees on the part of the House, Mr. KAHN, Mr. MCKENZIE, and Mr. DENT.

THE AMERICAN LEGION.

Mr. SHERWOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD an editorial which appeared simultaneously in five eminent independent journals of Ohio on the proposition of the American Legion. It is a very illuminating editorial, nonpartisan, and short.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing an editorial relative to the American Legion. Is there objection?

Mr. GARNER. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I regret very much to object to anything that the gentleman from Ohio might suggest should go into the RECORD, but if we begin now to insert into the RECORD editorials suggesting the policies which Congress should pursue with reference to the legion there will be no end to it. Only yesterday we referred all these measures to a committee of the House for the purpose of consideration. Would it not be better to wait until that committee reports out a bill and gives consideration to it before we encumber the RECORD with editorials? I am not going to object to-day, but I would like for somebody who is responsible for the RECORD to take care of it.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SHERWOOD. This is a copy of the editorial printed simultaneously in five most important papers in Ohio, namely, the Toledo News-Bee, the Cleveland Press, the Cincinnati Post, the Akron Press, and the Columbus Citizen:

JUSTICE FOR THE SOLDIER AND SAILOR.

The American Legion, through its executive committee, asks that Uncle Sam pay to all ex-service men and women a $50 bond for each month of service during the war.

Commander Franklin D'Olier, in presenting the legion's case, says the Government has granted additional pay to its clerks for war service. War-time workmen in shipyards and munitions plants were paid high wages.