

SENATE.

SATURDAY, October 6, 1917.

(Legislative day of Friday, October 5, 1917.)

The Senate reassembled at 10 o'clock a. m., on the expiration of the recess.

WAR-RISK INSURANCE.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I ask for the present consideration and immediate adoption of the concurrent resolution which I send to the Secretary's desk.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The concurrent resolution will be read.

The Secretary read the concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15), as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 5723) entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department,' approved September 2, 1914, and for other purposes," the Clerk be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to strike out the words "of premiums in advance shall not be required for periods of more than one month each and may be deducted from the pay or deposit of the insured or be otherwise made at his election," as the same appear on page 30, lines 26 and 27, and lines 1 and 2, on page 31.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I will state briefly that by mistake when an amendment to an amendment was adopted a part of the same language was included in the amendment to the amendment and left in the amendment to which it was an amendment. So we want to strike it out.

The concurrent resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

EXPORT OF DISTILLED SPIRITS.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 99) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the entry of distilled spirits into bonded warehouses under bond, conditioned for the export of such distilled spirits to some foreign country within three years from the date of entry into the United States, which was to amend the title so as to read: "Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the entry of distilled spirits into bonded warehouses under bond, conditioned for the export of such distilled spirits to some foreign country within one year from the date of entry into the United States."

Mr. SIMMONS. I move that the Senate concur in the amendment of the House.

The motion was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the Speaker had appointed Mr. KIRCHIN, Mr. FITZGERALD, and Mr. GILLET a committee on the part of the House to join a similar committee appointed by the Senate to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed the business of the present session and are ready to adjourn.

The message also announced that the House had agreed to the concurrent resolution of the Senate authorizing the clerk in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 5723) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and for other purposes, to strike out the words "for premiums in advance," etc.

The message further announced that the House had passed the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 89) to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to expend funds in New Mexico and Texas for drainage purposes.

The message also announced that the House had passed a joint resolution (H. J. Res. 162) authorizing the expenditure of money upon lands purchased for use of the Ordnance Department of the Army without reference to section 355 of the Revised Statutes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

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

S. 2527. An act authorizing appointment of chaplains at large for the United States Army;

S. 2531. An act to prevent the publication of inventions by the grant of patents that might be detrimental to the public safety or convey useful information to the enemy, to stimulate invention, and provide adequate protection to owners of patents, and for other purposes;

S. 2663. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Wolf Creek Lumber Co. to maintain a bridge already constructed across Tug River;

S. 2916. An act to amend sections 24 and 256 of the Judicial Code, relating to the jurisdiction of the district courts, so as to save to claimants the rights and remedies under the workmen's compensation law of any State;

S. 2920. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the State of North Carolina two brass cannon, with carriage;

S. 2937. An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Arkansas River between the cities of Little Rock and Argenta;

S. 2947. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of El Paso, Tex., to construct a bridge across the Rio Grande River within or near the city limits of El Paso, Tex., such construction to be made with the consent and cooperation of the Republic of Mexico;

H. R. 5646. An act to amend section 1585 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

H. R. 5648. An act to establish certain new ratings in the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5918. An act to authorize the President to organize provisionally as Field Artillery or Infantry and to use as Field Artillery or Infantry during the existing emergency such regiments of Cavalry as he may designate;

S. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to expend funds in New Mexico and Texas for drainage purposes; and

S. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the entry of distilled spirits into bonded warehouses under bond, conditioned for the export of such distilled spirits to some foreign country within one year from the date of entry into the United States.

PETITIONS.

Mr. SHEPPARD. I submit resolutions adopted by the Legislature of Texas, which I ask may be inserted in the Record.

The resolutions are as follows:

House concurrent resolution 1, Legislature of Texas.

Whereas the Supreme Court of the United States in a decision has held to be unconstitutional the law under which the cotton-tax fund was collected by the Federal Government; and

Whereas owing to the great number from whom it was collected and the difficulty of the establishment of the individual rights thereto; and Whereas the money has remained in the Federal Treasury for half a century unclaimed, and it becomes more and more difficult to establish a claim as time goes by; and

Whereas there are none more worthy or who more truly represent the spirit of the South than those Confederates from whom the taxes were collected and their widows; and

Whereas if the Congress of the United States should appropriate money to repay these taxes, it would enable the survivors of the Confederacy to pass their remaining years in comparative comfort; and

Whereas said veterans and their descendants have proved their loyalty to their country by following the flag under the matchless Joe Wheeler in the Spanish-American War; and

Whereas the hundreds of thousands have responded to the call of the peerless leader Woodrow Wilson to enlist in the cause of their country and fight against Germany; and for one-half of a century have helped to pay the pensions of the Federal soldiers, it is just and right and equitable for the Federal Government to return to these veterans what is rightfully and morally theirs; and believing that the North and the Grand Army of the Republic would indorse this act in justice to the decimated ranks of the gray: Therefore be it

Resolved by the house (the senate concurring), That we request our entire delegation in Congress at Washington to prepare, introduce, and work for the passage of a bill to appropriate "the cotton-tax fund" to the Confederate soldiers, sailors, and their widows, and to order the payment thereof to each Confederate soldier, sailor, and their widows in such monthly allowances as said fund will justify as long as such persons may live; therefore be it further

Resolved, That a copy of this resolution be sent to each Member of the Texas delegation in Congress and to our great President, Woodrow Wilson, by the secretary of the Senate and the chief clerk of the House of the Texas Legislature.

Adopted by the house on September 25, 1917.

F. O. FIELDS,
Speaker of the House.

T. B. REESE,
Acting Chief Clerk of the House.

Mr. SHEPPARD presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from sundry citizens of Alpine, Tex., regarding the utterances of certain Senators, which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. POINDEXTER presented petition of sundry citizens of Colfax, Wash., relative to the public utterances of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

Mr. SMITH of Maryland presented a petition of the Merchants and Manufacturers' Association of Baltimore, Md., relative to the public utterances of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE], which was referred to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

STREET RAILWAY CONDITIONS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

Mr. PITTMAN. On behalf of the special committee to investigate street railway conditions in the District of Columbia, I present a report (No. 176) and ask that it be printed.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That action will be taken.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES.

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

A bill (S. 93) to consolidate national forest lands (Rept. No. 173);

A bill (S. 95) to provide for agricultural entries on coal lands in Alaska (Rept. No. 174); and

A bill (S. 102) relating to the temporary filling of vacancies occurring in the offices of register and receiver of district land offices (Rept. No. 175).

Mr. SMITH of Arizona, from the Committee on Printing, to which was referred the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 101) to provide further for the national security and defense by insuring to the Government of the United States an adequate supply of paper at a fair price and by insuring a supply and equitable distribution at fair prices to the industries of the United States, reported it without amendment and submitted a report (No. 177) thereon.

INAUGURATION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT (S. DOC. NO. 116).

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. From the Committee on Printing, I report back favorably Senate resolution 147, submitted by the Senator from Florida [Mr. FLETCHER] on the 5th instant, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 147) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to as follows:

Resolved, That the manuscript entitled "The Official Report of the Second Inauguration of Woodrow Wilson as President of the United States and Thomas R. Marshall as Vice President of the United States, on March 5, 1917," be printed as a Senate document, with accompanying illustrations.

BILLS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. SWANSON:

A bill (S. 2980) to permanently renew patent No. 24917; to the Committee on Patents.

By Mr. JONES of Washington:

A bill (S. 2981) granting a pension to Elizabeth K. Cottman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND:

A bill (S. 2982) granting an increase of pension to Ebenezer B. Sims;

A bill (S. 2983) granting a pension to Edward G. Davis; and

A bill (S. 2984) granting an increase of pension to Martha A. Cooper; to the Committee on Pensions.

ADDRESS BY JUDGE W. M. BOND.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD a patriotic address delivered by Judge W. M. Bond, of Edenton, N. C., at Lumberton, N. C., on August 30, 1917. I have read the address, and it is a very admirable one by one of the prominent men of North Carolina.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

THE WAR AND OUR DUTY.

[A patriotic address delivered by Judge W. M. Bond, of Edenton, N. C., at Lumberton, N. C., on the 30th day of August, 1917.]

Judge Bond said:

"With the world veiled in the gloom of war, alike upon its surface, in the skies, and beneath the bosom of its seas, with millions dead and millions perhaps yet to die, with the flower of our manhood preparing to face its destruction, it may be well to speak of existing conditions. Fate has brought us face to face with a distressing situation. It has come uninvited and is not our fault. After our Government was constructed and our independence had been won by success in the Revolution our Nation began its career. In spite of disasters predicted, each closing decade has waved its admiring tribute to her growth and progress, and to-day her flag is respected on every ocean and her voice is heeded in every council of the nations.

"The War of 1812 was fought with England and terminated. About a quarter century later we had war with Mexico. That ended by establishing American sovereignty to the banks of the Rio Grande. In 1861 we had the War between the States. It closed by a settlement of the slavery question and denial of the right of the Southern States to secede from the Union in

1865. From then until our trouble with Spain a few years ago, which ended in liberation of the Isle of Cuba, the pearl of the Caribbean Sea, from Spanish cruelty, we had peace until a few months ago. The weapons used in those contests were playthings compared with present-day methods of destruction. During the entire period of her existence no threat has ever been made to blight the liberties of her people; since the dawn of history no government has placed as few burdens on its citizens.

"The framers of this Government believed in America for Americans, and fancied that, with 3,000 miles of ocean on one side and 10,000 on the other, we would sleep with our dreams undisturbed by European or Asiatic complications. Submarine perfection has dissipated that distance and furlled those watery curtains of immunity. Dark shadows of assault, with threatened invasion and destruction, have been floated over us and the continued enjoyment of our liberties is threatened.

"We stretched our arms across the Pacific and gathered in the Hawaiian Isles, and went farther over the bosom of that mighty sheet and acquired the Philippines. That move chained our destinies to theirs. We saw ourselves thus drawn into Asiatic policies and questions. Up to now peace has remained undisturbed and we pursued the noiseless tenor of our way.

"We have fought no war with any foreign power that was not to preserve the freedom of the seas, the great highways of nations, and to preserve the rights and liberties of men. We have fought no war with any power that was provided with present-day equipment for conquest and destruction. We have wanted no war and have done nothing to invite it, but we will meet it, regardless of cost, rather than surrender our national honor and lose our self-respect. True Americans can die, but can not live as slaves.

"Based upon the broad fundamental doctrine that man was capable of self-government and upon the further theory that every man should have equality of opportunity to enjoy the blessings of liberty and happiness, our Government has never fired a cannon that did not echo a desire to maintain the rights of men to freedom and liberty. No shackles of slavery can fetter beneath the shadow of our flag.

"Cutting through the heart of Europe and crossing the Asiatic border for years there has existed a great Government whose whole theory of national existence has been founded upon the so-called divine right of certain men to rule by reason of hereditary privilege. That Government is the German Empire, and its idea of ruling has ever been that every man's neck should have upon it the heel of Prussian military despotism. Its sole conception of right is its might, and its sole idea of solemn promises is to violate them whenever violation is to its advantage. Destructive power and brute force have paralyzed its measure of morality.

"Recently we have been forced into war with that great military machine—a nation that has dreamed only of war and conquest, and that has builded the greatest fighting machine the world has ever seen. They desire other monument: to bespeak their conquest, as do the statues in Paris draped in mourning silently lament the loss of Alsace and Lorraine.

"With ghoulish glee, as they spoke of England's contemptible little army, we have seen German soldiery laugh at their solemn treaty to respect the integrity of Belgium, calling it a "scrap of paper," invade that happy and historic little country, converting the sites where stood its splendid cities into international cemeteries where to-day sleep the dead soldiers of many nations and many climes. Like a pestilence which walked in the darkness and a destruction that wasted at noonday, they have made graveyards of that historic country which has never done them a wrong.

"We have seen them become the pirate of nations, and by the use of undersea boats sink ships and drown noncombatant men and helpless women and children. The ocean's bottom is to-day strewn with the bones of its victims. We have seen them make desolate happy countries that had done them no wrong, and leave to starvation their former citizens; they have hammered down cathedrals and colleges with their cannon; trained their guns on Red Cross boats; and slaughtered sleeping men, women, and children by dropping dynamite bombs at night, their vengeance writing cruelty that would have brought blushes to the cheek of the Goth, the Vandal, and the Hun, all done while they were marching arm in arm with the unspeakable Turk, and boasting of the culture and civilization of the Rhine. Language must confess its poverty in any attempt to describe the wantonness of their cruelty and to picture the deeds which only barbarians could have imagined. They seem to enjoy it.

"We have seen their representatives in office in our Capital, under the protection of our flag, entering into intrigues to incite Mexico and Japan to make war upon us. We have read of their efforts to incite to rebellion the negroes of the South. They

drowned our citizens while asserting their friendship for us. We protested, but the outrages continued unabated. They were making war upon us months before we declared that a state of war existed. Any nation that would submit in its cowardice to such treatment without resistance should be swept from existence. It ought not to live and could not live. Struggle for existence is a basic principle of life. Not an animal roams beneath the forest shades, not a bird flies beneath the summer skies, not a fish cuts his way beneath the bosom of the deep, but must be ever alert to resist efforts aimed at its destruction. So is eternal vigilance the price of liberty with man.

"Staggered by their disregard of size and sex in their efforts to stage a frightfulness at which barbarians would shudder, we wonder if Atilla, the Hun, the scourge of God, would not lie dissatisfied in his grave if he knew how they had surpassed him. Faced with duty of selecting whether we would purchase peace at price of surrendering honor, or whether we would die if necessary to maintain it, we were forced into the war. We are told by some it is not our war, and they pretend not to know what we are fighting for. Only the blind should fail to see, in this panorama of bloodshed and slaughter, a studied effort to float the flag of Prussian domination over every capitol of the globe. Since the close of the Franco-Prussian war not a day has passed without strengthening the German dream for absolute world control. Are we ready for them to have it? Not an allied soldier's blood has crimsoned the snows of the Carpathians, not one died at the forts of Liege, not one fell at the Marne, and not one has fallen on the fields of Belgium and France but whose heart's blood flowed to preserve free government and freedom for man. They were fighting as much for us as for themselves; they died that our descendants, as well as their's, might be free. Is it cowardice, demagoguery, politics, or ignorance which makes any say it is not our war?

"Every American soldier who dies on the battle fields of Europe should have floating over him the inscription:

"He died that American liberty might live;
He died to stay the iron hand of Prussian despotism.

"Are we craven descendants of ancestors whose blood was shed for us? Some say, from what motives we do not know, that we have no right to send our soldiers to die in Europe. Appalling as the threatened destruction is, it is astounding that American citizens, descendants of men whose blood on the fields of the Revolution bought the liberties we enjoy, should be weakening the arms of their Government, in a state of actual war, by creating distrust and dissension, and making utterances calculated to destroy loyalty and patriotism and give comfort to the enemies of their country. In the face of the enemy, in a state of war, are not words and conduct calculated to destroy loyalty to our flag in every respect moral treason? No man unwilling to support his flag should be protected by it.

"Many treasonable utterances have been made. From now on let every man make a note of such, by whom spoken, when, and where, and who heard them, so that when the smothered resentment of those whose relatives are facing the struggle shall burst into flame, as it will when the death lists float their harrowing sorrow over us, and then inflamed sentiment demands the punishment of the guilty, we may know who the guilty are. Words spoken which lessen the ardor of our people and embolden the enemy are as much overt acts of treason as would be the killing of American soldiers, because of one's sympathy for Germany. Many now are cavorting with the shaded silhouettes of death. They are sowing the wind; they will reap the whirlwind.

"If this Government has not the power to put its soldiers anywhere to prevent its own destruction, we are indeed a weak Nation, and its Constitution is a rope of sand. The suggestion would seem too childish to merit consideration. To say we had no power to intercept and destroy threatened invaders, but must wait until they get on our soil, and then risk our own destruction it would seem unnecessary to answer.

"I am not without sympathy for the fathers and mothers whose sons must go. Ghastly as may be the reflection, I admit many will go who will never return. I am in position to sympathize. One of my sons is in the Army and has served on the Mexican border and elsewhere for a year. Some morning I expect to hear that he is gone. I have another who will probably be drawn into it in the near future. What their fate is to be I can not know. I can only wait and hope, and 'hope's brightest robes will be brodered with the sable fringe of fear.' Every man owes to his Government the loss of his own life, if that loss is needed to prevent his Government's destruction.

"Every man who does not do his duty strikes a blow at the heart of the land of his birth. We are now at war. It is too

late for difference of opinion. The utterance of every man should be:

"My country, my country, may she ever be right;
But right or wrong, my country.

"No fancied freedom of speech gives to any man the right to make disloyal remarks after his country is at war. They should stand by the flag.

"It is no time for difference of classes or views. Some complain that it is a rich man's war. There has been no war in which that statement was not made. It was being said in England, when the sons of wealthy men were falling at the front, while at the same moment workers in munition factories were striking for higher wages. Away with such utterances. For better or for worse we are in it. Except by absolute loss of self-respect we could not stay out. If we have disloyalty in our ranks those possessing it should be silent.

"Instead of calling it Europe's war, in the language of Gen. Wood at Fayetteville, 'we should thank God that we have the trenches of the allies behind which to prepare for the struggle.'

"Let us march shield locked to shield, every man determined to do all he can to prevent the destruction of American liberty, trusting in God for success. The selective draft all must admit is absolutely fair. Each in turn as drawn must go. There is nothing in it open to complaint. Its validity has been adjudged in the Federal court. Who furnished the money to assail it?

"In closing upon this subject a word as to the duty of those who will not be sent to face the cannon and rifles of the battle field: Every person should produce what he can. A starving world appeals to us for food. Hunger stalks abroad to-day over many countries of Europe. It may come here. He who feeds a soldier helps to win the war. Extravagance should be avoided and economy practiced. No waste should be permitted. We must win, or ruin awaits us. Success can not be easily attained. A nation which boils the bodies of its dead soldiers to extract oil with which to run its engines and grinds their bones into fertilizer can not be easily subdued. We must prepare to meet the gloom that death lists will bring to us. We know they are coming. We must prepare to meet the taxation burdens. Will demagogues try to capitalize it?

"Every man whose avarice commands him to make commercial warfare on those who are to go to the front, or on the families and dependents they may leave, should have the eyes of censure riveted upon him. We should live or die together. Cries of greed should be silenced. The tongue of the agitator should be still. Play no politics in gambling with the lives of men. The contest is on between preservation of human liberties, or leaving to our descendants slavery to despotism. It is too late for assertion of individual opinion. Who lends aid and comfort to our enemies in this struggle will himself die a traitor to his native land and a deserter to his family and his descendants. Let every soldier who marches to the front feel that he has behind him the undivided support of every American man and woman. If he dies, he dies for them. They should not desert him. God pity the man who stands not by the flag of his country. That flag, our homes, and our country call. Let us turn no deaf ear to that call.

"Permanent peace for the future should be secured. The right of people to free government should be assured to avoid the shedding of other oceans of blood. The stars of freedom can not be turned backward in their course, nor the hand of autocratic tyranny be lifted higher. It is whispered in the air, 'The world must be made safe for democracy.' On this rock, and on this alone, can the world have assurance of permanent peace. Blood must be shed. Men must die and women suffer to achieve, but its attainment should be the lofty aim of those who feel it is not all of life to live nor all of death to die. We owe to freedom's cause the everlasting destruction of its arch enemy. There can be no security for permanent peace as long as a military giant sleeps in the lap of Europe determined upon world domination. No doves of peace can live surrounded by vultures of destruction. No desire for promotion and no glitter of German gold, nor any other forms of bribery, should swerve us from duty's path. We can not die but once, nor in better cause than to save man's freedom for man.

"President Wilson showed great patience in suffering under the injustices done us. As far as honor would permit, he tried to avoid the conflict. Deploring war and desiring peace, he watched and waited until longer forbearance ceased to be a virtue. The world wondered at us. The Congress declared existence of war. That settled the right and the status of every citizen. The wise occupant of the White House at once threw his matchless energy to complete preparation. He said mankind must be free. History will wrap wreaths of fadeless honor about his brow. He has consecrated his effort to protect

humanity. Secretary Daniels, of our State, is the directing head of our Navy. Senator SIMMONS is chairman of the Senate Finance Committee. They are now and have been at every step standing side by side with the President. Neither has done any act to weaken, hinder, or embarrass. They have done all in their power to help. Patriotic devotion to their flag has characterized their conduct. The Old North State has grave responsibilities resting upon her. She is not ashamed of her past. Let us preserve her future untarnished.

"There may be some Americans whose conduct should have awarded to them the Kaiser's iron cross for distinguished services rendered. We should not want it, but must prepare lest we meet the fate of crucifixion upon it.

"The great conflict will stagger many of us; to what extent we are not now permitted to know. Determination to do our duty and to take with calm resignation whatever comes should be our aim. We should have faith in the guiding power which shapes our destinies.

"Whether this cyclone of world madness be a part of the great plan of existence or whether it be caused by the weakness of men we may not know; but we can feel assured that the unseen force which from the center of the seas calls the wild waves to quiet and whispers peace to the storm-swept forest can in its own proper time command the stacking of arms and stop the flowing of rivers of blood.

"With duty done and faith in the Guiding Power, we must man the ship of state and pray she may sail on, sail on, while humanity, with its hopes, its fears, its smiles, its tears, is hanging breathless on her fate."

ADDRESS BY HON. GEORGE SUTHERLAND (S. DOC. NO. 119).

Mr. McCUMBER. I ask unanimous consent that an address of the president of the American Bar Association, Hon. George Sutherland, of Utah, may be printed as a public document.

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

PROMOTION OF EXPORT TRADE.

Mr. POMERENE. I ask unanimous consent to proceed to the consideration of the bill (H. R. 2316) to promote export trade, and for other purposes. Before the question is put I may say that it is not my expectation or desire to ask for final action. My sole purpose is to have the bill made the unfinished business, so that it may be taken up at the beginning of the next session.

Mr. SMOOT. The Senator will immediately ask that it be temporarily laid aside?

Mr. POMERENE. If that is the desire of the Senate, I shall do so.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the Chair lays the bill before the Senate.

The SECRETARY. A bill (H. R. 2316) to promote export trade, and for other purposes.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The bill will be temporarily laid aside.

APPROPRIATIONS FOR NAVAL ESTABLISHMENT.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, I have prepared an estimate of appropriations and contract authorizations for the Naval Establishment and Navy Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918. I ask to have these estimates of expenditures and authorizations printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, that will be done.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Appropriations and contract authorizations for the Naval Establishment and Navy Department for fiscal year 1918.

By the naval act:

Pay, miscellaneous and contingent, Navy	\$7,575,000.00
Bureau of Navigation	7,910,430.54
Bureau of Ordnance	43,594,359.00
Bureau of Yards and Docks	2,784,000.00
Public works, Bureau of Yards and Docks	16,976,255.01
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	1,445,478.00
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts	76,268,719.55
Bureau of Construction and Repair	13,725,000.00
Bureau of Steam Engineering	12,965,000.00
Naval Academy	909,049.20
Marine Corps	13,358,187.78
Increase of the Navy (3 battle ships, 1 battle cruiser, 3 scout cruisers, 15 destroyers, 1 destroyer tender, 1 submarine tender, and 18 coast submarines)	174,762,323.00

Naval emergency fund (additional torpedo-boat destroyers, submarine chasers, naval small craft, aircraft, guns, etc.)	\$115,000,000.00
Coast submarines, at a cost not exceeding \$1,300 each, exclusive of armor and armament	18,000,000.00
To expedite construction of ships	12,000,000.00

Total, naval act.....\$517,273,802.08

General deficiency act of the second session of the Sixty-fourth Congress:

Claims for damages	\$128.18
Pay, miscellaneous	124,180.33
Bureau of Ordnance	315,000.00
Bureau of Yards and Docks	746,000.00
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	42,698.19
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts	3,445,304.06
Bureau of Construction and Repair	1,715,000.00
Bureau of Steam Engineering	1,668,840.00
Naval Academy	5,200.00
Marine Corps	846,318.00

Total, general deficiency act.....8,908,668.76

By legislative, executive, and judicial and other acts.....2,417,162.22

Total, Sixty-fourth Congress, second session.....528,599,633.06

By the urgent deficiency act, Sixty-fifth Congress, first session:

Pay, miscellaneous	\$1,801,500.00
Aviation	11,000,000.00
Bureau of Navigation	19,516,124.00
Bureau of Ordnance	198,066,024.00
Bureau of Yards and Docks	14,713,500.00
Bureau of Medicine and Surgery	7,300,000.00
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts	142,933,084.87
Bureau of Construction and Repair	57,327,340.00
Bureau of Steam Engineering	34,960,500.00
Naval Academy	380,000.00
Marine Corps	26,806,961.00

Total, urgent deficiency act (first).....514,805,033.87

Urgent deficiency act, Sixty-fifth Congress, first session:

Aviation	\$45,000,000.00
Naval emergency fund (additional torpedo-boat destroyers, submarine chasers, and other naval craft)	100,000,000.00
Civilian consulting board	75,000.00
Bureau of Navigation	850,000.00
Bureau of Ordnance	152,677,123.50
Bureau of Yards and Docks	19,965,000.00
Urgent deficiency act, Sixty-fifth Congress, first session—Continued.	
Bureau of Supplies and Accounts	\$4,500,000.00
Bureau of Steam Engineering	10,200,000.00
Naval Academy	18,900.00
Marine Corps	3,150,000.00
Increase of the Navy (additional torpedo-boat destroyers, etc.)	225,000,000.00

Total, urgent deficiency act (second).....561,436,023.50

Grand total of appropriations.....1,604,840,690.43

Contract authorizations.....271,851,175.50

Total appropriations and contract authorizations.....1,876,691,865.93

MANUFACTURE AND STORAGE OF EXPLOSIVES.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. President, I rise to a question of the highest privilege, not of personal privilege, but of the privilege of the Senate, and call the attention of the Senate to the fact that on yesterday the signature of the Vice President was appended to the bill H. R. 3932, evidently by an inadvertence, while a motion was pending before the Senate, and undisposed of, for the reconsideration of the vote by which the conference report upon that bill was adopted.

I advise the Senate further of the fact that on Monday, the 1st day of October, a resolution of the Senate was adopted requesting the House to return that bill to the Senate. The request was submitted to the House and by certain proceedings in the House was disposed of without even the courtesy of a reply to the request of the Senate, as I am advised. I shall refer to the proceedings had in the House directly.

The request of the Senate thus being ignored by the House, the bill was presented to the Speaker, signed by him, and re-

turned to the Senate, and, as I am advised, being laid on his desk, was signed by the Vice President.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Let the Chair make a statement as to his signature to the bill. The Chair has to rely exclusively upon the bills that come to his desk. There is no way the Chair can keep a record of them.

Mr. WALSH. I had not time to inquire how it can be possible for a thing of that kind to occur. I assumed that one of the clerks was charged, as a matter of course, with the duty of seeing that no bills were laid upon the table of the Vice President that had not been finally disposed of by the Senate.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I know nothing about that. There is no way to keep on my desk a record of the proceedings when bills come to me to be signed.

Mr. WALSH. I assumed that one of the clerks is charged with that duty; but I want to call the attention to the proceedings had in the House on the request made by the Senate for the return of the bill. I read from the RECORD of October 4, as follows—

The VICE PRESIDENT rapped for order.

Mr. WALSH. I assume that it will be of some considerable interest to the Senate to see how its request to the House for the return of a bill was disposed of, without even a reply from that body. I read as follows:

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES,
October 1, 1917.

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be directed to request the House of Representatives to return to the Senate the bill (H. R. 3932) "to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes," with accompanying conference papers.

Attest:

JAMES M. BAKER, Secretary.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, as I observed the reading of the resolution, it seems to me that is an unusual form of resolution coming from the Senate.

I pause to remark, Mr. President, that I am advised by the clerks and the Secretary of the Senate that the resolution is in the usual and customary form. In fact, the form was drafted by one of the expert clerks of the Senate.

The conference report on this bill was agreed to by the Senate on September 28—

Within the time limited by the rules of the Senate I moved to reconsider the vote by which that conference report was agreed to, and the customary resolution for the recall of the bill was adopted by the Senate as provided by its Rule XIII.

The House agreed to it on September 29. A motion was made to reconsider, and to lay that motion on the table, which was agreed to in the House, and the Clerk of the House reported to the Senate that the House had agreed to the conference report, when it was supposed that that was the end of the matter, and that the bill would be enrolled and presented to the President. The orderly proceeding between the House and the Senate, it seems to me, ought to be such that when a conference report has been agreed to, where no mistake has been made, except such as was remedied by a concurrent resolution here, that ought to be the end of it—

That is to say, I take it, that the distinguished Member of the House whose language I have quoted takes the position that when a conference report has been agreed to in the Senate that ends the matter, and that there is no power in the Senate to reconsider the vote by which such report was agreed to. I do not believe the Senate can afford to have its rules thus interpreted. At least, it should reserve the right to be the sole judge of the signification and application of its own rules.

Such a question has never before been presented to the House or to the Congress of the United States to my knowledge in this way, except where a mistake has been made. It requires unanimous consent to set aside the proceedings of the House, in order that this bill may go back to the Senate and be sent over here as originally agreed to by the Senate with amendments, as this bill has. I do not believe that under those circumstances it is any discourtesy to the Senate that the House should not return these papers, and I think that for the future the Senate ought not to expect the House to return the papers in a case like this.

Further brief discussion, quite irrelevant, I venture to say, followed, resulting in the adoption by the House of a motion that the request of the Senate be laid on the table.

So the papers have not been returned to the Senate except in the manner I have indicated.

It is but just to the House to state that after the motion for the recall of the bill was adopted a concurrent resolution was passed by the Senate directing the enrolling clerk to insert language in the bill which was omitted from the conference report. That went to the House and was nonconcurrent in there, but the request of the Senate for the return of the bill remains on the table of the House.

Now just what action the Senate should take to uphold its own dignity in view of the substantial declination of the House either to comply with its request or even to communicate its

reason for its refusal may be deferred to be considered at some later day. It is a matter that has no more interest to me than to any other Member of the Senate, and I shall not suggest what action should be taken; but, Mr. President, the Senate certainly should advise the President of the United States that the signature of the Presiding Officer of this body was affixed to the bill inadvertently, so that he may know that it is in fact still pending before and undisposed of by this body. I have accordingly drawn a resolution to that effect.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I would like to submit a question to the Senator, if it would not interrupt him disagreeably. Was any reason given by the gentleman in the House, whom I understood the Senator to be quoting from, as to why the action of the Senate in accepting a conference report was not subject to a motion to reconsider, as any other action of the Senate would be?

Mr. WALSH. I have read the entire discussion on that point.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. I beg the Senator's pardon; I was not on the floor when the Senator began, and if he could briefly tell me without reading it all over again I would be obliged to him.

Mr. WALSH. No reason was urged except apparently the Member of the House, from whose remarks I have quoted, took the position that when the Senate had once concurred in a conference report the action was final.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. No reason was given?

Mr. WALSH. No reason was given.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. There is no reason.

Mr. WALSH. I offer, in view of the situation, the following resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The resolution will be read.

The resolution (S. Res. 148) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That the Secretary of the Senate be, and he is hereby, directed to advise the President of the United States that the signature of the Vice President was inadvertently affixed to the bill (H. R. 3932) "to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives; providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes," and while there was pending before the Senate a motion to reconsider the vote by which the report of the committee on conference to said bill was adopted.

Mr. WALSH. I ask for the adoption of the resolution.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

THE ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

The joint resolution (H. J. Res. 162) authorizing the expenditure of money upon lands purchased for use of the Ordnance Department of the Army without reference to section 355 of the Revised Statutes was read twice by its title.

Mr. MARTIN. This is a very important resolution, and I ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

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

There being no objection, the Senate, as in Committee of the Whole, proceeded to consider the joint resolution, which was read, as follows:

Resolved, etc., That section 355 of the Revised Statutes of the United States shall not apply to the expenditure of appropriations for the Ordnance Department of the Army now available for the purchase of land and for improvements upon such land.

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

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

Mr. MARTIN. I ask the Senator from Wisconsin to yield to me for just a moment.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Certainly.

Mr. MARTIN. I send a resolution to the desk and ask for its present consideration.

The resolution (S. Res. 149) was read, as follows:

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President, to join a similar committee appointed by the House of Representatives, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses, having completed the business of the present session, are ready to adjourn, unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

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

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair appoints Mr. MARTIN and Mr. SMOOT as the committee on the part of the Senate to wait upon the President.

FREE SPEECH AND THE RIGHT OF CONGRESS TO DECLARE THE OBJECTS OF THE WAR.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, I rise to a question of personal privilege.

I have no intention of taking the time of the Senate with a review of the events which led to our entrance into the war except in so far as they bear upon the question of personal privilege to which I am addressing myself.

Six Members of the Senate and 50 Members of the House voted against the declaration of war. Immediately there was let loose upon those Senators and Representatives a flood of invective and abuse from newspapers and individuals who had been clamoring for war, unequaled, I believe, in the history of civilized society.

Prior to the declaration of war every man who had ventured to oppose our entrance into it had been condemned as a coward or worse, and even the President had by no means been immune from these attacks.

Since the declaration of war the triumphant war press has pursued those Senators and Representatives who voted against war with malicious falsehood and recklessly libelous attacks, going to the extreme limit of charging them with treason against their country.

This campaign of libel and character assassination directed against the Members of Congress who opposed our entrance into the war has been continued down to the present hour, and I have upon my desk newspaper clippings, some of them libels upon me alone, some directed as well against other Senators who voted in opposition to the declaration of war.

One of these newspaper reports most widely circulated represents a Federal judge in the State of Texas as saying, in a charge to a grand jury—I read the article as it appeared in the newspaper and the headline with which it is introduced:

DISTRICT JUDGE WOULD LIKE TO TAKE SHOT AT TRAITORS IN CONGRESS.
[By Associated Press leased wire.]

HOUSTON, TEX., October 1, 1917.

Judge Waller T. Burns, of the United States district court, in charging a Federal grand jury at the beginning of the October term to-day, after calling by name Senators STONE of Missouri, HARDWICK of Georgia, VARDAMAN of Mississippi, GROENNA of North Dakota, GORE of Oklahoma, and LA FOLLETTE of Wisconsin, said:

"If I had a wish, I would wish that you men had jurisdiction to return bills of indictment against these men. They ought to be tried promptly and fairly, and I believe this court could administer the law fairly; but I have a conviction, as strong as life, that this country should stand them up against an adobe wall to-morrow and give them what they deserve. If any man deserves death, it is a traitor. I wish that I could pay for the ammunition. I would like to attend the execution, and if I were in the firing squad I would not want to be the marksman who had the blank shell."

The above clipping, Mr. President, was sent to me by another Federal judge, who wrote upon the margin of the clipping that it occurred to him that the conduct of this judge might very properly be the subject of investigation. He inclosed with the clipping a letter, from which I quote the following:

I have been greatly depressed by the brutal and unjust attacks that great business interests have organized against you. It is a time when all the spirits of evil are turned loose. The Kaisers of high finance, who have been developing hatred of you for a generation because you have fought against them and for the common good, see this opportunity to turn the war patriotism into an engine of attack. They are using it everywhere, and it is a day when lovers of democracy, not only in the world, but here in the United States, need to go apart on the mountain and spend the night in fasting and prayer. I still have faith that the forces of good on this earth will be found to be greater than the forces of evil, but we all need resolution. I hope you will have the grace to keep your center of gravity on the inside of you and to keep a spirit that is unclouded by hatred. It is a time for the words, "with malice toward none and charity for all." It is the office of great service to be a shield to the good man's character against malice. Before this fight is over you will have a new revelation that such a shield is yours.

If this newspaper clipping were a single or exceptional instance of lawless defamation, I should not trouble the Senate with a reference to it. But, Mr. President, it is not.

In this mass of newspaper clippings which I have here upon my desk, and which I shall not trouble the Senate to read unless it is desired, and which represent but a small part of the accumulation clipped from the daily press of the country in the last three months, I find other Senators, as well as myself, accused of the highest crimes of which any man can be guilty—treason and disloyalty—and, sir, accused not only with no evidence to support the accusation, but without the suggestion that such evidence anywhere exists. It is not claimed that Senators who opposed the declaration of war have since that time acted with any concerted purpose either regarding war measures or any others. They have voted according to their individual opinions, have often been opposed to each other on bills which have come before the Senate since the declaration of war, and, according to my recollection, have never all voted together since that time upon any single proposition upon which the Senate has been divided.

I am aware, Mr. President, that in pursuance of this general campaign of villification and attempted intimidation, requests from various individuals and certain organizations have been submitted to the Senate for my expulsion from this body, and that such requests have been referred to and considered by one of the committees of the Senate.

If I alone had been made the victim of these attacks, I should not take one moment of the Senate's time for their consideration, and I believe that other Senators who have been unjustly and unfairly assailed, as I have been, hold the same attitude upon this that I do. *Neither the clamor of the mob nor the voice of power will ever turn me by the breadth of a hair from the course I mark out for myself, guided by such knowledge as I can obtain and controlled and directed by a solemn conviction of right and duty.*

But, sir, it is not alone Members of Congress that the war party in this country has sought to intimidate. The mandate seems to have gone forth to the sovereign people of this country that they must be silent while those things are being done by their Government which most vitally concern their well-being, their happiness, and their lives. To-day and for weeks past honest and law-abiding citizens of this country are being terrorized and outraged in their rights by those sworn to uphold the laws and protect the rights of the people. I have in my possession numerous affidavits establishing the fact that people are being unlawfully arrested, thrown into jail, held incommunicado for days, only to be eventually discharged without ever having been taken into court, because they have committed no crime. Private residences are being invaded, loyal citizens of undoubted integrity and probity arrested, cross-examined, and the most sacred constitutional rights guaranteed to every American citizen are being violated.

It appears to be the purpose of those conducting this campaign to throw the country into a state of terror, to coerce public opinion, to stifle criticism, and suppress discussion of the great issues involved in this war.

I think all men recognize that in time of war the citizen must surrender some rights for the common good which he is entitled to enjoy in time of peace. *But, sir, the right to control their own Government according to constitutional forms is not one of the rights that the citizens of this country are called upon to surrender in time of war.*

Rather in time of war the citizen must be more alert to the preservation of his right to control his Government. He must be most watchful of the encroachment of the military upon the civil power. He must beware of those precedents in support of arbitrary action by administrative officials, which excused on the plea of necessity in war time, become the fixed rule when the necessity has passed and normal conditions have been restored.

More than all, the citizen and his representative in Congress in time of war must maintain his right of free speech. More than in times of peace it is necessary that the channels for free public discussion of governmental policies shall be open and unclogged. I believe, Mr. President, that I am now touching upon the most important question in this country to-day—and that is the right of the citizens of this country and their representatives in Congress to discuss in an orderly way frankly and publicly and without fear, from the platform and through the press, every important phase of this war; its causes, the manner in which it should be conducted, and the terms upon which peace should be made. The belief which is becoming widespread in this land that this most fundamental right is being denied to the citizens of this country is a fact the tremendous significance of which, those in authority have not yet begun to appreciate. I am contending, Mr. President, for the great fundamental right of the sovereign people of this country to make their voice heard and have that voice heeded upon the great questions arising out of this war, including not only how the war shall be prosecuted but the conditions upon which it may be terminated with a due regard for the rights and the honor of this Nation and the interests of humanity.

I am contending for this right because the exercise of it is necessary to the welfare, to the existence, of this Government, to the successful conduct of this war, and to a peace which shall be enduring and for the best interest of this country.

Suppose success attends the attempt to stifle all discussion of the issues of this war, all discussion of the terms upon which it should be concluded, all discussion of the objects and purposes to be accomplished by it, and concede the demand of the war-mad press and war extremists that they monopolize the right of public utterance upon these questions unchallenged, what think you would be the consequences to this country not only during the war but after the war?

RIGHT OF PEOPLE TO DISCUSS WAR ISSUES.

Mr. President, our Government, above all others, is founded on the right of the people freely to discuss all matters pertaining to their Government, in war not less than in peace, for in this Government the people are the rulers in war no less than in peace. It is true, sir, that Members of the House of Representatives are elected for two years, the President for four years, and the Members of the Senate for six years, and during their temporary official terms these officers constitute what is called the Government. But back of them always is the controlling sovereign power of the people, and when the people can make their will known, the faithful officer will obey that will. Though the right of the people to express their will by ballot is suspended during the term of office of the elected official, nevertheless the duty of the official to obey the popular will continues throughout his entire term of office. How can that popular will express itself between elections except by meetings, by speeches, by publications, by petitions, and by addresses to the representatives of the people? Any man who seeks to set a limit upon those rights, whether in war or peace, aims a blow at the most vital part of our Government. And then as the time for election approaches and the official is called to account for his stewardship—not a day, not a week, not a month, before the election, but a year or more before it, if the people choose—they must have the right to the freest possible discussion of every question upon which their representative has acted, of the merits of every measure he has supported or opposed, of every vote he has cast and every speech that he has made. And before this great fundamental right every other must, if necessary, give way, for in no other manner can representative government be preserved.

Mr. President, what I am saying has been exemplified in the lives and public discussion of the ablest statesmen of this country, whose memories we most revere and whose deeds we most justly commemorate. I shall presently ask the attention of the Senate to the views of some of these men upon the subject we are now considering.

Closely related to this subject of the right of the citizen to discuss war is that of the constitutional power and duty of the Congress to declare the purposes and objects of any war in which our country may be engaged. The authorities which I shall cite cover both the right of the people to discuss the war in all its phases and the right and the duty of the people's representatives in Congress to declare the purposes and objects of the war. For the sake of brevity, I shall present these quotations together at this point instead of submitting them separately.

DISCUSSION BY AMERICAN STATESMEN.

Henry Clay, in a memorable address at Lexington, Ky., on the 13th day of November, 1847, during the Mexican War, took a strong position in behalf of the right of the people to freely discuss every question relating to the war, even though the discussion involved a strong condemnation of the war policy of the Executive. He also declared it to be not only the right but the duty of the Congress to declare the objects of the war. As a part of that address he presented certain resolutions embodying his views on these subjects. These resolutions were adopted at that meeting by the people present, and were adopted at many other mass meetings throughout the country during the continuance of the Mexican War.

For introducing in this body some time ago a resolution asserting the right of Congress to declare the purposes of the present war, I have, as the newspaper clippings here will show, been denounced as a traitor and my conduct characterized as treasonable.

As bearing directly upon the conduct for which I have been so criticized and condemned, I invite your attention to the language of Henry Clay in the address I have mentioned.

He said:

But the havoc of war is in progress and the no less deplorable havoc of an inhospitable and pestilential climate. Without indulging in an unnecessary retrospect and useless reproaches on the past, all hearts and heads should unite in the patriotic endeavor to bring it to a satisfactory close. Is there no way that this can be done? Must we blindly continue the conflict without any visible object or any prospect of a definite termination? This is the important subject upon which I desire to consult and to commune with you. Who in this free Government is to decide upon the objects of a war at its commencement or at any time during its existence? Does the power belong to collective wisdom of the Nation in Congress assembled, or is it vested solely in a single functionary of the Government?

A declaration of war is the highest and most awful exercise of sovereignty. The convention which framed our Federal Constitution had learned from the pages of history that it had been often and greatly abused. It had seen that war had often been commenced upon the most trifling pretexts; that it had been frequently waged to establish or exclude a dynasty; to snatch a crown from the head of one potentate and place it upon the head of another; that it had often been prosecuted to promote alien and other interests than those of the nation whose chief had proclaimed it, as in the case of English wars for Hanoverian interests; and, in short, that such a vast and tremendous

power ought not to be confided to the perilous exercise of one single man. The convention therefore resolved to guard the war-making power against those great abuses, of which, in the hands of a monarch, it was so susceptible. And the security against those abuses which its wisdom devised was to vest the war-making power in the Congress of the United States, being the immediate representatives of the people and the States. So apprehensive and jealous was the convention of its abuse in any other hands that it interdicted the exercise of the power to any State in the Union without the consent of Congress. Congress, then, in our system of government, is the sole depository of that tremendous power.

Mr. President, it is impossible for me to quote as extensively from this address as I should like to do and still keep within the compass of the time that I have set down for myself; but the whole of the address is accessible to every Senator here, together with all of the discussion which followed it over the country, and in these times it would seem to me worthy of the review of Senators and of newspaper editors and of those who have duties to discharge in connection with this great crisis that is upon the world.

I quote further:

The Constitution provides that Congress shall have power to declare war and grant letters of marque and reprisal, to make rules concerning captures on land and water, to raise and support armies, and provide and maintain a navy, and to make rules for the government of the land and naval forces. Thus we perceive that the principal power, in regard to war, with all its auxiliary attendants, is granted to Congress. Whenever called upon to determine upon the solemn question of peace or war, Congress must consider and deliberate and decide upon the motives, objects, and causes of the war.

If that be true, is it treason for a Senator upon this floor to offer a resolution dealing with that question?

I quote further from Mr. Clay:

And, if a war be commenced without any previous declaration of its objects, as in the case of the existing war with Mexico, Congress must necessarily possess the authority, at any time, to declare for what purposes it shall be further prosecuted. If we suppose Congress does not possess the controlling authority attributed to it, if it be contended that a war having been once commenced, the President of the United States may direct it to the accomplishment of any object he pleases, without consulting and without any regard to the will of Congress, the convention will have utterly failed in guarding the Nation against the abuses and ambition of a single individual. Either Congress or the President must have the right of determining upon the objects for which a war shall be prosecuted. There is no other alternative. If the President possess it and may prosecute it for objects against the will of Congress, where is the difference between our free Government and that of any other nation which may be governed by an absolute Czar, Emperor, or King?

In closing his address Mr. Clay said:

I conclude, therefore, Mr. President and fellow citizens, with entire confidence, that Congress has the right, either at the beginning or during the prosecution of any war, to decide the objects and purposes for which it was proclaimed or for which it ought to be continued. And I think it is the duty of Congress, by some deliberate and authentic act, to declare for what objects the present war shall be longer prosecuted. I suppose the President would not hesitate to regulate his conduct by the pronounced will of Congress and to employ the force and the diplomatic power of the Nation to execute that will. But if the President should decline or refuse to do so and, in contempt of the supreme authority of Congress, should persevere in waging the war for other objects than those proclaimed by Congress, then it would be the imperative duty of that body to vindicate its authority by the most stringent and effectual and appropriate measures. And if, on the contrary, the enemy should refuse to conclude a treaty containing stipulations securing the objects designated by Congress, it would become the duty of the whole Government to prosecute the war with all the national energy until those objects were attained by a treaty of peace. There can be no insuperable difficulty in Congress making such an authoritative declaration. Let it resolve, simply, that the war shall or shall not be a war of conquest; and, if a war of conquest, what is to be conquered. Should a resolution pass disclaiming the design of conquest, peace would follow in less than 60 days, if the President would conform to his constitutional duty.

Mr. Clay as a part of that speech presented certain resolutions which were unanimously adopted by the meeting and which declared that the power to determine the purposes of the war rested with Congress, and then proceeded clearly to state the purposes, and the only purposes, for which the war should be prosecuted.

The last one of these resolutions is so pertinent to the present discussion that I invite your attention to it at this time. It is as follows:

Resolved, That we invite our fellow citizens of the United States who are anxious for the restoration of the blessings of peace, or, if the existing war shall continue to be prosecuted, are desirous that its purposes and objects shall be defined and known, who are anxious to avert present and future perils and dangers, with which it may be fraught, and who are also anxious to produce contentment and satisfaction at home, and to elevate the national character abroad, to assemble together in their respective communities, and to express their views, feelings, and opinions.

Abraham Lincoln was a Member of Congress at the time of the Mexican War. He strongly opposed the war while it was in progress and severely criticized President Polk on the floor of the House because he did not state in his message when peace might be expected.

In the course of his speech Lincoln said:

At its beginning, Gen. Scott was by this same President driven into disfavor, if not disgrace, for intimating that peace could not be conquered in less than three or four months. But now, at the end of 20

months * * * this same President gives a long message, without showing us that as to the end he himself has even an imaginary conception. As I have said, he knows not where he is. He is a bewildered, confounded, and miserably perplexed man. God grant he may be able to show there is not something about his conscience more painful than his mental perplexity.

Writing to a friend who had objected to his opposition to Polk in relation to this power of the President in war, Lincoln said:

The provision of the Constitution giving the war-making power to Congress was dictated, as I understand it, by the following reasons: Kings had always been involving and impoverishing their people in wars, pretending generally, if not always, that the good of the people was the object. This our convention understood to be the most oppressive of all kingly oppressions, and they resolved to so frame the Constitution that no man should hold the power of bringing this oppression upon us. But your view destroys the whole matter and places our President where kings have always stood.

I now quote from the speech of Charles Sumner, delivered at Tremont Temple, Boston, November 5, 1846.

John A. Andrew, who was the great war governor of Massachusetts, as I remember, presided at this public meeting, which was in support of the independent nomination of Dr. I. G. Howe as Representative in Congress. Mr. Sumner was followed by Hon. Charles Francis Adams, who also delivered an address at this meeting.

This is the view of Mr. Sumner on the Mexican War, which was then in progress, as expressed by him on this occasion:

The Mexican War is an enormity born of slavery. * * * Base in object, atrocious in beginning, immoral in all its influences, vainly prodigal of treasure and life, it is a war of infamy, which must blot the pages of our history.

In closing his eloquent and powerful address, he said:

Even if we seem to fail in this election we shall not fail in reality. The influence of this effort will help to awaken and organize that powerful public opinion by which this war will at last be arrested. Hang out, fellow citizens, the white banner of peace; let the citizens of Boston rally about it; and may it be borne forward by an enlightened, conscientious people, aroused to condemnation of this murderous war, until Mexico, now wet with blood unjustly shed, shall repose undisturbed beneath its folds.

Contrast this position taken by Charles Sumner at Tremont Temple with that of the Secretary of the Treasury, Mr. McAdoo. He is now touring the country with all the prestige of his great financial mission and the authority of his high place in the administration. I quote the language of the authorized report of his speech before the Bankers' Association of West Virginia, September 21, 1917. According to daily press reports he is making substantially the same denunciation in all his addresses:

America intends that those well-meaning but misguided people who talk inopportunely of peace when there can be no peace until the cancer which has rotted civilization in Europe is extinguished and destroyed forever shall be silenced. I want to say here and now and with due deliberation that every pacifist speech in this country made at this inopportune and improper time is in effect traitorous.

In these times we had better turn the marble bust of Charles Sumner to the wall. It ill becomes those who tamely surrender the right of free speech to look upon that strong, noble, patriotic face.

Mr. President, Daniel Webster, then in the zenith of his power, and with the experience and knowledge of his long life and great public service in many capacities, to add weight to his words, spoke at Faneuil Hall, November 6, 1846, in opposition to the Mexican War. He said:

Mr. Chairman, I wish to speak with all soberness in this respect, and I would say nothing here to-night which I would not say in my place in Congress or before the whole world. The question now is, *For what purposes and to what ends is this present war to be prosecuted?*

What will you say to the stature of the statesmanship that imputes treason to his country to a Member of this body who introduces a resolution having no other import than that?

Webster saw no reason why the purposes of the war in which his country was engaged should not be discussed in Congress or out of Congress by the people's representatives or by the people themselves.

After referring to Mexico as a weak and distracted country he proceeded:

It is time for us to know what are the objects and designs of our Government.

It is not the habit of the American people, nor natural to their character, to consider the expense of a war which they deem just and necessary—

Not only just, but necessary—

but it is their habit and belongs to their character to inquire into the justice and necessity of a war in which it is proposed to involve them.

Mr. Webster discussed the Mexican War at Springfield, Mass., September 29, 1847, and again, while the war was in progress, he did not hesitate to express his disapproval in plain language.

Many battles had been fought and won, and our victorious armies were in the field, on foreign soil.

Sir, free speech had not been suppressed. The right of the people to assemble and to state their grievances was still an attribute of American freedom. Mr. Webster said:

We are, in my opinion, in a most unnecessary and therefore a most unjustifiable war.

Whoever expects to whip men, free men, in this country into a position where they are to be denied the right to exercise the same freedom of speech and discussion that Webster exercised in that speech little understand the value which the average citizen of this country places upon the liberty guaranteed to him by the Constitution. Sir, until the sacrifices of every battle field consecrated to the establishment of representative government and of constitutional freedom shall be obliterated from the pages of history and forgotten of men, the plain citizenship of this country will jealously guard that liberty and that freedom and will not surrender it.

To return to my text. Mr. Webster said:

We are, in my opinion, in a most unnecessary and therefore a most unjustifiable war. I hope we are nearing the close of it. I attend carefully and anxiously to every rumor and every breeze that brings to us any report that the effusion of blood, caused, in my judgment, by a rash and unjustifiable proceeding on the part of the Government, may cease.

He makes the charge that the war was begun under false pretenses, as follows:

Now, sir, the law of nations instructs us that there are wars of pretexts. The history of the world proves that there have been, and we are not now without proof that there are, wars waged on pretenses; that is, on pretenses, where the cause assigned is not the true cause. That I believe on my conscience is the true character of the war now waged against Mexico. I believe it to be a war of pretenses; a war in which the true motive is not distinctly avowed, but in which pretenses, afterthoughts, evasions, and other methods are employed to put a case before the community which is not the true case.

Think you Mr. Webster was not within his constitutional rights in thus criticizing the character of the war, its origin, and the reasons which were given from time to time in justification of it?

Mr. Webster discusses at length what he considers some of the false pretenses of the war. Later on he says:

Sir, men there are whom we see, and whom we hear speak of the duty of extending our free institutions over the whole world if possible. We owe it to benevolence, they think, to confer the blessings we enjoy on every other people. But while I trust that liberty and free civil institutions, as we have experienced them, may ultimately spread over the globe, I am by no means sure that all people are fit for them; nor am I desirous of imposing, or forcing, our peculiar forms upon any nation that does not wish to embrace them.

Taking up the subject that war does now exist, Mr. Webster asks:

What is our duty? I say for one, that I suppose it to be true—I hope it to be true—that a majority of the next House of Representatives will be Whigs; will be opposed to the war. I think we have heard from the East and the West, the North and the South, some things that make that pretty clear. Suppose it to be so. What then? Well, sir, I say for one, and at once, that unless the President of the United States shall make out a case which shall show to Congress that the aim and object for which the war is now prosecuted is no purpose not connected with the safety of the Union and the just rights of the American people, then Congress ought to pass resolutions against the prosecution of the war, and grant no further supplies. I would speak here with caution and all just limitation. It must be admitted to be the clear intent of the Constitution that no foreign war should exist without the assent of Congress. This was meant as a restraint on the Executive power. But, if, when a war has once begun, the President may continue it as long as he pleases, free of all control of Congress, then it is clear that the war power is substantially in his own single hand. Nothing will be done by a wise Congress hastily or rashly, nothing that partakes of the nature of violence or recklessness; a high and delicate regard must, of course, be had for the honor and credit of the Nation; but, after all, if the war should become odious to the people, if they shall disapprove the objects for which it appears to be prosecuted, then it will be the bounden duty of their Representatives in Congress to demand of the President a full statement of his objects and purposes. And if these purposes shall appear to them not to be founded in the public good, or not consistent with the honor and character of the country, then it will be their duty to put an end to it by the exercise of their constitutional authority. If this be not so, then the whole balance of the Constitution is overthrown, and all just restraint on the Executive power. In a matter of the highest concern to the peace and happiness of the country, entirely destroyed. If we do not maintain this doctrine; if it is not so—if Congress, in whom the war-making power is expressly made to reside, is to have no voice in the declaration or continuance of war; if it is not to judge of the propriety of beginning or carrying it on—then we depart at once, and broadly, from the Constitution.

Mr. Webster concluded his speech in these memorable words:

We may be tossed upon an ocean where we can see no land—nor, perhaps, the sun or stars. But there is a chart and a compass for us to study, to consult, and to obey. That chart is the Constitution of the country. That compass is an honest, single-eyed purpose to preserve the institutions and the liberty with which God has blessed us.

In 1847 Senator Tom Corwin made a memorable speech in the Senate on the Mexican War. It was one of the ablest addresses made by that very able statesman, and one of the great contributions to the discussion of the subject we are now considering. At the time of Senator Corwin's address the majority in Con-

gress were supporting the President. The people up to that time had had no chance to express their views at an election. After referring to the doctrine then preached by the dominant faction of the Senate, that after war is declared it must be prosecuted to the bitter end as the President may direct, until one side or the other is hopelessly beaten and devastated by the conflict, with one man—the President—in sole command of the destinies of the Nation, Mr. Corwin said:

With these doctrines for our guide, I will thank any Senator to furnish me with any means of escaping from the prosecution of this or any other war, for an hundred years to come, if it please the President who shall be, to continue it so long. Tell me, ye who contend that, being in war, duty demands of Congress for its prosecution all the money and every able-bodied man in America to carry it on if need be, who also contend that it is the right of the President, without the control of Congress, to march your embodied hosts to Monterey, to Yucatan, to Mexico, to Panama, to China, and that under penalty of death to the officer who disobeys him—tell me, I demand it of you—tell me, tell the American people, tell the nations of Christendom, what is the difference between your democracy and the most odious, most hateful despotism, that a merciful God has ever allowed a nation to be afflicted with since government on earth began? You may call this free government, but it is such freedom, and no other, as of old was established at Babylon, at Susa, at Bactrina, or Persepolis. Its parallel is scarcely to be found when thus falsely understood, in any, even the worst, forms of civil polity in modern times. Sir, it is not so; such is not your Constitution; it is something else, something other and better than this.

Lincoln, Webster, Clay, Sumner—what a galaxy of names in American history! They all believed and asserted and advocated in the midst of war that it was the right—the constitutional right—and the patriotic duty of American citizens, after the declaration of war and while the war was in progress, to discuss the issues of the war and to criticize the policies employed in its prosecution and to work for the election of representatives opposed to prolonging war.

The right of Lincoln, Webster, Clay, Sumner to oppose the Mexican War, criticize its conduct, advocate its conclusion on a just basis, is exactly the same right and privilege as that possessed by every Representative in Congress and by each and every American citizen in our land to-day in respect to the war in which we are now engaged. Their arguments as to the power of Congress to shape the war policy and their opposition to what they believed to be the usurpation of power on the part of the Executive are potent so long as the Constitution remains the law of the land.

English history, like our own, shows that it has ever been the right of the citizen to criticize and, when he thought necessary, to condemn the war policy of his Government.

DISCUSSION BY ENGLISH STATESMEN.

John Bright consistently fought the Crimean War with all the power of his great personality and noble mind; he fought it inch by inch and step by step from the floor of the English Parliament. After his death Gladstone, although he had been a part of the ministry that Bright had opposed because of the Crimean War, selected this as the theme for his eulogy of the great statesman, as best portraying his high character and great service to the English people.

Lloyd-George aggressively opposed the Boer War. Speaking in the House of Commons July 25, 1900, in reply to the prime minister, he said:

He has led us into two blunders. The first was the war. But worse than the war is the change that has been effected in the purpose for which we are prosecuting the war. We went into the war for equal rights; we are prosecuting it for annexation. * * * You entered into these two Republics for philanthropic purposes and remained to commit burglary. * * * A war of annexation, however, against a proud people must be a war of extermination, and that is, unfortunately, what it seems we are now committing ourselves to—burning homesteads and turning men and women out of their homes.

I am citing this language, Mr. President, as showing the length to which statesmen have gone in opposing wars which have been conducted by their governments and the latitude that has been accorded them.

* * * The right honorable gentleman has made up his mind that this war shall produce electioneering capital to his own side. He is in a great hurry to go to the country before the facts are known. He wants to have the judgment of the people in the very height and excitement of the fever. He wants a verdict before the pleadings are closed and before "discovery" has been obtained. He does not want the documents to come, but he wants to have the judgment of the country upon censored news, suppressed dispatches, and unpaid bills.

In a speech delivered October 23, 1901, Lloyd-George charged that the English Army had burned villages, blown up farmhouses, swept away the cattle, burned thousands of tons of grain, destroyed all agricultural implements, all the mills, the irrigation works, and left the territory "a blackened devastated wilderness." He said:

In June the death rate among the children in the Orange River Colony camps was at the rate of 192 per thousand per annum, and in Transvaal 233 per thousand per annum. In July the figures were 220 and 336 per thousand per annum, respectively. In August they had

risen to 250 and 468, and in September to 442 in Orange River Colony and to 457 in the Transvaal. These are truly appalling figures. It means that at that rate in two years' time there would not be a little child left in the whole of these two new territories. The worst of it is that I can not resist the conclusion that their lives could have been saved had it not been that these camps had been deliberately chosen for military purposes. In the few camps near the coast there is hardly any mortality at all—

Observe that here is a criticism of the military policies of his Government—

and if the children had been removed from the Orange River Colony and the Transvaal to the seacoasts, where they could have been easily fed and clothed and cared for, their lives might be saved; but as long as they were kept up in the north there was a terrible inducement offered to the Boer commanders not to attack the lines of communication. * * * If I were to despair for the future of this country it would not be because of trade competition from either America or Germany, or the ineffectiveness of its army, or anything that might happen to its ships; but rather because it used its great, hulking strength to torture a little child. Had it not been that his ministry had shown distinct symptoms of softening of the brain, I would call the torpor and indifference they are showing in face of all this, criminal. It is a maddening horror, and it will haunt the Empire to its dying hour. What wonder is it that Europe should mock and hiss at us? Let any honest Britisher fearlessly search his heart and answer this question: Is there any ground for the reproach flung at us by the civilized world that, having failed to crush the men, we have now taken to killing babes?

Mr. President, while we were struggling for our independence the Duke of Grafton, in the House of Lords, October 26, 1775, speaking against voting thanks to British officers and soldiers, after the battles of Lexington and Bunker Hill, declared:

I pledge myself to your lordships and my country that if necessity should require it and my health otherwise permit it, I mean to come down to this House in a litter in order to express my full and hearty disapproval of the measures now pursued, and, as I understand from the noble lords in office, meant to be pursued.

On the same occasion, Mr. Fox said:

I could not consent to the bloody consequences of so silly a contest, about so silly an object, conducted in the silliest manner that history or observation had ever furnished an instance of, and from which we are likely to derive poverty, misery, disgrace, defeat, and ruin.

In the House of Commons, May 14, 1777, Mr. Burke is reported in the parliamentary debates against the war on the American Colonies, as saying he was, and ever would be, ready to support a just war, whether against subjects or alien enemies, but where justice or color of justice was wanting he would ever be the first to oppose it.

Lord Chatham, November 18, 1777, spoke as follows regarding the war between England and the American Colonies:

I would sell my shirt off my back to assist in proper measures, properly and wisely conducted, but I would not part with a single shilling to the present ministers. Their plans are founded in destruction and disgrace. It is, my lords, a ruinous and destructive war; it is full of danger; it teems with disgrace and must end in ruin. * * * If I were an American, as I am an Englishman, while a foreign troop was landed in my country I never would lay down my arms! Never! Never!

Mr. President, I have made these quotations from some of the leading statesmen of England to show that the principle of free speech was no new doctrine born of the Constitution of the United States. Our Constitution merely declared the principle. It did not create it. It is a heritage of English-speaking peoples, which has been won by incalculable sacrifice, and which they must preserve so long as they hope to live as free men. I say without fear of contradiction that there has never been a time for more than a century and a half when the right of free speech and free press and the right of the people to peaceably assemble for public discussion have been so violated among English-speaking people as they are violated to-day throughout the United States. To-day, in the land we have been wont to call the free United States, governors, mayors, and policemen are preventing or breaking up peaceable meetings called to discuss the questions growing out of this war, and judges and courts, with some notable and worthy exceptions, are failing to protect the citizens in their rights.

It is no answer to say that when the war is over the citizen may once more resume his rights and feel some security in his liberty and his person. As I have already tried to point out, now is precisely the time when the country needs the counsel of all its citizens. In time of war even more than in time of peace, whether citizens happen to agree with the ruling administration or not, these precious fundamental personal rights—free speech, free press, and right of assemblage so explicitly and emphatically guaranteed by the Constitution should be maintained inviolable. There is no rebellion in the land, no martial law, no courts are closed, no legal processes suspended, and there is no threat even of invasion.

But more than this, if every preparation for war can be made the excuse for destroying free speech and a free press and the right of the people to assemble together for peaceful discussion, then we may well despair of ever again finding ourselves for a long period in a state of peace. With the possessions we

already have in remote parts of the world, with the obligations we seem almost certain to assume as a result of the present war, a war can be made any time overnight and the destruction of personal rights now occurring will be pointed to then as precedents for a still further invasion of the rights of the citizen. This is the road which all free governments have heretofore traveled to their destruction, and how far we have progressed along it is shown when we compare the standard of liberty of Lincoln, Clay, and Webster with the standard of the present day.

This leads me, Mr. President, to the next thought to which I desire to invite the attention of the Senate, and that is the power of Congress to declare the purpose and objects of the war, and the failure of Congress to exercise that power in the present crisis.

POWER OF CONGRESS TO DECLARE OBJECTS OF WAR.

For the mere assertion of that right, in the form of a resolution to be considered and discussed—which I introduced August 11, 1917—I have been denounced throughout this broad land as a traitor to my country.

Mr. President, we are in a war the awful consequences of which no man can foresee, which, in my judgment, could have been avoided if the Congress had exercised its constitutional power to influence and direct the foreign policy of this country.

On the 8th day of February, 1915, I introduced in the Senate a resolution authorizing the President to invite the representatives of the neutral nations of the world to assemble and consider, among other things, whether it would not be possible to lay out lanes of travel upon the high seas and through proper negotiation with the belligerent powers have those lanes recognized as neutral territory, through which the commerce of neutral nations might pass. This, together with other provisions, constituted a resolution, as I shall always regard it, of most vital and supreme importance in the world crisis, and one that should have been considered and acted upon by Congress.

I believe, sir, that had some such action been taken the history of the world would not be written at this hour in the blood of more than one-half of the nations of the earth, with the remaining nations in danger of becoming involved.

I believe that had Congress exercised the power in this respect, which I contend it possesses, we could and probably would have avoided the present war.

Mr. President, I believe that if we are to extricate ourselves from this war and restore this country to an honorable and lasting peace, the Congress must exercise in full the war powers intrusted to it by the Constitution. I have already called your attention sufficiently, no doubt, to the opinions upon this subject expressed by some of the greatest lawyers and statesmen of the country, and I now venture to ask your attention to a little closer examination of the subject viewed in the light of distinctly legal authorities and principles.

CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS INVOLVED.

Section 8, Article I, of the Constitution provides:

The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts, and excises to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

In this first sentence we find that no war can be prosecuted without the consent of the Congress. No war can be prosecuted without money. There is no power to raise the money for war except the power of Congress. From this provision alone it must follow absolutely and without qualification that the duty of determining whether a war shall be prosecuted or not, whether the people's money shall be expended for the purpose of war or not rests upon the Congress, and with that power goes necessarily the power to determine the purposes of the war, for if the Congress does not approve the purposes of the war, it may refuse to lay the tax upon the people to prosecute it.

Again, section 8 further provides that Congress shall have power—

To declare war, grant letters of marque and reprisal, and make rules concerning captures on land and water;

To raise and support armies, but no appropriation of money to that use shall be for a longer term than two years;

To provide and maintain a Navy;

To make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces;

To provide for calling forth the militia to execute the laws of the Union, suppress insurrection, and repel invasion;

To provide for organizing, arming, and disciplining the militia, and for governing such part of them as may be employed in the service of the United States, reserving to the States, respectively, the appointment of the officers and the authority of training the militia according to the discipline prescribed by Congress.

In the foregoing grants of power, which are as complete as language can make them, there is no mention of the President. Nothing is omitted from the powers conferred upon the Congress. Even the power to make the rules for the government

and the regulation of all the national forces, both on land and on the sea, is vested in the Congress.

Then, not content with this, to make certain that no question could possibly arise, the framers of the Constitution declared that Congress shall have power—

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof.

We all know from the debates which took place in the constitutional convention why it was that the Constitution was so framed as to vest in the Congress the entire war-making power. The framers of the Constitution knew that to give to one man that power meant danger to the rights and liberties of the people. They knew that it mattered not whether you call the man king or emperor, czar or president, to put into his hands the power of making war or peace meant despotism. It meant that the people would be called upon to wage wars in which they had no interest or to which they might even be opposed. It meant secret diplomacy and secret treaties. It meant that in those things, most vital to the lives and welfare of the people, they would have nothing to say. The framers of the Constitution believed that they had guarded against this in the language I have quoted. They placed the entire control of this subject in the hands of the Congress. And it was assumed that debate would be free and open, that many men representing all the sections of the country would freely, frankly, and calmly exchange their views, unafraid of the power of the Executive, uninfluenced by anything except their own convictions, and a desire to obey the will of the people expressed in a constitutional manner.

Another reason for giving this power to the Congress was that the Congress, particularly the House of Representatives, was assumed to be directly responsible to the people and would most nearly represent their views. The term of office for a Representative was fixed at only two years. One-third of the Senate would be elected each two years. It was believed that this close relation to the people would insure a fair representation of the popular will in the action which the Congress might take. Moreover, if the Congress for any reason was unfaithful to its trust and declared a war which the people did not desire to support or to continue, they could in two years at most retire from office their unfaithful Representatives and return others who would terminate the war. It is true that within two years much harm could be done by an unwise declaration of war, especially a war of aggression, where men were sent abroad. The framers of the Constitution made no provision for such a condition, for they apparently never contemplated that such a condition would arise.

Moreover, under the system of voluntary enlistment, which was the only system of raising an army for use outside the country of which the framers of the Constitution had any idea, the people could force a settlement of any war to which they were opposed by the simple means of not volunteering to fight it.

The only power relating to war with which the Executive was intrusted was that of acting as Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy and of the militia when called into actual service. This provision is found in section 2 of Article II, and is as follows:

The President shall be Commander in Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States and of the militia of the several States when called into the actual service of the United States.

Here is found the sum total of the President's war powers. After the Army is raised he becomes the General in Command. His function is purely military. He is the General in Command of the entire Army, just as there is a general in command of a certain field of operation. The authority of each is confined strictly to the field of military service. The Congress must raise and support and equip and maintain the Army which the President is to command. Until the Army is raised the President has no military authority over any of the persons that may compose it. He can not enlist a man, or provide a uniform, or a single gun, or pound of powder. The country may be invaded from all sides and except for the command of the Regular Army, the President, as Commander in Chief of the Army, is as powerless as any citizen to stem the tide of the invasion. In such case his only resort would be to the militia, as provided in the Constitution. Thus completely did the fathers of the Constitution strip the Executive of military power.

It may be said that the duty of the President to enforce the laws of the country carries with it by implication control over the military forces for that purpose, and that the decision as to when the laws are violated, and the manner in which they should be redressed, rests with the President. This whole mat-

ter was considered in the famous case of *Ex parte Milligan* (4 Wall., 2). The question of enforcing the laws of the United States, however, does not arise in the present discussion. *The laws of the United States have no effect outside the territory of the United States.* Our Army in France or our Navy on the high seas may be engaged in worthy enterprises, but they are not enforcing the laws of the United States, and the President derives from his constitutional obligation to enforce the laws of the country no power to determine the purposes of the present war.

The only remaining provision of the Constitution to be considered on the subject is that provision of Article II, section 2, which provides that the President—

Shall have power by and with the consent of the Senate to make treaties, providing two-thirds of the Senate present concur.

This is the same section of the Constitution which provides that the President "shall nominate, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, shall appoint ambassadors, other public ministers, consuls, judges of the Supreme Court," and so forth.

Observe, the President under this constitutional provision gets no authority to declare the purposes and objects of any war in which the country may be engaged. It is true that a treaty of peace can not be executed except the President and the Senate concur in its execution. If a President should refuse to agree to terms of peace which were proposed, for instance, by a resolution of Congress, and accepted by the parliament of an enemy nation against the will, we will say, of an emperor, the war would simply stop, if the two parliaments agreed and exercised their powers respectively to withhold supplies; and the formal execution of a treaty of peace would be postponed until the people could select another President. It is devoutly to be hoped that such a situation will never arise, and it is hardly conceivable that it should arise with both an Executive and a Senate anxious, respectively, to discharge the constitutional duties of their office. But if it should arise, under the Constitution, the final authority and the power to ultimately control is vested by the Constitution in the Congress. The President can no more make a treaty of peace without the approval not only of the Senate but of two-thirds of the Senators present than he can appoint a judge of the Supreme Court without the concurrence of the Senate. A decent regard for the duties of the President, as well as the duties of the Senators, and the consideration of the interests of the people, whose servants both the Senators and the President are, requires that the negotiations which lead up to the making of peace should be participated in equally by the Senators and by the President. For Senators to take any other position is to shirk a plain duty; is to avoid an obligation imposed upon them by the spirit and letter of the Constitution and by the solemn oath of office each has taken.

PRECEDENTS AND AUTHORITIES.

As might be expected from the plain language of the Constitution, the precedents and authorities are all one way. I shall not attempt to present them all here, but only refer to those which have peculiar application to the present situation.

Watson, in his work on the Constitution, Volume II, page 915, says:

The authority of the President over the Army and Navy to command and control is only subject to the restrictions of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces. . . . Neither can impair or invade the authority of the other. . . . The powers of the President (under the war clause) are only those which may be called "military."

The same author on the same and succeeding page points out that the President as Commander in Chief of the Army may direct the military force in such a way as to most effectively injure the enemy. He may even direct an invasion of enemy territory. But, says the author, this can be done "temporarily, however, only until Congress has defined what the permanent policy of the country is to be."

How, then, can the President declare the purposes of the war to be, to extend permanently the territory of an ally or secure for an ally damages either in the form of money or new territory?

Mr. KING. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I prefer not to yield, if the Senator will permit me to continue. I can hardly get through within the time allotted, and I am certain to be diverted if I begin to yield.

Mr. KING. I just wanted to ask the Senator whether he thinks the President of the United States has contravened any constitutional powers conferred upon him thus far in the prosecution of the war?

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Well, sir, I am discussing the constitutional question here, and Senators must make their own application.

Pomeroy, in his "Introduction to the Constitutional Law of the United States" (9th edition, 1886, p. 373), says:

The organic law nowhere prescribes or limits the causes for which hostilities may be waged against a foreign country. *The causes of war it leaves to the discretion and judgment of the legislature.*

In other words, it is for Congress to determine what we are fighting for. The President, as Commander in Chief of the Army, is to determine the best method of carrying on the fight. But since the purposes of the war must determine what are the best methods of conducting it, the primary duty at all times rests upon Congress to declare either in the declaration of war or subsequently what the objects are which it is expected to accomplish by the war.

In Elliot's Debates (supplement 2d edition, 1866, p. 439, vol. 5) it is said:

There is a material difference between the cases of making war and making peace. It should be more easy to get out of war than into it.

In the same volume, at page 140, we find:

Mr. Sherman said he considered the executive magistracy as nothing more than an institution for carrying the will of the legislature into effect.

Story, in his work on the Constitution (5th edition, 1891, p. 92), says:

The history of republics has but too fatally proved that they are too ambitious of military fame and conquest and too easily devoted to the interests of demagogues, who flatter their pride and *betray their interests*. It should, therefore, be difficult in a republic to declare war, but not to make peace. The representatives of the people are to lay the taxes to support a war, and therefore have a right to be consulted as to its propriety and necessity.

I commend this language to those gentlemen, both in and out of public office, who condemn as treasonable all efforts, either by the people or by their representatives in Congress, to discuss terms of peace or who even venture to suggest that a peace is not desirable until such time as the President, acting solely on his own responsibility, shall declare for peace. It is a strange doctrine we hear these days that the mass of the people, who pay in money, misery, and blood all the costs of this war, out of which a favored few profit so largely, may not freely and publicly discuss terms of peace. I believe that I have shown that such an odious and tyrannical doctrine has never been held by the men who have stood for liberty and representative government in this country.

Ordronaux, in his work on Constitutional Legislation, says:

This power (the war-making power) the Constitution has lodged in Congress, as the political department of the Government, and more immediate representative of the will of the people. (P. 495).

On page 496, the same author points out that—

The general power to declare war, and the consequent right to conduct it as long as the public interests may seem to require—is vested in Congress.

The right to determine when and upon what terms the public interests require that war shall cease must therefore necessarily vest in Congress.

I have already referred to the fact that Lincoln, Webster, Clay, Sumner, Corwin, and others, all contended and declared in the midst of war that it was the right—the constitutional right—and the patriotic duty of American citizens, after the declaration of war, as well as before the declaration of war, and while the war was in progress, to discuss the issues of the war, to criticize the policies employed in its prosecution, and to work for the election of representatives pledged to carry out the will of the people respecting the war.

Let me call your attention to what James Madison, who became the fourth President of the United States, said on the subject in a speech at the constitutional convention, June 29, 1787:

A standing military force, with an overgrown Executive, will not long be safe companions to liberty. The means of defense against foreign dangers have always been the instrument of tyranny at home. Among the Romans it was a standing maxim to excite war whenever a revolt was apprehended. Throughout all Europe the armies kept up under the pretense of defending have enslaved the people. It is perhaps questionable whether the best concerted system of absolute power in Europe could maintain itself in a situation where no alarms of external danger could tame the people to the domestic yoke.

I now invite your attention to some of the precedents established by Congress showing that it has exercised almost from the time of the first Congress substantially the powers I am urging it should assert now.

CONGRESSIONAL PRECEDENTS.

Many of the precedents to which I shall now briefly refer will be found in Hinds' Precedents, volume 2, chapter 49. My authority for the others are the records of Congress itself as contained in the Congressional Globe and CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

In 1811 the House originated and the Senate agreed to a resolution as follows:

Taking into view the present state of the world, the peculiar situation of Spain and of her American Provinces, and the intimate relations of the territory eastward of the River Perdido, adjoining the United States, to their security and tranquillity: Therefore

Resolved, etc., That the United States can not see with indifference any part of the Spanish Provinces adjoining the said States eastward of the River Perdido pass from the hands of Spain into those of any other foreign power.

In 1821 Mr. Clay introduced the following resolution, which passed the House:

Resolved, That the House of Representatives participates with the people of the United States in the deep interest which they feel for the success of the Spanish Provinces of South America, which are struggling to establish their liberty and independence, and that it will give its constitutional support to the President of the United States whenever he may deem it expedient to recognize the sovereignty and independence of any of the said Provinces.

In 1825 there was a long debate in the House relating to an unconditional appropriation for the expenses of the ministers to the Panama Congress. According to Mr. Hinds's summary of this debate, the opposition to the amendment, led by Mr. Webster, was that—

While the House had an undoubted right to express its general opinion in regard to questions of foreign policy, in this case it was proposed to decide what should be discussed by the particular ministers already appointed. If such instructions might be furnished by the House in this case they might be furnished in all, thus usurping the power of the Executive.

James Buchanan and John Forsythe, who argued in favor of the amendment, "contended that it did not amount to an instruction to diplomatic agents, but was a proper expression of opinion by the House. The House had always exercised the right of expressing its opinion on great questions, either foreign or domestic, and such expressions were never thought to be an improper interference with the Executive."

In April, 1864, the House originated and passed a resolution declaring that—

It did not accord with the policy of the United States to acknowledge a monarchical government erected on the ruins of any republican government in America under the auspices of any European power.

On May 23 the House passed a resolution requesting the President to communicate any explanation given by the Government of the United States to France respecting the sense and bearing of the joint resolution relative to Mexico.

The President transmitted the correspondence to the House.

The correspondence disclosed that Secretary Seward had transmitted a copy of the resolution to our minister to France, with the explanation that—

This is a practical and purely executive question, and the decision of its constitutionality belongs not to the House of Representatives or even to Congress but to the President of the United States.

After a protracted struggle, evidently accompanied with much feeling, the House of Representatives adopted the following resolution, which had been reported by Mr. Henry Winter Davis from the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

Resolved, That Congress has a constitutional right to an authoritative voice in declaring and prescribing the foreign policy of the United States as well in the recognition of new powers as in other matters, and it is the constitutional duty of the President to respect that policy, no less in diplomatic negotiations than in the use of the national force when authorized by law.

It will be observed from the language last read that it was assumed as a matter of course that Congress had an authoritative voice as to the use of the national forces to be made in time of war, and that it was the constitutional duty of the President to respect the policy of the Congress in that regard, and Mr. Davis in the resolution just read argued that it was the duty of the President to respect the authority of Congress in diplomatic negotiations even as he must respect it when the Congress determined the policy of the Government in the use of the national forces. The portion of the resolution I have just read was adopted by a vote of 119 to 8. The balance of the resolution was adopted by a smaller majority, and was as follows:

And the propriety of any declaration of foreign policy by Congress is sufficiently proved by the vote which pronounces it, and such proposition, while pending and undetermined, is not a fit topic of diplomatic explanation with any foreign power.

The joint resolution of 1898 declaring the intervention of the United States to remedy conditions existing in the island of Cuba is recent history and familiar to all. This resolution embodied a clear declaration of foreign policy regarding Cuba as well as a declaration of war. It passed both branches of Congress and was signed by the President.

After reciting the abhorrent conditions existing in Cuba it reads as follows:

Resolved, etc., First. That the people of the island of Cuba are, and of right ought to be, free and independent.

Second. That it is the duty of the United States to demand, and the Government of the United States does hereby demand, that the Government of Spain at once relinquish its authority and government in the island of Cuba and withdraw its land and naval forces from Cuba and Cuban waters.

Third. That the President of the United States be, and he hereby is, directed and empowered to use the entire land and naval forces of the United States, and to call into the actual service of the United States the militia of the several States, to such extent as may be necessary to carry these resolutions into effect.

Fourth. That the United States hereby disclaims any disposition or intention to exercise sovereignty, jurisdiction, or control over said island except for the pacification thereof, and asserts its determination, when that is accomplished, to leave the government and control of the island to its people.

On April 28, 1904, a joint resolution was passed by both Houses of Congress in the following terms:

That it is the sense of the Congress of the United States that it is desirable in the interests of uniformity of action by maritime States in time of war, that the President endeavor to bring about an understanding among the principal maritime powers, with a view to incorporating into the permanent law of civilized nations the principle of the exemption of all private property at sea, not contraband of war, from capture or destruction by belligerents.

Here it will be observed that the Congress proposed by resolution to direct the President as to the policy of exempting from capture private property at sea, not contraband of war, in not only one war merely but in all wars, providing that other maritime powers could be brought to adopt the same policy. So far as I am aware, there is an unbroken line of precedents by Congress upon this subject down to the time of the present administration. It is true that in 1846 President Polk, without consulting Congress, assumed to send the Army of the United States into territory the title of which was in dispute between the United States and Mexico, thereby precipitating bloodshed and the Mexican War. But it is also true that this act was condemned as unconstitutional by the great constitutional lawyers of the country, and Abraham Lincoln, when he became a Member of the next Congress, voted for and supported the resolution, called the Ashmun amendment, which passed the House of Representatives, declaring that the Mexican War had been—

Unnecessarily and unconstitutionally begun by the President of the United States. (See Schouler's History of the United States, vol. 5, p. 83. See also Lincoln's speech in the House of Representatives, Jan. 12, 1848.)

That the full significance of this resolution was appreciated by the House of Representatives is shown by the speech of Mr. Venable, Representative from North Carolina, and a warm supporter of President Polk, made in the House, January 12, 1848, where referring to this resolution he says:

Eighty-five Members of this House sustained that amendment (referring to the Ashmun amendment) and it now constitutes one of our recorded acts. I will not here stop to inquire as to the moral effect upon the Mexican people and the Mexican Government which will result to us from such a vote in the midst of a war. I suppose gentlemen have fully weighed this matter. Neither will I now inquire how much such a vote will strengthen our credit or facilitate the Government in furnishing the necessary supply of troops.

They [referring to his fellow Members in the House of Representatives] have said by their votes that the President has violated the Constitution in the most flagrant manner; that every drop of blood which has been shed, every bone which now whitens the plains of Mexico, every heart-wringing agony which has been produced must be placed to his account who has so flagitiously violated the Constitution and involved the Nation in the horrors of war. This the majority of this House have declared on oath. The grand inquest of the Nation have asserted the fact and fixed it on their records, and I here demand of them to impeach the President.

That Mr. Lincoln was in no manner deterred from the discharge of his duty as he saw it is evidenced by the fact that on the day following the speech of Representative Venable, Lincoln replied with one of the ablest speeches of his career, the opening sentences of which I desire to quote. He said:

Some, if not all, the gentlemen of the other side of the House, who have addressed the committee within the last two days, have spoken rather complainingly, if I have rightly understood them, of the vote given a week or 10 days ago, declaring that the War with Mexico was unnecessarily and unconstitutionally commenced by the President. I admit that such a vote should not be given in mere party wantonness and that the one given is justly censurable, if it have no other or better foundation. I am one of those who joined in that vote; and I did so under my best impression of the truth of the case.

Lincoln then proceeded to demonstrate the truth of the charge as he regarded it. Evidently he did not think that patriotism in war more than in peace required the suppression of the truth respecting anything pertaining to the conduct of the war.

And yet to-day, Mr. President, for merely suggesting a possible disagreement with the administration on any measure submitted, or the offering of amendments to increase the tax upon incomes, or on war profits, is "treason to our country and an effort to serve the enemy."

Since the Constitution vests in Congress the supreme power to determine when and for what purpose the country will engage in war and the objects to attain which the war will be prosecuted, it seems to me to be an evasion of a solemn duty on the part of the Congress not to exercise that power at this critical time in the Nation's affairs. The Congress can no more avoid its responsibility in this matter than it can in any other. As the Nation's purposes in conducting this war are of supreme importance to the country, it is the supreme duty of Congress to exercise the function conferred upon it by the Constitution of guiding the foreign policy of the Nation in the present crisis.

A minor duty may be evaded by Congress, a minor responsibility avoided without disaster resulting, but on this momentous question there can be no evasion, no shirking of duty of the Congress, without subverting our form of government. If our Constitution is to be changed so as to give the President the power to determine the purposes for which this Nation will engage in war, and the conditions on which it will make peace, then let that change be made deliberately by an amendment to the Constitution proposed and adopted in a constitutional manner. It would be bad enough if the Constitution clothed the President with any such power, but to exercise such power without constitutional authority can not long be tolerated if even the forms of free government are to remain. We all know that no amendment to the Constitution giving the President the powers suggested would be adopted by the people. We know that if such an amendment were to be proposed it would be overwhelmingly defeated.

The universal conviction of those who yet believe in the rights of the people is that the first step toward the prevention of war and the establishment of peace, permanent peace, is to give the people who must bear the brunt of war's awful burden more to say about it. The masses will understand that it was the evil of a one-man power exercised in a half dozen nations through the malevolent influences of a system of secret diplomacy that plunged the helpless peoples of Europe into the awful war that has been raging with increasing horror and fury ever since it began and that now threatens to engulf the world before it stops.

No conviction is stronger with the people to-day than that there should be no future wars except in case of actual invasion, unless supported by a referendum, a plebiscite, a vote of ratification upon the declaration of war before it shall become effective.

And because there is no clearness of understanding, no unity of opinion in this country on the part of the people as to the conditions upon which we are prosecuting this war or what the specific objects are upon the attainment of which the present administration would be willing to conclude a peace, it becomes still more imperative each day that Congress should assert its constitutional power to define and declare the objects of this war which will afford the basis for a conference and for the establishment of permanent peace. The President has asked the German people to speak for themselves on this great world issue; why should not the American people voice their convictions through their chosen representatives in Congress?

Ever since new Russia appeared upon the map she has been holding out her hands to free America to come to her support in declaring for a clear understanding of the objects to be attained to secure peace. Shall we let this most remarkable revolution the world has ever witnessed appeal to us in vain?

We have been six months at war. We have incurred financial obligations and made expenditures of money in amounts already so large that the human mind can not comprehend them. The Government has drafted from the peaceful occupations of civil life a million of our finest young men—and more will be taken if necessary—to be transported 4,000 miles over the sea, with their equipment and supplies, to the trenches of Europe.

The first chill winds of autumn remind us that another winter is at hand. The imagination is paralyzed at the thought of the human misery, the indescribable suffering, which the winter months, with their cold and sleet and ice and snow, must bring to the war-swept lands, not alone to the soldiers at the front but to the noncombatants at home.

To such excesses of cruelty has this war descended that each nation is now, as a part of its strategy, planning to starve the women and children of the enemy countries. Each warring nation is carrying out the unspeakable plan of starving non-combatants. Each nurses the hope that it may break the spirit of the men of the enemy country at the front by starving the wives and babes at home, and woe be it that we have become partners in this awful business and are even cutting off food shipments from neutral countries in order to force them to help starve women and children of the country against whom we have declared war.

There may be some necessity overpowering enough to justify these things, but the people of America should demand to know what results are expected to satisfy the sacrifice of all that civilization holds dear upon the bloody altar of a conflict which employs such desperate methods of warfare.

The question is, Are we to sacrifice millions of our young men—the very promise of the land—and spend billions and more billions, and pile up the cost of living until we starve—and for what? Shall the fearfully overburdened people of this country continue to bear the brunt of a prolonged war for any objects not openly stated and defined?

The answer, sir, rests, in my judgment, with the Congress, whose duty it is to declare our specific purposes in the present war and to state the objects upon the attainment of which we will make peace.

CAMPAIGN SHOULD BE MADE ON CONSTITUTIONAL LINES.

And, sir, this is the ground on which I stand. I maintain that Congress has the right and the duty to declare the objects of the war and the people have the right and the obligation to discuss it.

American citizens may hold all shades of opinion as to the war; one citizen may glory in it, another may deplore it, each has the same right to voice his judgment. An American citizen may think and say that we are not justified in prosecuting this war for the purpose of dictating the form of government which shall be maintained by our enemy or our ally, and not be subject to punishment at law. He may pray aloud that our boys shall not be sent to fight and die on European battle fields for the annexation of territory or the maintenance of trade agreements and be within his legal rights. He may express the hope that an early peace may be secured on the terms set forth by the new Russia and by President Wilson in his speech of January 22, 1917, and he can not lawfully be sent to jail for the expression of his convictions.

It is the citizen's duty to obey the law until it is repealed or declared unconstitutional. But he has the inalienable right to fight what he deems an obnoxious law or a wrong policy in the courts and at the ballot box.

It is the suppressed emotion of the masses that breeds revolution.

If the American people are to carry on this great war, if public opinion is to be enlightened and intelligent, there must be free discussion.

Congress, as well as the people of the United States, entered the war in great confusion of mind and under feverish excitement. The President's leadership was followed in the faith that he had some big, unrevealed plan by which peace that would exalt him before all the world would soon be achieved.

Gradually, reluctantly, Congress and the country are beginning to perceive that we are in this terrific world conflict, not only to right our wrongs, not only to aid the allies, not only to share its awful death toll and its fearful tax burden, but, perhaps, to bear the brunt of the war.

And so I say, if we are to forestall the danger of being drawn into years of war, perhaps finally to maintain imperialism and exploitation, the people must unite in a campaign along constitutional lines for free discussion of the policy of the war and its conclusion on a just basis.

Permit me, sir, this word in conclusion. It is said by many persons for whose opinions I have profound respect and whose motives I know to be sincere that "we are in this war and must go through to the end." That is true. But it is not true that we must go through to the end to accomplish an undisclosed purpose, or to reach an unknown goal.

I believe that whatever there is of honest difference of opinion concerning this war, arises precisely at this point.

There is, and of course can be, no real difference of opinion concerning the duty of the citizen to discharge to the last limit whatever obligation the war lays upon him.

Our young men are being taken by the hundreds of thousands for the purpose of waging this war on the Continent of Europe, possibly Asia or Africa, or anywhere else that they may be ordered. Nothing must be left undone for their protection. They must have the best army, ammunition, and equipment that money can buy. They must have the best training and the best officers which this great country can provide. The dependents and relatives they leave at home must be provided for, not meagerly, but generously so far as money can provide for them.

I have done some of the hardest work of my life during the last few weeks on the revenue bill to raise the largest possible amount of money from surplus incomes and war profits for this war and upon other measures to provide for the protection of the soldiers and their families. That I was not able to accom-

plish more along this line is a great disappointment to me. I did all that I could, and I shall continue to fight with all the power at my command until wealth is made to bear more of the burden of this war than has been laid upon it by the present Congress. Concerning these matters there can be no difference of opinion. We have not yet been able to muster the forces to conscript wealth, as we have conscripted men, but no one has ever been able to advance even a plausible argument for not doing so.

No, Mr. President; it is on the other point suggested where honest differences of opinion may arise. Shall we ask the people of this country to shut their eyes and take the entire war program on faith? There are no doubt many honest and well-meaning persons who are willing to answer that question in the affirmative rather than risk the dissensions which they fear may follow a free discussion of the issues of this war. With that position I do not—I can not agree. Have the people no intelligent contribution to make to the solution of the problems of this war? I believe that they have, and that in this matter, as in so many others, they may be wiser than their leaders, and that if left free to discuss the issues of the war they will find the correct settlement of these issues.

But it is said that Germany will fight with greater determination if her people believe that we are not in perfect agreement. Mr. President, that is the same worn-out pretext which has been used for three years to keep the plain people of Europe engaged in killing each other in this war. And, sir, as applied to this country, at least, it is a pretext with nothing to support it.

The way to paralyze the German arm, to weaken the German military force, in my opinion, is to declare our objects in this war, and show by that declaration to the German people that we are not seeking to dictate a form of government to Germany or to render more secure England's domination of the seas.

A declaration of our purposes in this war, so far from strengthening our enemy, I believe would immeasurably weaken her, for it would no longer be possible to misrepresent our purposes to the German people. Such a course on our part, so far from endangering the life of a single one of our boys, I believe would result in saving the lives of hundreds of thousands of them by bringing about an earlier and more lasting peace by intelligent negotiation, instead of securing a peace by the complete exhaustion of one or the other of the belligerents.

Such a course would also immeasurably, I believe, strengthen our military force in this country, because when the objects of this war are clearly stated and the people approve of those objects they will give to the war a popular support it will never otherwise receive.

Then, again, honest dealing with the entente allies, as well as with our own people, requires a clear statement of our objects in this war. If we do not expect to support the entente allies in the dreams of conquest we know some of them entertain, then in all fairness to them that fact should be stated now. If we do expect to support them in their plans for conquest and aggrandizement, then our people are entitled to know that vitally important fact before this war proceeds further. Common honesty and fair dealing with the people of this country and with the nations by whose side we are fighting, as well as a sound military policy at home, requires the fullest and freest discussion before the people of every issue involved in this great war and that a plain and specific declaration of our purposes in the war be speedily made by the Congress of the United States.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President— [Applause in the galleries.]

The VICE PRESIDENT. The occupants of the galleries at the present time are not aware of the fact perhaps that the presiding officer of the Senate is required to suppress all demonstrations of approval or disapproval on the part of occupants of the galleries. Upon the assumption that that rule was not known to the occupants of the galleries it will not be enforced at the present time. A repetition of it will result in the clearing of the galleries. The Senator from Minnesota will proceed.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask the Senator from Minnesota if he will yield to me for just one second?

Mr. KELLOGG. I yield to the Senator from Virginia.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask the Chair to lay before the Senate the adjournment resolution which came from the House, and I ask for its immediate consideration.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate the resolution of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The Secretary read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 25.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives be authorized to close the present session of the Congress by adjourning their respective Houses on Saturday, the 6th day of October, 1917, at 3 o'clock p. m.

Mr. MARTIN. I ask for the adoption of the resolution.

The resolution was considered by unanimous consent and agreed to.

WAR WITH GERMANY.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, I have no sympathy with unjust and intemperate criticism of the Members of this Senate or of any public men, for I realize that when this Senate ceases to be a deliberative body the Republic is in danger. I desire for a few moments, however, to discuss the reasons which brought this country into this great conflict and what I believe to be the duties of public men in relation thereto.

The Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] stated that resolutions or petitions had been presented asking for his expulsion for expressions of his opinion in public. I introduced one of those petitions a week ago. I presented it to the Senate. It came as a resolution from the Minnesota Public Safety Commission, a body created by authority of statute and headed by the distinguished governor of that Commonwealth. It had attached thereto, certified to me, a stenographic copy of the speech of the senior Senator from Wisconsin. It was not a pleasant duty to present the petition to the Senate of the United States. Sir, I performed that duty in response to the guaranties of the Constitution of the United States, fixing forever in our laws the right of petition.

At the time I made no comment thereon, and should not have done so but for the speech of the Senator to-day. I shall not now anticipate the action of the committee or of the Senate upon the question, or express any opinion as to what, if anything, should be done; but I can not allow this occasion to pass or this Congress to adjourn without expressing my emphatic dissent from some of the views stated in that speech. I shall limit my remarks to those parts of the speech stating, as the Senator understood it, the reasons why this Government went to war. The speech was delivered on the 20th day of September—16 days ago. It has been scattered broadcast all over this land. I have heard no denial of the parts of the speech which I shall read to the Senate. I hope they were not spoken; but they have been printed in the press of this country, and it is as to the sentiments therein expressed and the reasons therein given for this war to which I address myself. I invite the attention of the Senate to two paragraphs of that speech, reading as follows:

Now, fellow citizens, we are in the midst of a war. For my own part, I was not in favor of beginning the war. [Continued applause.] I didn't mean to say we had not suffered grievances. We had, at the hands of Germany, serious grievances; we had cause for complaining; they had interfered with the right of American citizens to travel upon the high seas on ships loaded with munitions for Great Britain. [Applause and yells.] And, gentlemen, I would not be understood as saying we didn't have grievances; we did, and upon those grievances, which I have regarded as insufficient, considering the amount involved and the rights involved, which was the right to ship munitions to Great Britain with American passengers on board to secure a safe transit. [Laughter and applause.] We had a right, a technical right, to ship munitions, and the American citizens had a technical right to ride on those vessels. I was not in favor of riding on them [laughter] because it seemed to me when the consequences resulting from any destruction of life that might occur would be so awful, I say [a voice: "Yellow"]—any man who says that in an audience where he can conceal himself is yellow himself. [Cries: "Put him out."] I say this, that the comparatively small privilege of the right of an American citizen to ride on a munition-loaded ship flying a foreign flag is too small to involve this country in a loss of millions and hundreds of millions of lives. [Applause.]

Reading another part:

And, fellow citizens, it behooves a nation to consider well before it enters upon a war of that sort how much it has got at stake. If all it has got at stake is the loans the house of Morgan makes to foreign Governments, and the profits that the munition makers will earn in shipping their products to foreign countries, then I think it ought to be weighed, not in a common hay scale, but in an apothecary's scale. [Applause.]

Ah! But somebody will tell you American rights are involved. What American rights? The right of some venturesome person to ride upon a munition-laden vessel in violation of an American statute that no vessel which carries explosives shall carry passengers. Four days before the *Lusitania* sailed President Wilson was warned in person by Secretary of State Bryan that the *Lusitania* had 6,000,000 rounds of ammunition on board, besides explosives, and that the passengers who proposed to sail on that vessel were sailing in violation of a statute of this country, that no passengers shall travel upon a railroad train or sail upon a vessel which carries dangerous explosives. [Applause.] And Mr. Bryan appealed to President Wilson to stop passengers from sailing upon the *Lusitania*. I am giving you some history that maybe has not come to you heretofore—the grievances that carry this country into the war, into a war the results of which, as to the loss of life and burdens, financial burdens, that shall be laid upon us can not be calculated by any mind.

Mr. President, after we have declared war and when we are calling upon brave men to sacrifice their lives, when we are marshaling the resources of a mighty nation for a struggle unparalleled in history, I believe that we should be extremely cautious and scrupulously accurate in stating the grounds of conflict and causes of the war. I deny that we went to war to secure the right of American citizens to ride on ships loaded with munitions for Great Britain or loaded with explosives in violation of American statutes. I deny that we went to war to protect the loans of the house of Morgan & Co. to foreign Governments. I deny that we went to war to insure profits to munition makers, and I believe that such a statement is a slander upon the intelligence, the honor, and the patriotism of this country. What did we go to war for? I shall not hark back to the cause of the war between the central empires and the entente allies, although from a most painstaking investigation, I am convinced that Imperial Germany has been preparing for more than 30 years to spring on an unsuspecting world. To that preparation she has brought all the resources of her great empire and the marvelous energy of her concentrated government; that when the opportune time came, when she thought Europe was unprepared to meet her onslaught, she availed herself of an excuse to plunge Europe into war, that she might realize her dream of conquest and imperial mastery. I am convinced that the allied nations—France, England, and Russia—used every reasonable effort to prevent this world calamity. Sir, Germany stands convicted by the judgment of the civilized world, and this war is a blot upon the pages of her history which sacrificial blood and time will never efface.

But whatever may be said as to the original cause of the war between Germany and the allies, this Nation rests upon solid grounds, backed by international law, by the dictates of humanity, and the instincts of self-preservation. Germany violated her sacred treaties with this country. She closed the ocean to our commerce and the commerce of the world. She sank merchant ships in violation of international law and the universal custom of all civilized nations. She murdered noncombatants, innocent women, and children; she defied and scoffed at our authority. She tried to induce a neighboring nation, with which we were at peace, to make war upon us by promising that nation a part of our territory. She violated our hospitality by having her ambassador, her consular agents, and her spies plot in our midst against our peace and safety. Sir, to-day, when we are at war, her spies and her agents are in our midst. She undertook to stir up rebellion in Cuba, in Haiti, in Santo Domingo, and she has filled the world with her mercenaries advocating her unlimited power and ruthlessness in destruction.

Mr. President, it is unnecessary for me to recite the details of the record of the sinking of American and foreign passenger ships—a record so black, so treacherous, so barbarous as to stir the indignation of all civilized nations. It is sufficient here to say that in addition to the sinking of the *Lusitania* and many other ships, on the 24th of March, 1916, her submarines sank the *Sussex* in the English Channel, having on board a number of American citizens. She was a passenger ship. There was no claim that she was armed or carrying munitions. And following a demand by our Government, on May 4, Germany gave her solemn pledge that thereafter "merchant vessels, both within and without the area declared a naval war zone shall not be sunk without warning and without saving human lives, unless the ship attempted to escape or offer resistance."

But this pledge, like all other pledges of the Imperial German Government, was treated as a scrap of paper, and on the last day of January, 1917, the German Government declared itself bound by no promises and threatened a ruthless submarine warfare against all the world.

I send to the desk and ask to have inserted in the RECORD a statement containing the number of American ships sunk immediately following this decree and American lives lost by the sinking of more than 20 vessels, American and foreign.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH in the chair). Without objection, the matter referred to will be inserted in the RECORD.

The statement referred to is as follows:

Following eight or more American vessels which had been sunk or attacked earlier, in most cases in contravention to international law, these ships also had been sunk following the repudiation of her pledges by Germany:

February 3, 1917, *Housatonic*.
February 13, 1917, *Lyman M. Law*.
March 16, 1917, *Vigilancia*.
March 17, 1917, *City of Memphis*.
March 17, 1917, *Illinois*.
March 21, 1917, *Heraldton* (claimed to have been sunk off Dutch coast, and far from the so-called "prohibited zone").
April 1, 1917, *Aztec*.
March 2, 1917, *Algonquin*.
Furthermore, no American should forget the sinking of the *William P. Frye* on January 28, 1915, by a German raider. This act, under

normal circumstances, would be a *casus belli*. The raider, the *Prinz Eitel Friedrich*, then impudently took refuge in an American port. American lives lost on the ocean during the war. (See Cong. Rec., 65th Cong., 1st sess.)

American lives have been lost during the sinking of at least 20 vessels, whereof 4 were American, 1 Dutch, and 1 Norwegian. In one or two cases the vessels tried to escape and made resistance, and the loss of life was possibly excusable for the Germans. In the bulk of the cases the destruction was without fair warning and without reasonable effort to give the passengers and crew chance to escape.

Among the more flagrant cases were:

May 7, 1915, *Lusitania*, 114 Americans lost.
August 19, 1915, *Arabia*, 3 Americans lost.
September 4, 1915, *Hesperian*, 1 American lost.
October 28, 1916, *Marina*, 8 Americans lost.
December 14, 1916, *Russian*, 17 Americans lost.
February 26, 1917, *Laconia*, 8 Americans lost.
March 16, 1917, *Vigilancia*, 5 Americans lost (United States).
March 21, 1917, *Heraldton*, 7 Americans lost (United States).
April 1, 1917, *Aztec*, 28 Americans lost (United States).
Some on *Aztec*, probably not American citizens, although she was a regular American ship.

In all, up to declaration of war by us, 226 American citizens, many of them women and children, had lost their lives by the action of German submarines, and in most instances without the faintest color of international rights.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, it is sufficient for me to say that eight American vessels were sunk after that declaration of Germany and before the declaration of war by this country.

Mr. WILLIAMS. And they were flying the American flag.

Mr. KELLOGG. And, as the Senator from Mississippi says, they were flying the American flag.

Sir, there are duties which a nation owes to its citizens and to the world which it can not ignore without danger to its institutions. Are our brave and patriotic young men who are going to Europe to fight our battles to be told they are fighting for no cause; that they are giving their lives that munition makers may reap a harvest; that banking houses may loan money? Is this Congress, this Nation, so sordid that our noble sons on the field of battle are to be sacrificed for these purposes, and all the splendid patriotism and the marshaling of the resources of this mighty Nation are for no honorable purpose? Sir, we owe it to ourselves, we owe it to those brave men, we owe it to history, we owe it to the nations allied with us in this tremendous conflict to place our disapproval before the world of this slanderous accusation.

I have it upon the highest authority that it is not a fact that President Wilson was warned by Secretary Bryan before the sailing of the *Lusitania*, that she had on board 6,000,000 rounds of ammunition, besides explosives, and that the passengers who proposed to sail on that vessel were sailing in violation of the statutes of this country. In fact, Mr. Bryan denies that statement in the morning papers. We have the highest authority for the statement that the *Lusitania* was not armed, and that she did not carry a cargo prohibited by the statutes of the United States—the authority of a declaration of the State Department of this Nation, made on June 9, 1915, when the Secretary of State sent to the German Government, through Ambassador Gerard, the following statement:

Fortunately, these are matters concerning which the Government of the United States is in a position to give the Imperial German Government official information. Of the facts alleged in your excellency's note, if true, the Government of the United States would have been bound to take official cognizance in performing its recognized duty as a neutral power and in enforcing its national laws. It was its duty to see to it that the *Lusitania* was not armed for offensive action; that she was not serving as a transport; that she did not carry a cargo prohibited by the statutes of the United States; and that if, in fact, she was a naval vessel of Great Britain, she should not receive clearance as a merchantman; and it performed that duty and enforced its statutes with scrupulous vigilance through its regularly constituted officials. It is able, therefore, to assure the Imperial German Government that it has been misinformed.

And, as the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. WILLIAMS] suggests, the man who furnished that information to Bernstorff was afterwards prosecuted for perjury and, I believe, convicted. This solemn statement of the Secretary of State to the German Government has never been successfully controverted.

Neither is it an accurate statement that the passengers who sailed upon the *Lusitania* did so in violation of the statutes of the United States. I send to the desk and ask to have incorporated in my remarks section 10404 of the Compiled Statutes, which, in substance, makes it unlawful to transport, carry, or convey liquid nitroglycerin, fulminate in bulk in dry condition, or other like explosive on any vessel or vehicle of any description operated by a common carrier in the transportation of passengers or articles of commerce by land or water.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, the matter referred to by the Senator from Minnesota will be incorporated in the RECORD.

The section of the statutes referred to is as follows:

Sec. 10404 (Criminal Code, sec. 224). High explosives excluded from certain vessels or vehicles.—It shall be unlawful to transport, carry, or convey liquid nitroglycerin, fulminate in bulk in dry condition, or other like explosive, between a place in a foreign country and a place within or subject to the jurisdiction of the United States, or place noncon-

tigious to but subject to the jurisdiction thereof, and a place in any other State, Territory, or District of the United States, or place non-contiguous to but subject to the jurisdiction thereof, or any vessel or vehicle of any description operated by a common carrier in the transportation of passengers or articles of commerce by land or water.

Mr. KELLOGG. Mr. President, it is not unlawful nor in violation of the laws of nations to carry contraband of war or for passengers to ride upon such ships. But, however this may have been, it was not within the laws of nations, within the principles of humanity and justice governing the civilized communities of the world, the right of Germany to sink such a ship without warning and without taking off the crew and passengers and landing them in a place of safety.

Are we as a Nation willing to subscribe to the doctrine that will turn back the wheels of progress for more than 500 years; that will countenance the sinking of ships, freighted with men, women, and children, without warning, upon the highway of nations? Sir, it would be a blot upon the honor of this Nation, which stands for justice, for international law, for right, and for civilization, to consent for one day to such conduct.

But that is not all. Germany did sink our ships and take the lives of American citizens thereon when there was no pretense that they were carrying munitions of war or explosives, and this without warning and in brutal defiance of this Nation and the world. The time came when no self-respecting nation, believing in the principles of self-government and enlightened civilization, could longer ignore this monstrous menace to free institutions. If we believe in the right of a people to govern themselves unmolested by the dictates of arbitrary power; if we believe in the institutions of our own Government and all they mean to us; if we believe in self-preservation, in a peace that shall not make the world an armed camp, it is our duty to prosecute this war, to uphold the national arm until a lasting and honorable peace can be made, based upon these rights.

Sir, I wish here to read the language of the Father of his Country in his first inaugural address. He said:

The foundations of our national policy will be laid in the pure and immutable principles of private morality. There exists in the course of nature an indissoluble union between virtue and happiness, between duty and advantage, between honest policy and public felicity. The propitious smiles of heaven can never be expected on a union [or government] that disregards the eternal rules of order and right, which heaven itself has ordained.

Mr. President, I have no quarrel with the Senator from Wisconsin or with the principles enunciated by the long line of American statesmen quoted by him who claimed the highest right and privilege of expressing their opinions of the rights of their country when involved in a foreign war. But, Mr. President, this is not a question of free speech. It is a question of an erroneous statement of facts rather than of free speech. I honor that long line of statesmen referred to by the Senator—Webster and his immortal appeal for unity of the Nation; Lincoln, the martyr of our greatest struggle, and many others. Charles James Fox protested against England's war with the French, but when we were engaged in war with Mexico our land was not filled with German spies, interfering with our citizens, stirring up discord and anarchy, encouraging the destruction of property, and plotting with foreign nations. We were not then engaged with the mightiest autocracy the world has ever known and the greatest of military powers for the principles of eternal justice upon which our Government is founded. Sir, I would refer the Senator to the language of President Lincoln addressed to the agitators in Ohio and other States when this Nation was struggling for its existence.

Mr. President, I am as jealous of the right of free speech as any Member of this body or any citizen of this land. It is a right acquired by the struggles of our ancestors for 700 years—since the days of Runnymede—and immutably fixed in our written Constitution; and I believe that the freedom of speech and the freedom of the press are absolutely necessary to human liberty.

I have no right or wish to criticize any man who voted against this Nation going to war, although I may disagree with him. But, sir, we are at war, and I believe men of this body, men of influence, should not make statements tending to aid and encourage the enemy and to cast dishonor and discredit upon this Nation. Imagine, sir, the circulation in the German Empire of these statements reflecting discredit upon our prosecution of the war and sustaining the justice of the cause of the German Empire. Could these people be blamed for believing in a cause, however lacking in justice and right, if these are the reasons which lead us into this great conflict and sustain us through its trying ordeal?

Mr. ROBINSON. Mr. President and Senators, I regret that the address of the Senator from Wisconsin has been made in the closing hours of this session of Congress, so that the minds and labors of Senators are diverted from matters of important

public interest to a consideration of the questions which are involved in the views which he has expressed. The greater portion of his address was directed toward the vindication of the constitutional privilege and right of freedom of the press and freedom of speech and to the quotation of mere platitudinous utterances by great men of the past.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin seems to me strangely inconsistent in insisting upon his right, under the constitutional guaranty of free speech, to declare in substance that this Government has entered upon war for no just cause, and to assail the Executive Department of the Government for its manner of conducting this conflict, to assail the legislative branch of the Government for a failure to perform its alleged duty, and even to attack the courts of the United States for their failure to protect the citizens of this country in the enjoyment of their constitutional rights. If it is the right of a Senator of the United States to speak freely upon topics of this character, why should the Senator from Wisconsin or any other Senator entertaining those views denounce newspaper men and other citizens of this country who, in the exercise of the same right of free thought and free speech, have declared that the Senator ought to abandon his seat in the United States Senate and seek membership in the German Bundesrath?

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has sought to justify his attitude in this debate upon the record of Abraham Lincoln and Daniel Webster. It may be recalled that Mr. Lincoln, who introduced the resolution denouncing and criticizing his Government for engaging in the Mexican War and for its manner of conducting that conflict, was defeated for reelection by an Illinois constituency. Daniel Webster is not remembered for the speech the Senator quotes; his name does not linger in the memory of millions of American citizens because of the act of which the Senator from Wisconsin has spoken to-day—that is, because of his criticism of his Government for entering the Mexican War—but Daniel Webster will live in the hearts of the American people as long as men love liberty because he stood in this sacred presence and declared for the preservation of his country and the maintenance of its flag.

It is a singular thing to me, Senators, that a Senator of the United States should consume two and a half hours in denouncing his Government and have not one word for its flag, not one word for the Commander in Chief of the Armies of the United States, not one word for the encouragement of the men who have already been sent to the far-stretched battle fronts of Europe, and who are now upholding with their lives the honor, the dignity, and the safety of this great Nation. If it is a privilege of free speech for Senators to test the patience of their colleagues and the patience of the citizens of this Nation, it is equally a right of other citizens, in the exercise of free speech, to criticize the conduct of Senators.

If I entertained the sentiments which the Senator from Wisconsin has expressed in this presence this morning, I would not wait for the United States Senate to pass upon the question of my loyalty or disloyalty; I would seek the companionship of those whom my discussion and my sentiments are calculated to support.

Mr. President, the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG] has discussed an address credited to the Senator from Wisconsin, made in St. Paul some days ago. In that address the Senator from Wisconsin is charged with saying that the United States went to war for the purpose of vindicating the right of venturesome citizens to ride on passenger vessels transporting ammunition. I want to know from Senators how assembled whether they believe that is an exercise of the right of free speech. The Senator from Wisconsin is one of the best-informed men in the United States Senate. I want to know from you, sirs, whether or not you believe that was a statement of the conscientious sentiments of the Senator from Wisconsin. If he believes that the United States is involved in this conflict for that cause, or if he believes that is the principal cause which brought the United States into this conflict, his attitude is justified; but where does he get his information?

I propose to tell you to-day, in addition to the incidents that have been recited by the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. KELLOGG], some of the reasons which forced the United States into this war. The whole speech of the Senator from Wisconsin is based upon the erroneous assumption that the United States declared war against Germany and forced war on her. We did no such thing. The United States recognized a state of war which had already been existing between the United States and Germany for many months, for some years; and that state of war was brought about by the brutal, lawless disregard by the German Government of the rights of American citizens and of the sovereignty of this great Nation. A Sena-

for who can find it in his heart to say, here or elsewhere, that the United States went to war for a trivial cause is, to say the least, lacking in the information which a Senator should possess.

The Senator, during the course of his address, referred to the failure of the courts to protect citizens of the United States in the exercise of their rights as citizens. I was astounded when, in the beginning of his address, he made the statement that Government agencies, acting under the authority of the Executive, are invading the private homes of loyal citizens, are arresting and confining innocent and loyal American citizens in jail, without warrant and without cause; that Government officers are violating every private and sacred right of the people of this Government. Passing over the references made by the Senator from Minnesota, taking the speech just made as the basis of my address, I say to you that while I can not find language within the rules of the Senate to appropriately characterize the sentiments uttered on this floor this morning by the Senator from Wisconsin, if I entertained those sentiments I would not think I had the right to retain a seat on the floor of the United States Senate. I would apply to the Kaiser for a seat in the Bundesrath.

The Senator from Wisconsin has denounced this Congress for failure to perform its duty in passing a resolution which he has introduced. That is Senate concurrent resolution No. 11 introduced by the Senator from Wisconsin August 11, 1917. I think the Senator himself inserted that resolution in the RECORD. I want to call the attention of the Senate to some of the provisions in that resolution.

He says it is designed to bring about peace by forcing the United States and the allies to declare their purposes in conducting this war. One of the purposes to which he declares the United States should commit itself is as follows:

Resolved further, That the Congress hereby declares that this Government will not contribute to the efforts of any belligerent for the purpose of prolonging the war to annex new territory, either in Europe or outside of Europe, nor to enforce the payment of indemnities to recover the expenses of the war.

The correct construction of that language is that it is designed to prevent the allies, in case of victory, from compelling Germany to indemnify Belgium for the misery and desolation which she has so lawlessly brought to that kingdom, for the wreck and ruin which has followed in the path of the German armies as they lawlessly invaded the Kingdom of Belgium. It will be remembered that at the outbreak of the war Germany invaded both Belgium and France. She justified her invasion of Belgium on the ground of alleged military necessity, and the Kaiser promised indemnity at the end of the war. He recognized that he was violating international law. He recognized that he was tearing up treaties and denouncing them as mere "scraps of paper." He said that in order to carry out the military purpose of the German Army it was necessary to violate the sovereignty of Belgium and to invade her, and that when the war was over, Germany would make reparation for that damage.

Germany violated the sovereignty of France. What was the excuse given for the invasion of France? She said French aviators had dropped bombs on the Nuremberg railway line. That statement, like the statement about armament on the *Lusitania*, was proved to be false. The German who gave that evidence to Von Bernstorff and made that affidavit concerning the *Lusitania* afterwards plead guilty to perjury. German agencies of high authority have denounced as equally false the statement that French aviators, before the outbreak of the war, dropped bombs on German railway lines.

It will be remembered that the Franco-Prussian War of 1871 was precipitated by the false telegram of Ems, sent by Bismarck. So, in this war, Germany invaded Belgium and France in violation of the law of nations.

I have not language nor time to recite the many brutalities imposed upon the people of Belgium by the German Army. If I could command your attention and express these outrages in language that would accurately define them, your blood would boil in horror. I shall not speak of German wrongs against foreign nations. I shall speak of German wrongs against the United States, which the Senator from Wisconsin and every other Senator here has sworn to vindicate.

The United States was forced into this war with Germany. We have not gone to war. The war has come to us. Before the Congress recognized the existence of a state of war the German Government, with insufferable barbarity and cruelty, had committed many acts of war against the United States. Every known peaceful means was resorted to by the President in his efforts to preserve neutrality, but the rulers of Germany misjudged our prudence and forbearance as cowardice and grew

more and more aggressive until it became apparent that we must fight or be destroyed.

In the minds of nearly all our citizens, the question whether the United States was right in declaring the existence of a state of war with Germany has been so completely foreclosed that further discussion of that issue may seem useless. They know that our Government is now at war, and they are willing to uphold the flag without regard to the merits of our cause; but I am not willing to rest the case upon so narrow grounds.

As a Senator, I voted for the resolution declaring the existence of a state of war, and I intend to tell you why I cast that vote. No citizen more than I is imbued with the ideals of peace. My efforts have been contributed toward the establishment of permanent, world-wide peace. It was therefore with reluctance, and only when the path of duty seemed too clear for doubt, that I voted to protect with military force the lives and property of American citizens against German aggressions on land and sea.

The war was imperative from the standpoint of our national safety. Incredible as the statement may at first appear, the German Government planned for war with the United States even before the outbreak of the present conflict in Europe.

Just before the clash of August, 1914, Field Marshal von Edelsheim, of the Prussian General Staff, published in German newspapers Germany's war aim against Great Britain, France, and the United States. Regarding the contemplated attack against this Government, he said:

Operations against the United States of North America would have to be conducted in a different manner from those against England. During the last year political friction with the States, especially friction arising from commercial causes, has not been lacking, and the difficulties that have arisen have mostly been settled by our giving way. As this obliging attitude has its limits, we have to ask ourselves what force we can possibly bring to bear in order to meet the attack of the United States against our interests and to impose our will.

Our fleet will probably be able to defeat the naval forces of the United States, which are distributed over two oceans and over long distances. But it would be a mistake to suppose that the defeat of their fleet will force the United States, with immense resources, into concluding peace.

Considering the great extent of the United States, the conquest of the country by an army of invasion is not possible. But there is every reason to believe that victorious enterprises on the Atlantic coast and the conquest of the most important arteries through which imports and exports pass, will create such an unbearable state of affairs in the whole country that the Government will readily offer acceptable conditions in order to obtain peace.

If Germany begins preparing a fleet of transports and troops for landing purposes at the moment when the battle fleet steams out of our harbors we may conclude that operations on American soil can begin after about four weeks, and it can not be doubted that the United States will not be able to oppose to us within that time an army equivalent to our own.

There is nothing ambiguous or equivocal in this language. It proves conclusively that Germany was preparing to precipitate a conflict with the United States. It is seldom during peace that so offensive a purpose finds expression in such frank language as that employed by Edelsheim.

Not only is it true that Germany planned war upon the United States more than three years ago, but since the conflict began, and before Congress recognized the existence of a state of war, German military leaders declared a purpose to make the United States indemnify the Fatherland for the cost of the war on the ground of our alleged partiality in permitting American citizens to sell munitions of war to the allies. Germany realized that when the conflict with France, Britain, Russia, and Italy was over her resources would be exhausted and her industries impaired. She coveted the fertile fields, the extensive forests, the rich mines, and unlimited resources of our people, and without doubt would have undertaken to reimburse her treasury by indemnity forced from us. Her plan of despoiling the United States originated with Bismarck, who, when asked his opinion of this country, replied:

The United States is a great fat pig, which Germany will one day stick.

It is not important that you and I feel sure this Government could have repelled German invasion and successfully resisted every effort of the Kaiser to collect indemnity. The material fact is that Germany believed the United States was practically defenseless, and therefore after peace had been made with the allies she could make us pay her expenses and losses during the war.

Everyone here knows that the sale of munitions by the citizens of a neutral nation to belligerents is not a violation of the law of nations. Traffic in munitions between neutrals and belligerents has continued throughout the centuries, and its legality has never been questioned by any Government, except, perhaps, when forbidden by treaty stipulations.

Germany sold munitions to our enemies. When the United States was at war with Spain our enemies obtained their principal supply of munitions from German manufacturers. In

the Boer War Germany's trade in munitions was profitable with both England and the Boers. During the Balkan War the Krupps received enormous profits from the sale of munitions to the belligerents. It was only when the British Navy had shut Germany out from American ports and deprived her of the ability to secure munitions here that Germany started in the United States a propagandism against munition making.

The Senator from Wisconsin has insisted that the United States ought now to declare the purposes of this war and the terms of peace. The answer to that, Mr. President, is that that is exactly what the Kaiser wants. The authorities of this Government now have proof that more than \$27,000,000 have been spent by representatives of the German Government in carrying on that propaganda; and it is unfortunate for the country and unfortunate for the Senator from Wisconsin that he has lent himself, his great talents and his services, to the promulgation of the ideas, theories, and desires of the Kaiser.

Mr. President, not only is it true that the traffic in munitions, as conducted by citizens of the United States with the respective belligerents in this war prior to our entry into the war, was entirely consistent with the law of nations, but it would have been suicidal for the United States to have estopped itself of the ability to secure munitions from other countries in case of war with a foreign foe by declaring the policy that citizens of neutrals shall not sell munitions to belligerents in time of war. It is well known that the United States, at the outbreak of this war, was one of the smallest manufacturers of munitions. It was well known that Germany was the greatest munitions-making country in the world; and for the United States to have lent itself to this German propaganda of forbidding the sale by American citizens of munitions to the allies would have been to deny herself the right of self-defense in case of war with Germany.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has characterized as diabolical the acts of the executive department of this Government in making investigations of those who were suspected of being disloyal to the country. He has said that every private right guaranteed to the citizen by the Constitution is being invaded by the agents of the Government of the United States. Mr. President, the expenditure of millions of dollars by the German Government in the United States, the hiring of countless agents, the placing throughout this land of numerous spies, has made necessary activity upon the part of the Department of Justice and other agencies of this Government in order to protect our country and our people against the iniquitous schemes and devices of those German hirelings. It may be true, Mr. President, that in some instances unnecessary investigations have been made; but I suspect that if the Senator from Wisconsin would produce his evidence here, it would be found that those who made the affidavits to which he has referred in condemnation of his Government are German sympathizers, and some of them German spies.

Let not the Senator from Wisconsin and others be deceived. The great majority of the American people are loyal—loyal to our flag, loyal to the men in the trenches and in the camps, loyal to the President of the United States in every effort to conduct this war to a successful termination; and neither slackers, traitors, nor spies can prevent the consummation of those efforts. If I had my way about it, every spy, proven to be such, would be executed, and every German hireling in the United States would be placed in jail.

The Senator talks about the liberties of the citizen. The liberties of the citizen are imperiled as nothing else could imperil them in this conflict with Germany. The Senator from Wisconsin discloses either ignorance or indifference as to the true facts when he says that this war was brought about by a contention for the right of American citizens to travel on vessels carrying munitions. The German Government not only established a war zone 1,400 miles in length, through which passes three-fourths of all the commerce of the world, and declared that the United States could not continue her commerce in that zone, notwithstanding the fact that the laws of nations for a thousand years have made the open seas the free trading grounds of all neutrals, but Germany declared her purpose to destroy every vessel that entered that zone, whether neutral or belligerent; and in the execution of that lawless threat she sent to the bottom or attacked before the outbreak of this war more than 25 vessels lawfully bearing the American flag, with men and women upon them who were entitled to the protection of the United States. We may differ about the details of our duties as public citizens, but governments are justified principally upon the ground that they secure to their citizens their rights. An American citizen on the deck of an American vessel in mid-ocean is by the law on American territory; and every lawyer knows that when Germany fired upon our flag and killed American citizens on American

vessels in the open seas she was outraging the sovereignty of the United States just as much as if she had crossed the ocean and made heard the thunder of her guns at the great seacoast ports of the United States or invaded the mainland of the United States with a German army.

What language can characterize the ignorance or the indifference to truth that would place this country, the soldiers in the field, the citizens at home, under the infamous charge of having gone into this war for a trivial purpose, of having gone into this war for the sole purpose or for the principal purpose of vindicating a questionable right? It was no questionable right for the American flag on an American vessel to be upon the ocean. If American commerce had been stopped, the conditions in the United States would have become appalling, and Germany would have been unable to arouse the sentiments for pacifism which talk about the war being unjustifiable and that it ought to be terminated. If Germany had enforced her decree, if American ships had stayed in port as the Kaiser expressly said and the Senator from Wisconsin impliedly says, then a bale of cotton would not have been worth as much as a bale of hay; the value of every American product would have shrunk into nothing; prosperity would have disappeared from the country.

But, sir, it is not on the ground of commercial right, however sacred and plain this may be, that the American people went to war. They went to war in part because it was the duty of this Republic to protect our citizens in the enjoyment of their peaceful pursuits, not on the sea alone but in their homes. Germany not only disregarded the law of nations and sought to destroy the commerce of neutrals and belligerents alike but she sent into the United States spies to arouse and stimulate a spirit of sedition among the people of the United States. Evidence of this is easily obtained. Millions upon millions of dollars were paid out to bribe men to betray their flag. For what purpose? To assist the Kaiser to carry out his will in America. They have prostituted the sacred and holy name of peace in this unrighteous propagandism.

I love peace as much as any man on this earth; but who wants a German peace save a German? In the name of God, is all the blood that has been shed by valiant men, women, and children, is all the blood that France has poured out on her battle fields, are all the sacrifices of Britain, Italy, and Russia to be wasted? Is Germany to be established "over all"?

If the Senator from Wisconsin had his will, if the Kaiser had his will, liberty would become a memory, honor a tradition, and tyranny the ruling power throughout this world. We pray for peace. We will make peace. When? When the army of the Kaiser is rolled back toward Berlin; when from the fields and homes of France and Italy arises the shout of victory, when bleeding Belgium arises from her desolation and cries, "Glory, glory, liberty, liberty, through the combined efforts of the forces of civilization; liberty through the power and wrath of the American people!" God pity the man who comes in the way of this wrath. God have mercy on the men who would paralyze the arm of American power in this great conflict. The American people will show him no mercy.

But, sir, Germany not only sent spies among us and filled the country with hirelings but it sent down into the sunny lands of the South countless hired agents to stimulate the negroes to rise in insurrection and destroy, if possible, the white people of the South. They sent agents into the Philippines, Porto Rico, and Cuba. They sought to lay the South prostrate beneath black domination.

It is not the fault of the German Government that this diabolical scheme failed. It is due to two causes, the fear and the loyalty of the American negro. The American negro knew that to attempt such a foolish thing meant his own destruction and the extinction of his race. But, thank God, that was not the principal cause which induced him to refuse the proffer of the German Government of its assistance in insurrection. The principal cause arose out of the fact that the American negro, North and South, is loyal to the flag of this Republic. He has vindicated his right to the blessings and benefits of our civilization. He is standing to-day loyally beneath the American flag giving up his fortune and his blood to uphold the country's honor. Germany could not induce him to rise in insurrection. What would have followed if she had been successful in that scheme? I leave it to your imagination to portray. The failure of the attempt was not due to Germany; it was due to the negro himself and his refusal to make himself a party to such treason.

But the cruel acts of Germany did not end there. While protesting friendship for us by calling upon the President to use his good offices to bring about peace, while our President was using his masterful resources and his great intellect, while invoking the power and the judgment of the President of this Nation in favor of peace, Germany, with the intention of vio-

lating her agreement for a temporary abandonment of ruthless submarine warfare, before seeking a rupture with the United States was planning for an invasion of the United States by Mexico and Japan, and actually offered to give to Mexico those sovereign States, Arizona, New Mexico, and Texas, and to Japan the rich domain of the Pacific Coast States was to be parceled out.

Now, the Kaiser and the Senator from Wisconsin talk about wanting no war of conquest, wanting a guaranty from the United States and our allies that whatever the result we will neither profit by nor require Germany to make recompense, and at the same time would leave Germany to enjoy the fruits of victory if she can retain them. That may be free speech. A Senator can say it, a fool can utter it, but it is not patriotic Americanism!

If ever there was a holy war, this is one. Every wrong and outrage that human ingenuity can conceive Germany sought to perpetrate on the United States, and the longer we waited to resent it in the hope that peace might be maintained, the greater was the outrage perpetrated.

We realize that unless we recognized the state of war which she had forced upon us nearly three years ago and unless we did our best to aid the allies in defeating Germany, when peace had come to Europe, when the allies had settled back to their normal activities, Germany carrying out her plans conceived before the war began, would have demanded tribute from this Government, and then on American soil we would have had a conflict which would have excelled in its bitterness and barbarism anything that human history records.

The Senator from Wisconsin on other occasions has had a great deal to say against sending American soldiers to France. Sir, it is better for the American Army to go to France and fight there than for us to wait until the war is over and invite Germany to attack us here at home. Let him who doubts this declaration look for a moment on bleeding Belgium and prostrate Poland. Let him think of the homes that have been laid in ashes; of the beautiful structures devoted to religion and art that have fallen in ruins. Let him think of the women who have been outraged, of the boys whose hands have been cut off that they might never become warriors. Let him think of the men, women, and children who have been deported from Belgium into conditions of servitude worse than slavery. If men can find it in their hearts let them declare that the United States ought to wait until the war is over in Europe and then alone fight Germany here. But the moment they make that declaration in exercising the "right of free speech" let them move and move hastily into German territory.

Mr. President, a part of the propaganda that has been going on in this country has clustered around the declaration that the munition makers made the war. It is found in the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin as reported at St. Paul. It has been heard here on the floor of the United States Senate. There never was a sillier or falsier statement. The munition makers had nothing to do with bringing on this war, and any man who makes that statement discloses his ignorance or his indifference to the truth.

Mr. President, the Senator from Wisconsin has treated the *Lusitania* incident as the sole cause of this war. That conclusion is irresistible if the only report which is available for me of his speech at St. Paul is reliable. I, of course, can not pass upon the reliability of that document, but he is quoted as justifying the sinking of the *Lusitania* in bold language. This to me is incomprehensible.

THE DESTRUCTION OF THE "LUSITANIA."

Warfare, when conducted in accordance with the law of nations, is cruel and destructive. But German warfare is the epitome of barbarism. What language can appropriately characterize the deliberate destruction of a great passenger ship and the sacrifice of 1,500 noncombatant passengers? The *Lusitania* incident turned the tide of human sympathy throughout the civilized world against the German Government. One thousand five hundred noncombatant passengers, including 125 American men, women, and children, entitled by the law of God and man to the protection of this Nation, deliberately murdered without show of pity. Behold the wreck of the majestic steamer far out at sea and listen to the cries of the dying mingling with the roar of the waves and the crash of the wreck! Look upon the pallid faces of helpless mothers hugging to their breasts their innocent babes and going to their ocean graves unknelt, uncoffined, and unsung! I have no argument that can appeal to any mind which for a moment justifies such cowardly brutality. I will not waste any time in appealing for sympathy to one whose conscience can approve such outrage. I will not argue that the destruction of the *Lusitania* was an outrage upon civilization. If anyone here is in doubt upon that

point he is a fit companion for the lustful Turk and the bloody Teuton and is unworthy of the name "American."

I wish to place in the Record a list of the ships bearing the American flag that were fired upon, some of them destroyed, some of them escaping, and others of them damaged. Many American lives were lost as the aggregate result. I wish to place this statement in the Record in everlasting refutation of the strangely foolish statement imputed to the Senator from Wisconsin that the United States went to war solely and principally on the demand of citizens for the right to ride on munition-laden vessels. I want to point him to the outrages perpetrated upon our citizens upon the seas and the cowardly injustice and treachery Germany perpetrated in carrying on her system of spies and hirelings, in seeking to incite insurrection among the negroes of the South, in trying to stimulate Mexico and Japan to make war upon this Government and promising as a result rich profits in the way of conquest. I want him to remember this statement. He can talk from now until judgment day if he wants to, but let him answer in his own conscience and in the exercise of "free speech" why he said the United States went to war at the instance of the munition makers to vindicate the right of venturesome citizens to travel on ships carrying munitions. When he made that declaration out in St. Paul, if he did make it, what was his purpose? What was his motive behind it? Men have the right of free speech, but it is the right to speak the truth, and, as suggested to me by the Senator from Missouri [Mr. REED], to the right of free speech is attached the responsibility of truthfulness.

A man's memory may fail concerning trivial events, but when he himself prepares a speech and reads it word for word and letter for letter, when he takes a position that is questioned by a great many of his fellow citizens as disloyal, he ought to speak with some degree of caution and self-respect, and if he states a falsehood, if he leaves an impression that does injustice to his flag or to his President or to the armies which are enforcing the demands of his Government, then in humility he ought to correct it and not in defiance repeat it.

Twenty-four American ships have been attacked by German and Austrian submarines and other Teutonic commerce raiders since the outbreak of the European war and before the United States became a party to it. Of these, eight were destroyed by submarines and one, the *William P. Frye*, by the German converted cruiser raider *Prinz Eitel Friedrich*. In addition, one American ship, the *Cushing*, was attacked by a German airship on April 28, 1915. The list is as follows:

William P. Frye, January 28, 1915. Sunk by German raider *Prinz Eitel Friedrich*. Crew taken off.

Cushing, April 28, 1915. Attacked by German airship.

Nebraska, May 1, 1915. Torpedoed by German submarine.

Gulflight, May 20, 1915. Torpedoed by German submarine. Proceeded.

Leclanaw, July 25, 1915. Sunk by torpedo and shell fire.

Oscego, August 14, 1915. Fired on 10 times, but made port.

Communiaw, December 3, 1915. Fired on, but proceeded.

Petrolite, December 5, 1915. Fired on by Austrian submarine repeatedly after vessel had stopped.

Seacomet, June 18, 1915. Damaged by mine or torpedo.

Kansas, October —, 1916. Fired on by U-53, leaving United States. Struck mine after reaching other side. Six men injured in mine explosion.

Lanao (Philippine), October 28, 1916. Destroyed by German submarine.

Columbian, November 7, 1916. Sunk by German submarine.

Chemung, November 26, 1916. Sunk by Austrian submarine.

St. Helens, December 10, 1916. Attacked by German submarine.

Rebecca Palmer, December 14, 1916. Fired on by German submarine. Damage light.

Galena, December 15, 1916. Fired on by German submarine.

Sacramento, January 9, 1917. Fired on by German submarine.

Westwego, January 21, 1917. Stopped by German submarine, but allowed to proceed.

Housatonic, February 3, 1917. Sunk by German submarine.

Lyman M. Law, February 13, 1917. Burned by submarine.

Algonquin, March 12, 1917. Sunk by German submarine.

City of Memphis, March 18, 1917. Sunk by gunfire.

Illinois, March 18, 1917. Sunk by submarine.

Vigilancia, March 18, 1917. Sunk by submarine.

Mr. President, it is impossible in a brief address to marshal all the wrongs which Germany has sought to impose on this country. If there ever was a just cause for war, Germany gave the United States such a cause. A man who will not fight when his flag is repeatedly fired upon and his right to be secure on American territory is questioned, a man who will not fight to redress the wrongs which Germany inflicted upon the citi-

zens of the United States when she sought to incite the colored population to insurrection and Japan and Mexico to invasion, a man who will not fight then will not fight even if an enemy invaded his home and ravished his daughter in his presence.

When these outrages were occurring upon the seas the President was successful in inducing Germany for a time to abandon them. Germany promised that her conduct in the future should be governed by international law; that thereafter she would not attack neutral vessels and unarmed merchant vessels or vessels of belligerents without visitation and warning in accordance with the law of nations. It was a great and masterful achievement for the executive branch of this Government to accomplish that. We felt secure when it was announced that Germany had abandoned ruthless submarine warfare. She sought, however, to attach a condition to her purpose and her plans, and stated that the United States must rectify certain wrongs committed by the British Government. The President replied to that conditional agreement that Germany must obey the law without regard to Great Britain; that this was a matter to be settled between this Government and Great Britain; and for nearly a year Germany acquiesced in that statement by the President. But on the 31st of January of the present year Germany gave notice that on the following day all limitations upon the method of conducting submarine warfare would be abandoned and that anywhere on God's great ocean a neutral or belligerent merchant vessel in commerce with the allies would be subject to destruction without visitation or warning.

Let your champions of peace, let your advocates of mercy and of justice justify, if you can, that brutal attempt to abrogate the laws which the customs of men have established after a thousand years of struggles.

When Germany made that announcement the President saw that there was only one alternative to war, and that was to arm American merchant vessels, so that wherever they went under the American flag, if they were wrongfully assailed they might defend themselves.

I have never been able to comprehend the mental processes of the men who thought that the armed neutrality bill under those circumstances was wrong or a violation of the duties of this Government. I have never been able to comprehend that. It was the only alternative of war. If the armed neutrality bill had been promptly passed, in all probability Germany would have realized, despite her expenditure of enormous sums to corrupt American citizenship and to instill the ideas of the Kaiser into our people, that the American people are loyal. Congress had the duty to give American citizens the right to protect themselves when unlawfully assailed on the high seas.

By a filibuster, by a resort to a method which formerly prevailed in the United States Senate, but which has since been abolished by the action of the Senate—by a filibuster advised on the part of the Senator from Wisconsin, who boasted of it in his St. Paul speech as reported in the document I have before me—he encompassed the defeat of the armed-neutrality bill, with almost every Senator in favor of it. Under the absurd, old, and worn-out tradition of unlimited debate in the Senate of the United States, under "freedom of speech," if you please; under the system of debate which is not debate, but the mere foolishness of useless conversation, through a filibuster the Senator from Wisconsin defeated that great measure.

Mr. President, I am glad the day will probably never return when one Senator or a few Senators can accomplish such purposes as that by an abuse of the privileges of the Senate. The right of unlimited debate merely means that any Senator who gets the floor may talk just as long as he pleases on any subject he chooses, and nobody but Almighty God can interfere with him; and the Lord never seems to take notice of him in the exercise of that function. By a filibuster the desire of the American people, the desire of the President, the desire of Congress was prevented from registering itself, and the Kaiser chuckled, for the filibuster did just as well for him as if he, the crown prince, Hindenberg, and Ludendorff had been seated on the floor of the United States Senate. The Kaiser might well have said: "We do not need to be there ourselves. We thwarted the will of the American people. We bought and persuaded enough citizens and their representatives in the United States to prevent the Government of the United States from protecting the rights of its citizens and vindicating its sovereignty."

Congress reconvened and it was apparent to everybody that war was close at hand. We did not declare war on Germany, but simply said the time has come when we must recognize a state of war that Germany has forced on us. We will not go to war, but we recognize the fact that the war has come to us. So we began a systematic preparation for this gigantic conflict. There were those in the Senate here, there were some

men in the country who did not realize what the conflict meant. They seem not to realize it yet; but, sir, my opinion is that it meant and still means a test of the strength and permanence of American institutions. It is no time to talk of peace when the Hun is at our gates. It is no time to talk of peace when the Hun is boasting of his victory. The time to talk of peace is when the armies of France, Russia, Britain, Italy, and the United States are driving the German Army back across the Rhine and making Germany feel what ruthless warfare means by imposing on the German people some of the burdens which have fallen on France and Poland and Belgium.

Some have said, and the spirit of the address of the Senator from Wisconsin has been, that we are in an unholy and questionable alliance with Great Britain and France. I have been amazed at the sacrifice and the resolution with which the British people have met this contest. At the beginning of the war Great Britain was totally unprepared and that is the best proof that she was not expecting a conflict with Germany. On the other hand, for 50 years Germany had been arming and training and preparing for the great conflict. German leaders had been investigating to see how they could best strike France and Great Britain and the United States. England was resting in fancied security. When Germany invaded Belgium and France, England went to the rescue, not alone from a spirit of humanity and resentment against outrages that were being perpetrated, but with the knowledge that it was necessary to do so in order to preserve her own existence. What did gallant France do? You may read human history from the beginning until now and you will never find a record of a braver struggle than the French people have made.

I read in a magazine the story of the Count de Pelleport—who is a relative of the wife of a Member of this body—70 years old, descended in a line of nobility for 11 centuries, a democrat at heart. On the evening when war came to France he was sitting in his library. He heard the bells. He said, "I will go forth and find the cause of the alarm." He came back and said, "It is war. I am going to enlist." In other days he might have become a general.

In the earlier days of France, because of his ancestry and his well-known virtues, he would have been given leadership. But he entered the army as a private soldier of France. He said, "I am only a private. My ambition is to be a soldier in the first rank." The French Army is democratic. I would to God some way could be found by which the American Army could be made more democratic than it is; more like the French Army than it is. In the French Army the Count de Pelleport was received with distinction. He bore himself courageously until one day the officer who led a portion of his regiment fell wounded and the count took up the standard and led the soldiers to victory. They made him, not a colonel, not a general, but they made him a private of the first rank in the army of France. A few days later dashing from the trenches toward the German lines bearing the tricolor to the outer works he fell dead with a hundred bullet wounds in his body, and when they examined the wounds they said—the French author reports—they expected to find a coat of mail but only found the coarse woolen shirt of a private soldier in the army of France.

If you know anything, if you have studied history like the Senator from Wisconsin, who bears a French name, however pro-German his sympathies and teachings may seem to us, you ought to rise in pride at the name of France!

Give us a name to fill the mind
With the shining thoughts that lead mankind,
The glory of learning, the joy of art,
A name that tells of a splendid part
In the long, long toil and strenuous fight
Of the human race to win its way
From the ancient shadows into the day
Of freedom, brotherhood, equal right.
A name like a star! A name of light!
I give you France.

Give us a name to stir the blood
With a swifter flow and a stronger flood,
At the touch of a courage that conquers fear,
A name that sounds like a trumpet clear,
And silver sweet and iron strong,
That brings three million men to their feet,
Ready to march and steady to meet
The foe who threatens that name with wrong,
A name that rings like a battle song!
I give you France.

Give us a name to move the heart
With the strength that noble deeds impart;
A name that speaks of the blood outpoured
To save mankind from the sway of the sword.
A name that calls on the world to share
The burden of sacrificial strife,
Where the cause at stake is the world's free life,
And the rule of the people everywhere.
A name like a star! A name of light!
I give you France.

I am proud that, after the passing of the years, the United States, in the vindication of the rights of its citizens, in the protection of our flag and of our people from wrongs and insults by the German Government, has joined hands with the gallant soldiers of France—France who has always been our friend. In the days of the Revolution D'Estaing and Lafayette came with money and with men to uphold the cause of the Colonies; and it was through their contributions largely that victory finally came to the cause of American independence and civil liberty. Now, in this conflict we are fighting side by side with France, with Britain, with Russia, and with Italy.

Germany tried to buy Russia by the same system that she inaugurated in the United States—that despicable and contemptible system of spies, and by stimulating sedition and all shames and crimes known to human history. Germany tried to put them into effect in Russia, and for a time it seemed as if she would succeed. If there is one man in this war who has risen above the wreck of revolutions and above the clouds of battle to everlasting fame it is the Russian Kerensky—Kerensky, the youthful hero and statesman, who has raised the standard of liberty in Russia. The Kaiser, with all his gold, the Kaiser's diplomats, with all their treachery, have not been able to cause him to betray his trust.

If Russia stands and fights to the end, the war will soon be over; the world will be free and enjoying a peace which ought to endure; but if Russia fails then, men of the Senate, it means greater sacrifices on the part of the United States; it means more millions poured into the maelstrom of this great conflict—millions of money and millions of men.

But the failure of Russia, which I do not now anticipate, to bear her part in this great struggle can not bring success to the German cause, for in the end that cause is doomed. Pro-Germans in the United States, hired agencies of the German Government, those who would betray their flag and their country, and those who are foolish enough not to know their duty, had better get to cover. There is no compromise on this issue. There are only two sides to this conflict—Germanism and Americanism; the Kaiser or the President. I want to know where you stand. I heard every word of the speech of the Senator from Wisconsin, and I do not know where he stands. I read his speech as reported from St. Paul, and I do not know from it where he stands. The American people are wondering where he stands.

The hour has come for loyal Americans to assert their manhood. We do not want any half-hearted support of this flag. You had the right to question the wisdom of the war, if in your honest judgment you doubted it, but when Congress passed the declaration of war, then, instead of going about the country and leaving your place on the floor of the Senate, where duty calls you, instead of going over the country, stirring up sedition, and gathering together the discontented elements of the country and seeking to inflame them against your flag, your country, and your President; by God, you ought to stand here and support the flag and the President and help bring victory to American arms!

Mr. President, let no mistake be made. The Congress and the people are loyal to this Government. They do not regard the President of the United States as an usurper, who is trying to take over to himself the prerogatives of Congress and the courts, and as a partner in the house of Morgan and of the munition makers. If that question were left to the people of the United States for a vote to-day they would say that Woodrow Wilson, by his courage, his capacity for leadership, his calm demeanor, his fearless conduct in the hour of peril, is entitled to a place with Washington, with Jefferson, and with Lincoln.

Do not deceive yourselves with the thought that you can organize the disgruntled, semidishonest elements of the United States and run for the Presidency on a platform of disloyalty. It can not be done. You can not even start the running, much less win. That flag stands for justice—justice at home and liberty abroad. That flag never was lifted in a nobler cause than in the present conflict with Germany. If you can not agree with this statement, for God's sake so familiarize yourselves with current events as to escape the fearful responsibility of misrepresenting your country and its leadership before the American people.

A day of judgment is coming. The duty of every citizen, whether he is an officer or a private citizen, is to support his Government. He has the right to lead a revolution—the God-given right. If I believed, as the Senator from Wisconsin has asserted, that this war was inspired for the benefit of the house of Morgan and by the munition makers, and to guarantee the right of an American citizen to sail on vessels bearing munitions, I would not support the Government. But I can not

comprehend how any man, much less a Senator, can make that statement or seek to justify his questionable action on theories of that kind. History belies his statement; every circumstance known to students of current events shows that that declaration is a libel upon the Government which he misrepresents.

We have some duty, my fellow Senators, besides the duty of talking. Some Senators seem to think that there is a paramount obligation to exercise the speaking power, but there come times when men of judgment remain silent. Perhaps I have already talked longer than I am justified, but I have done my duty as I see it. I have no malice toward the Senator from Wisconsin. I am a loyal American citizen, and the fact that I happen for a short time to occupy a seat in the United States Senate has not so inflated my opinion of myself that I conceive I am entitled to disregard my duty and obligations to the people who have sent me here and to the people of this great Republic. With me the first consideration is the honor of our flag and the safety of our Nation. We are fighting in the noblest cause that can inspire human hearts with courage.

E'en now the vanguard gathers,
E'en now we face the fray,
Thou who didst help our fathers,
Help Thou our hosts to-day;
Fulfilled in signs and wonders,
In life, in death made clear,
Jehovah of the thunders,
Lord God of battles, hear.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, we have heard a great deal to-day about freedom of speech. The argument of the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. LA FOLLETTE] upon that point, I presume, met with the approval and received the indorsement of practically every Member of this body in so far as the general principles which he discussed were concerned. Our boast, of course, is our liberty. For a hundred years and more it has been our boast that we had established a Government as a "sign of the times" for all ages; that we had shown for the first time in the history of the world that a free government could be established and maintained without liberty or license bringing about chaos.

Freedom of speech, of course—the right to speak freely upon matters concerning the people of this country—is guaranteed us by the Constitution of the United States; there is no doubt of that, and no one will question it.

The Constitution of the United States recognizes a status of government—peace upon the one hand and war upon the other. A declaration of war is not a law; a declaration of war is not necessary, Mr. President, to create a legal status of war, as seems to be the impression of the Senator from Wisconsin, judging from his utterances here and from his utterances upon the platform elsewhere, as reported to us. A declaration of war is simply notice to our own people and to the other peoples of the world that war exists, in order that they may take notice and conduct themselves accordingly. It simply means that a certain status exists as between the people of this country, as well as their Government, and the people of other countries; it means that not only are the countries themselves at enmity and in a state of war but all citizens of the respective governments are enemies for the time being of the citizens of the other government. Therefore, when we discuss the abstract question or the particular or special question of liberty of speech in time of war, we must understand it with reference to the status existing.

Mr. President, the declaration of war which was adopted by the two bodies of Congress last April, over the opposition of certain Senators here, simply declared that a state of war existed between the United States and the Imperial German Government because of certain acts of the Imperial German Government, because the Imperial German Government had declared war and was making war at that time upon the United States and the people of the United States; and that was the fact. Germany by its note to us had embargoed our commerce; Germany had said to us that we should not enjoy the freedom of the seas—a right which she maintains now is one of the objects of the great world war which she is waging. Germany had notified us that if we chose to continue as a nation of merchants, as we are, we should place a barber pole upon every ship carrying goods from our harbors to the harbors of other countries. We declared that Germany was making war upon the United States. I deny the freedom of speech of any Senator here, in view of the evidence and the facts in the case, to state the contrary.

I have criticized the President of the United States, and very likely I may criticize him again; but, having armed him with the sword for the defense of this Government, I think it is the duty of every citizen, and certainly of every official of the Government, to stand by him, carrying his buckler and his

shield for his defense and that of his country, and I think that any citizen who views his duty in a contrary light must accept the responsibility for his acts.

Mr. President, we have had cited to us a speech that Abraham Lincoln made during the Mexican War. Of course, the correctness of the citation is beyond doubt. The propriety of the utterances, if we may judge them now at this late day, should be judged by the status of the country at that time and by contemporaneous history. The Mexican War was not a war of liberty, not a war of democracy, not a war in defense of this Nation against overbearing attacks. It was a war for territory brought about by the annexation of Texas to the United States. It met with serious opposition; it was discussed from the inflamed standpoint of slavery, one party opposing it on the ground that the objects of the war were to annex territory from Mexico which would strengthen the slave States of the South, and the other party favoring it. It was a war for territorial acquisition, a war for profit, the result of which was the bringing of Texas into the sisterhood of States and the carving out of the territory of Mexico of other States of the Union—New Mexico, Arizona, California, and a portion of Colorado.

A matter of that kind, I may say, in my judgment, was at that time properly discussed, and I may go further and say now, sir, that utterances in criticism of this war and of the acts of the President may be made now in the Senate or in the other House of Congress which are justifiable, but which, when made before some assemblage with no one present to challenge the correctness of the statements made would not be justifiable. I say that if the speech reported to have been made by the Senator from Wisconsin, and which is the subject now under discussion, had been made here in this Hall, such an answer, such a refutation of the statements made by the Senator would have gone out to the public, along with those statements themselves, as would have deprived the statements of any possible effect upon the people of the United States; but unanswered, made, as they were, without an opportunity for answer, unless challenged and answered elsewhere, no more dangerous doctrine has been preached, no more insidiously dangerous utterance has been heard from any source, in my judgment, than that of the Senator from Wisconsin made at Minneapolis.

Mr. President, Abraham Lincoln made the speech to which reference has been made, criticizing the declaration of a status of war existing between the United States and Mexico, and a few years afterwards Lincoln became the President of these great United States. Then Abraham Lincoln, by an arbitrary order, arrested 10 duly elected members of the Maryland Legislature, a Congressman, the mayor of Baltimore, two editors, and various citizens and confined them in military prisons in Boston, and in New York, without a warrant, without authority of law, because they were guilty, in his judgment, of seditious utterances impeding the conduct of the war which Lincoln was then waging as Commander in Chief of the forces of the United States, and instructions were issued that no writ of habeas corpus should reach those men thus arbitrarily deprived of their liberty. Time and again, in the border States, and not only in the border States but in the loyal States of the North, men were arrested arbitrarily, fined arbitrarily, and instructions were issued by Lincoln that his military commanders should not recognize the writ of habeas corpus issued by any court.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. FALL. For a question.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Well, I will put it in the form of a question, Mr. President.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I can not yield. The Senator has had three hours, and I am only going to occupy the floor for a very short time. I want to treat the Senator courteously and justly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I will put it in the form of a question, Mr. President, if the Senator will be kind enough to yield to me.

Mr. FALL. I will; certainly.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Under the Constitution the writ of habeas corpus can be suspended only in case of a revolution or an invasion, and the writ of habeas corpus was suspended at that time. It is not suspended now, and it can not be suspended now. Is not that the understanding of the Senator?

Mr. FALL. No, sir. I will answer exactly, and I think I will correct the Senator.

Mr. President, the writ of habeas corpus was suspended in the State of Missouri, and it was suspended in some portions of the State of Kentucky. It was not suspended in Maryland; it was not suspended in Ohio; and it was not suspended throughout the loyal States of the Union at that time.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President, will the Senator permit another question?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. FALL. I yield.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Did not President Lincoln, in the letter which he wrote regarding the Vallandigham case, put his denial of the right of Vallandigham to any appeal on the ground that the writ of habeas corpus was, within the authority of the Constitution, suspended by the President during a revolution or during a rebellion against the Government or an invasion?

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, Mr. Lincoln's answer was directed to certain petitioners who asked clemency in behalf of Vallandigham. That is the letter to which the Senator has reference. It was not a question of appeal, but a question of clemency, in the first place. The President did refer, of course, to his right to suspend the writ of habeas corpus. The President said, I presume—the fact was—that in that case he had recognized the suspension of the writ of habeas corpus by Burnside.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Exactly.

Mr. FALL. The Senator, of course, is familiar with these matters of history. Vallandigham was not arrested under orders from Abraham Lincoln, but he was arrested by Gen. Burnside. He was tried before a military court-martial. He was sentenced to imprisonment in the penitentiary; and the President of the United States, as Commander in Chief of the Army of the United States, had to pass upon the report of the court-martial and either confirm it or disagree to it. He confirmed it in so far as the finding of culpability and guilt was concerned, and he mitigated the sentence from imprisonment to expatriation to the Confederacy, and he did it despite the petition of the gentlemen in answer to which he wrote this letter.

Mr. President, on February 19 and 20 of this year we had under discussion what were known as the espionage bills—some 14 bills, consolidated. I am not going to discuss those bills now; but the general purpose was to arm the President and the courts of this country, the judicial officers and the executives of this country, with certain powers which they did not possess under the law as then existing. I supported those measures, voted for their adoption, and fought upon the floor for their adoption against the Senator from Wisconsin and those who disagreed with me and thought as he did. I said then, among other things, that I owed nothing of a personal nature to the present occupant of the White House, but that to my mind we were even then, prior to the declaration of war, faced with a graver question than was embodied in any pending negotiations between the Imperial German Government, or any other country, and this; that we were not a homogeneous people, with our 100,000,000 inhabitants here in this country; that we have millions and millions who are, or recently were, citizens of the other countries of the world, some of them now engaged in this great world struggle. My idea then was, as it is now, that such freedom of speech as was allowed to Northcliffe, to Lloyd-George, and others in Great Britain, such freedom as is allowed to a senator in France among a homogeneous people, can not be allowed to extend to the point where it constitutes license and may mean sedition in this country, with a population such as we have here. I say to the Senator, if he does not know it, that there is to-day a practical revolution going on in various parts of the country, and that there has been a true revolution recently in some districts of some of the States of this Republic, and that utterances which might be perfectly proper at one time, in my judgment are not proper at the present time. I say to the Senator that in my judgment if he or any other Senator, in exercising his freedom of speech, so exercises it as that it is evidently his intention, or that it is the natural consequence of what he utters, whether it is his intention or not, to embarrass the administration in carrying on this war, then the Senator is not exercising the constitutional freedom of speech which is guaranteed him and to which he has appealed.

Mr. President, I say this with all kindly feeling to the Senator from Wisconsin. I have believed that he was sincere, although I have generally disagreed with him in the matters which he favored during the last five years. I have given him credit for sincerity of purpose. I have believed, as I believe now, that he is in error in certain matters. That was my personal judgment. I did not agree with him upon the revenue and finance bills. I stood here and heard his denunciation of those measures, and I read his denunciation in the speeches which he made in Minneapolis and St. Paul, and one of which, at least, is now the subject of discussion.

The Senator, I think, makes this mistake: Some sincere people become convinced that they are the only honest people. Some sincere people, as the Senator from Wisconsin, conceive themselves to be justified in saying, as the Senator said, that

in the passage of the revenue bill recently—where he stood, as he says, with only a little handful fighting for the liberties of the people and a just system of taxation—the actions of the other Senators who did not agree with him in his ideas of the proper method of fighting this war justified him in saying, "Shame upon the Congress of the United States which passed it, and shame upon the President of the United States, because he signed it!"

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Wisconsin?

Mr. FALL. The Senator from Wisconsin, of course, must have some little consideration for me.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. I do appreciate—

Mr. FALL. I yield for a question. I believe, however, I shall have to ask the Senator to pardon me.

Mr. LA FOLLETTE. Will the Senator permit me to make this statement? It is a very brief one.

The accuracy of a statement which I made in the speech at St. Paul has been questioned here. I had expected that I would have an opportunity to say a few words in conclusion of this debate, and at that time I had expected to be given a chance to lay before the Senate and the country the authority upon which I made the statement. I thank the Senator for giving me the opportunity to say that I shall have to avail myself of some other means of communicating the facts to the public.

I thank the Senator for his courtesy.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I must of course conclude very briefly. I should like to have 5 or 10 minutes more than will be allowed me.

To leave the subject to which I have just referred and go back for a moment in order that I may catch up one or two of these broken knots, I want to call attention—particularly the attention of the Senator from Wisconsin, if I did not emphasize it to him before—to the fact that in discussing these war measures or these powers of the President, and in discussing the arbitrary acts of Abraham Lincoln, I had the two things in mind, and was actuated in voting for the war powers of the President of the United States because of the historical facts with relation to the War of the Rebellion. In other words, as the Senator has said, there is no question that when the President of the United States decides that in any portion of this Nation rebellion exists he can suspend the writ of habeas corpus. That right has been conceded him by the courts, although the Constitution itself is silent as to who may exercise the right, whether it could be exercised by Congress or by the President. Jefferson, however, made the precedent.

Mr. President, I believe in establishing civil tribunals which could and would try a Vallandigham. I believe in establishing civil tribunals which would have jurisdiction to try all offenses against this Government during this time of war, and not in relegating those matters to the arbitrary decision of a military court-martial. For that reason I voted for those measures, that the Senator himself might exercise the freedom of speech which he has demanded, and that his right to it might be guaranteed under the Constitution of the United States and enforced by a writ of habeas corpus, and might not be suspended, as was the case with Vallandigham, when he was at first sentenced to incarceration and then exiled from his country. The Senator voted against those measures which provided a civil tribunal for the trial of such cases.

Now, Mr. President, to catch up the other knot for just a moment: I voted against the Senator's proposition to tax the wealth of this country 80 per cent, or the incomes of this country 80 per cent, and for that he cries upon me, "Shame! Shame!"

Mr. President, it is simply a question of difference of opinion as to the proper way to finance this war. The Senator from Wisconsin is proceeding, as he says, in this debate upon the theories advanced by Mill and Adam Smith and other writers upon economic questions. The Senator is discussing and voting upon these matters as though we were again in Great Britain or in France or in Germany or in some other country of the Old World, with all of our natural resources developed, not an acre of timber or a pound of coal in the possession of the General Government, no resources whatsoever except purely the private wealth of the individuals. The Senator forgets that while we estimate our wealth in this country at approximately \$187,000,000,000, that estimate is based upon individual wealth, upon the developed farms, upon the factories which are now open and producing, upon the sheep and the cattle which can be counted—that this is the basis upon which the wealth of \$187,000,000,000 is fixed; and he votes for a system of finance as though the profits upon that wealth, and that wealth alone, were the only

resources of this Government with which to meet the extraordinary expenses of this war.

I voted, sir, that the undeveloped resources of this country might continue to be developed, as they have always been developed, by the excess profits of those engaged in present industry. I voted that when these boys come home from Europe and find their positions filled here in the present business of this country, the great fields of this country might be open to them, that they might find homes, and that they might find occupations; in other words, that the business of this country should not cease simply because we happen to be in war.

Mr. President, I voted as I did because in my State of New Mexico alone the Federal Government owns, according to its own reports, 191,000,000 tons of coal—at 10 cents a ton enough coal to raise all the money that we have voted. I voted as I did because we have 300,000,000 acres of public domain in the United States, because we have untold billions of wealth under the ground, because we have 48,000,000 acres of coal lands belonging to the United States, forty-five millions aside from that in New Mexico; because we have in Government ownership, aside from all the privately owned coal resources of the United States, approximately two thousand billions of tons of coal belonging to the National Government.

We have untold billions of tons of iron belonging to the United States Government. We have 160,000,000 acres of forest lands belonging to the United States Government. We have in Alaska, alone, sir, an asset which I will guarantee can be placed with financiers in this country upon a basis that will pay the sinking fund and the interest upon \$50,000,000,000 of war indebtedness. It is upon those resources rather than taxing the present industry of the United States, that I would rely for the final payment of this great war indebtedness. I want to say, sir, that not only can we raise and spend this \$21,000,000,000 but that rather than sending word to the Kaiser that our people are growing restless under the system of taxation already adopted, we should send word to him that with the natural resources belonging to us, without taxing the people of the United States one dollar, we can carry this war to a successful conclusion if it costs us two hundred and fifty billions rather than twenty-one billions of dollars.

During the delivery of Mr. FALL's speech,

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by J. C. South, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House had passed the bill (S. 2531) to prevent the publication of inventions by the grant of patents that might be detrimental to the public safety or convey useful information to the enemy, to stimulate invention, and provide adequate protection to owners of patents, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House agrees to the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 4897) to provide for the promotion of first lieutenants in the Regular Army and National Guard to the grade of captain, and respecting the Dental Corps of the Army and medical and dental students, and for other purposes.

The message further announced that the House had passed a concurrent resolution providing for the printing as one document the three revenue laws, etc., in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

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

H. R. 4897. An act to provide for the promotion of first lieutenants in the Regular Army and National Guard to the grade of captain, and respecting the Dental Corps of the Army and medical and dental students, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5723. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and for other purposes; and

H. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution authorizing the expenditure of money upon lands purchased for use of the Ordnance Department of the Army without reference to section 355 of the Revised Statutes.

PRINTING OF WAR-REVENUE ACTS.

Mr. SIMMONS. I ask that the concurrent resolution, which has just been received from the House of Representatives, providing for the printing of a certain number of copies of the present war-revenue act and the law of 1916 be laid before the Senate for action.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair lays before the Senate a concurrent resolution of the House of Representatives, which will be read.

The concurrent resolution was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

House concurrent resolution 26.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring). That there be printed as one document the following three revenue laws: The act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes, approved September 8, 1916; the act to provide increased revenue to defray the expenses of increased appropriations for the Army and Navy and the extensions of fortifications, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1917; and the act to provide revenue to defray war expenses, and for other purposes, approved October 3, 1917; of which 40,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 60,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, the apportionment for the House of Representatives to be distributed through the folding room.

STATEMENT OF APPROPRIATIONS.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, at the request of a number of Senators on both sides of the Chamber, I have prepared a statement showing the aggregate appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, the estimated total receipts of the Government for the same fiscal year, the bonds and other Government obligations authorized, and also the percentage of appropriations covering the expenses of the Government to be raised by direct taxation. I ask to have the statement printed in the Record without taking the time of the Senate to read it at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there any objection? The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

The statement referred to is as follows:

The direct appropriations made for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, total.....	\$18,879,177,014.96
There have been contracts authorized by acts of Congress, in addition to direct appropriations, to be met by future appropriations by Congress amounting to.....	2,511,553,925.50

Included in the direct appropriations are the following items that will not be paid out of the appropriations authorized and for advances to foreign countries, which will be paid back to our Government with interest:

The first war-risk insurance act, later repealed.....	10,000,000.00
The sinking fund never set aside.....	60,000,000.00
Loans to foreign countries.....	7,000,000,000.00
Interest on loans to foreign countries.....	170,000,000.00

Total.....	7,240,000,000.00
------------	------------------

Appropriations made.....	18,879,177,014.96
Deductions not direct payments for Government expenses.....	7,240,000,000.00

Actual Government expenses for year appropriated for.....	11,639,177,014.96
---	-------------------

Revenues to be raised under existing laws:

From acts in force before this present extra session of Congress.....	1,333,500,000.00
From the revenue act passed this session.....	2,534,870,000.00
From post-office receipts (provision for expenses of the Post Office Department is included in the annual appropriations).....	325,000,000.00

Total revenue.....	4,193,370,000.00
--------------------	------------------

Appropriations for expenses of the Government.....	11,639,177,014.96
Revenues of the Government.....	4,193,370,000.00

Balance to be provided for.....	7,445,807,014.96
---------------------------------	------------------

The act of Sept. 24, 1917, authorizes an additional issue of bonds to meet expenditures of the Government of.....	3,538,945,460.00
---	------------------

From this it will be seen that the appropriations already made are not covered either by direct taxation or the authorization of a bond issue or other Government obligations amounting to the difference between.....	7,445,807,014.96
And.....	3,538,945,460.00

Or a balance of.....	3,906,861,554.96
----------------------	------------------

The next Congress will no doubt provide means for meeting this uncovered amount.

	Per cent.
The percentage to be raised by direct taxation is.....	36.02
The percentage to be met by Government obligations.....	63.98
The percentages raised by direct taxation by other countries involved in the present war, after three years of continuous and bloody war, is as follows:	
England.....	26
France.....	14½
Germany.....	14½
Canada.....	8
United States.....	36.02

CONFIRMATION OF WILLIAM D. KYSER.

Mr. SHIELDS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent, in open session as in executive session, to make a favorable report from the Committee on the Judiciary of the nomination for district attorney in the western district of Tennessee. It is to fill a vacancy. Action should be taken upon it before the adjournment of the session. I therefore ask unanimous consent to make the report, and I also ask unanimous consent that the nomination be confirmed in open session as in executive session,

on account of the emergency, and that the President be notified.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection to the request of the Senator from Tennessee? The Chair hears none.

The Secretary read as follows:

William D. Kyser, of Memphis, Tenn., to be United States attorney, western district of Tennessee, vice Hubert F. Fisher, resigned.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the nomination is confirmed. The President will be notified.

IDA COTTRELL HODGSON.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, of course the Senate can readily understand that in the course of these interruptions the thread of my discourse is very much knotted.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President—

Mr. FALL. Another knot, Mr. President.

Mr. WARREN. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment? I know he will not object when he knows what I am about to ask.

Mr. FALL. I am sure the Senator from Wyoming would not ask for anything that did not meet my approval.

Mr. WARREN. It is simply for the family of an old employee of the Government who has died. I ask that this bill may be taken up and placed upon its passage.

Mr. FALL. I yield for that purpose.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate the bill (H. R. 5833) granting six months' pay to Ida Cottrell Hodgson, widow of Frederick Grady Hodgson, deceased, colonel, United States Army, retired.

Mr. WARREN. I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of this bill.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Is there objection?

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

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

CONFIRMATION OF NOMINATIONS.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to interrupt him for just a moment?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. POMERENE in the chair). Does the Senator from New Mexico yield to the Senator from Oregon?

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I am very anxious to favor other Senators, but I have exercised a great degree of patience, I think. I will yield to the Senator from Oregon, but I should like now to give notice that I do not care to be interrupted again.

Mr. CHAMBERLAIN. The President has just sent to the Senate the names of a number of officers promoted under the law that has just been signed by him—Gen. Pershing, Gen. Bliss, Gen. Crowder, and others provided for under the law—and I should like to ask, as in open executive session, that these nominations be confirmed.

Mr. FALL. Unless there is objection from other sources, there will not be from myself, Mr. President.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to considering these nominations as in executive session? The Chair hears none, and the nominations are confirmed. The President will be notified.

Mr. OVERMAN. Mr. President, will the Senator yield to me to report from the Committee on the Judiciary a nomination which the Department of Justice is very anxious to have passed upon?

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, of course these nominations are more important than any other matters that could possibly come before the Congress or be considered by the people of the United States. I yield.

Mr. OVERMAN. I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consider, as in open executive session, the nomination which is at the desk.

The SECRETARY. Emmet R. Jordan to be United States marshal for the District of Alaska, division No. 2.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection to the consideration of this nomination as in executive session?

Mr. KING. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Objection is made.

NOTIFICATION TO THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. MARTIN and Mr. SMOOT appeared, and

Mr. MARTIN said: Mr. President, the joint committee of the two Houses of Congress appointed for the purpose of informing the President that the work of the session has been concluded and that Congress is ready to adjourn unless he has some other communication to make has performed that duty, and the President has informed us that he has no further communication to make to Congress.

THANKS TO THE VICE PRESIDENT.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I ask the Senator if he will yield to me for a minute?

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I yield for a vote of thanks to the Vice President.

Mr. WARREN. Mr. President, I have the pleasure of sending to the desk a resolution for which I ask immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of a resolution which will be read.

The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 150), as follows:
Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to Hon. THOMAS R. MARSHALL, Vice President of the United States and President of the Senate, for the dignified, impartial, and courteous manner in which he has presided over its deliberations during the present session.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

THANKS TO THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE.

Mr. PENROSE. Mr. President, if the Senator from New Mexico will yield to me—this will take only a moment.

Mr. FALL. I will conclude in a moment. The Senator will have time if he will allow me to proceed. However, I will yield now, if it is necessary.

Mr. PENROSE. I offer the resolution which I send to the desk.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The resolution will be stated. The Secretary read the resolution (S. Res. 151), as follows:

Resolved, That the thanks of the Senate are hereby tendered to Hon. WILLARD SAULSBURY, president pro tempore of the Senate, for the dignified, impartial, and courteous manner in which he presided over its deliberations during the present session.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was unanimously agreed to.

ADDRESS BY THE VICE PRESIDENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. I suppose the Senator from New Mexico will yield to the Chair for just a moment.

The present occupant of the Chair wants to thank the Senators of the United States for the resolution just adopted, and for the patience and forbearance with which they have dealt at many times with my irascible conduct. I want to assure them that the outbursts that now and then have taken place from the Chair were not real in character. They were simply intended to call the attention of the Senate to the fact that they did have a presiding officer—not one that perhaps they wanted, but one that an ignorant electorate had thrust upon them.

I part with you, and I part with this session of Congress, with mingled feelings of pleasure and of sadness—pleasure in the fact that the proceedings of this session have been practically harmonious and practically unanimous; with a feeling of sadness in that I believe it has become necessary for the American people to engage in a great war. That is a necessity that always saddens every sober man and every man who has a kindly heart. But for myself I may be permitted to say that I think it will be my duty, whenever I am called upon to say anything, to voice my belief in the justice and necessity of this war.

I have been requested by the Secretary of the Treasury to ask that the several Senators, as they go to their homes and address the people upon the duties and responsibilities, the rights and privileges of American citizens and upon the rightfulness of this war, will call the attention of the people to the fact that this war must be fought finally out of the dollars and cents of the American people, and to urge upon the American people the duty of subscribing for this liberty loan.

I wish you all, Senators of the United States, long life, health, happiness, and that greatest consolation which can come to any human being—the consolation of finding out what the right is, and of daring to stand for the right regardless of how much it may cost either you individually or the American people in blood and treasure.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President of the United States, by Mr. Sharkey, one of his secretaries, announced that the President had approved and signed the following acts and joint resolutions:

On October 5, 1917:

S. 309. An act authorizing the county of Clallam, in the State of Washington, to convey to the city of Port Angeles certain lands;

S. 2434. An act authorizing the counties of Cass and Itasca, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River between said counties;

S. 2435. An act authorizing the counties of Itasca and Cass, Minn., to construct a bridge across the Mississippi River in said counties;

S. 2623. An act defining the status of citizens of the United States who have entered the military or naval services of certain countries during the existing war in Europe;

S. 2710. An act granting the consent of Congress to Webbers Falls Railroad Co., a corporation, its successors and assigns, to construct a bridge across the Arkansas River between the towns of Webbers Falls and Gore, in the State of Oklahoma;

S. 2878. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Whiteville Lumber Co. to construct a bridge across Waccamaw River;

S. 2922. An act to amend the laws relating to the denominations of circulating notes by national banks and to permit the issuance of notes of small denominations, and for other purposes;

S. J. Res. 78. Joint resolution to suspend the requirements of annual assessment work on mining claims during the years 1917 and 1918; and

S. J. Res. 102. Joint resolution authorizing the payment of October salaries to officers and employees of the Senate and House of Representatives on the day of adjournment of the present session.

On October 6, 1917:

S. 2437. An act to provide for the acquisition of an air-station site for the United States Navy;

S. 2774. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Gilmer-Pittsburgh Coal Co. to construct a bridge across the Little Kanawha River;

S. 2203. An act for the establishment of Northgate, in the State of North Dakota, as a port of entry for immediate transportation without appraisement of dutiable merchandise;

S. 2883. An act making further provision for the allotment of pay of officers, enlisted men, and civilian employees of the Army, and for other purposes; and

S. 2938. An act to authorize the construction, maintenance, and operation of a bridge across Little River, in Poinsett County, Ark., at or near the section line between sections 35 and 36, township 11 north, range 6 east.

S. 2527. An act authorizing appointment of chaplains at large for the United States Army;

S. 2531. An act to prevent the publication of inventions by the grant of patents that might be detrimental to the public safety or convey useful information to the enemy, to stimulate invention, and provide adequate protection to owners of patents, and for other purposes;

S. 2663. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Wolf Creek Lumber Co. to maintain a bridge already constructed across Tug River;

S. 2916. An act to amend sections 24 and 256 of the Judicial Code, relating to the jurisdiction of the district courts, so as to save to claimants the rights and remedies under the workmen's compensation law of any State;

S. 2947. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of El Paso, Tex., to construct a bridge across the Rio Grande River within or near the city limits of El Paso, Tex., such construction to be made with the consent and cooperation of the Republic of Mexico;

S. 2920. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the State of North Carolina two brass cannon, with carriage;

S. 2937. An act granting the consent of Congress for the construction of a bridge and approaches thereto across the Arkansas River between the cities of Little Rock and Argenta;

S. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to expend funds in New Mexico and Texas for drainage purposes; and

S. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the entry of distilled spirits into bonded warehouses under bond, conditioned for the export of such distilled spirits to some foreign country within one year from the date of entry into the United States.

FINAL ADJOURNMENT.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The hour of 3 o'clock p. m. of this the 6th day of October, 1917, having arrived, in accordance with the concurrent resolution of the two Houses heretofore passed, I now declare the Senate of the United States adjourned sine die.

NOMINATIONS.

Executive nominations received by the Senate October 6 (legislative day of October 5), 1917.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

TO BE GENERALS.

Maj. Gen. Tasker H. Bliss, Chief of Staff, United States Army.
Maj. Gen. John J. Pershing, United States Army.

ADJUTANT GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

Brig. Gen. Henry P. McCain, The Adjutant General, to be The Adjutant General, with rank of major general from October.

INSPECTOR GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

Brig. Gen. John L. Chamberlain, Inspector General, to be Inspector General, with rank of major general from October.

JUDGE ADVOCATE GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT.

Brig. Gen. Enoch H. Crowder, Judge Advocate General, to be Judge Advocate General, with rank of major general from October.

CORPS OF ENGINEERS.

Brig. Gen. William M. Black, Chief of Engineers, to be Chief of Engineers, with rank of major general from October.

ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT.

Brig. Gen. William Crozier, Chief of Ordnance, to be Chief of Ordnance, with rank of major general from October.

SIGNAL CORPS.

Brig. Gen. George O. Squier, Chief Signal Officer, to be Chief Signal Officer, with rank of major general from October.

BUREAU OF INSULAR AFFAIRS.

Brig. Gen. Frank McIntyre, Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, to be Chief of the Bureau of Insular Affairs, with the rank of major general from October.

CONFIRMATIONS.

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate October 6 (legislative day of October 5), 1917.

UNITED STATES ATTORNEY.

William D. Kyser to be United States attorney for the western district of Tennessee.

APPOINTMENTS IN THE ARMY.

TO BE GENERALS.

Maj. Gen. Tasker H. Bliss.
Maj. Gen. John J. Pershing.

TO BE MAJOR GENERALS.

Brig. Gen. Henry P. McCain.
Brig. Gen. John L. Chamberlain.
Brig. Gen. Enoch H. Crowder.
Brig. Gen. William M. Black.
Brig. Gen. William Crozier.
Brig. Gen. George O. Squier.
Brig. Gen. Frank McIntyre.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

SATURDAY, October 6, 1917.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who hast been our refuge and our strength, a very present help in trouble, from the beginning of our Republic, continue, we pray Thee, to uphold, sustain and guide us, in the present crisis which has been thrust upon us. And now, O God, our Heavenly Father, as the extraordinary session of the Sixty-fifth Congress is about to pass into history, grant that its work may be well pleasing in Thy sight and redound to the good of mankind. Let Thy blessing be upon the Members of this House, its officers and employees, to keep them and their dear ones in health and strength, that they may come together at the appointed time, fully equipped to take up the arduous duties which wait upon them. And Thine shall be the praise. "The Lord bless you and keep you; the Lord make his face shine upon you and be gracious unto you; the Lord lift up his countenance upon you and give you peace," now and evermore. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

COMMUNICATION FROM SECRETARY OF TREASURY—LIBERTY BONDS.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a telegram from the Secretary of the Treasury, dated from Madison, S. Dak., which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Now that Congress is about to adjourn and the Members will return to their respective homes, may I not beg you to invite each and every one of them to speak to their constituents upon the liberty loan and to urge every citizen to invest his available means in the bonds of our Government, the safest investment in the world, and at the same time help provide the means to equip, support, and sustain our gallant soldiers and sailors in this righteous war? Warm regards.

W. G. MCADOO.

The SPEAKER. I think I can assure the Secretary of the Treasury on the part of the House that the Members will not only invest their own money in these bonds as far as they are able to do so but get everybody else to invest. [Applause.]

INTERNATIONAL PARLIAMENTARY CONFERENCE OF COMMERCE.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a communication from the Secretary of State, which ought to have been laid before the House some time ago. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 24, 1917.

HON. CHAMP CLARK,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIR: Referring to my letter of May 4 last, communicating to you the invitation extended by the secretary general of the International Parliamentary Conference of Commerce to Congress to participate in that meeting, which was held in Rome May 1, I now have the honor to inform you that a telegram has been received from the American ambassador in Paris, in which he states that the conference is desirous that the United States send delegates to the coming meeting to be held in Paris from the 11th to the 14th of October, and requests to be informed what decision has been reached by Congress.

Since the receipt of the telegram above referred to a second message has been received from the American ambassador in Paris in which he states that he has been advised that Belgium, England, Italy, Japan, Portugal, Roumania, and Serbia will be represented.

The ambassador is further advised that England is to send a delegation from the House of Lords and the House of Commons; Italy to be represented by Mr. Tittoni, some time Italian ambassador at Paris, and by Mr. Ferrari, who was former minister of state. It appears from Ambassador Sharp's message that discussions of a private character will be held with the presidents of the tariff commissions, and should the United States conclude to participate a solemn session will take place in the senate in honor of the American delegates.

The coming International Parliamentary Conference will be presided over by Mr. Doumer, who is minister of state in the French cabinet.

According to the statement of the secretary general, the conference was founded in the year 1914, at the suggestion of the commercial commission of the House of Commons, under the patronage of the Belgian King, before the declaration of war, and is purely an economic organization and quite distinct from the political congress in behalf of which Mr. Franklin Bouillon is now in the United States for the purpose of extending an invitation to both Houses of Congress.

I am, sir, your obedient servant,

ROBERT LANSING.

The SPEAKER. The communication is referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered printed.

COMMISSION FROM JAPANESE DIET.

The Speaker also laid before the House the following communication from the Secretary of State, which, with the accompanying document, was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, September 26, 1917.

The Hon. CHAMP CLARK,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

SIR: I have the honor to inclose herewith, for your information, a copy of a dispatch from the American chargé d'affaires at Tokyo, Japan, together with copies of the inclosures therewith, reporting that on the 18th instant a party of five members of the lower house of the Japanese Diet would sail from Yokohama for the United States for the purpose of studying general political, social, and economic conditions in this country.

I have the honor to be, sir,

Your obedient servant,

(Signed)

ROBERT LANSING.

Inclosures: Copy of dispatch No. 827, September 4, 1917, from the American chargé d'affaires at Tokyo and copies of the inclosures therewith. 033.9411-95.

ADDRESS OF JOSEPH W. FOLK.

Mr. FISHER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a speech made at Memphis, Tenn., before the Cotton States Exchange Merchants' Association convention, by the Hon. Joseph W. Folk. It is a patriotic address and is brief.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting a speech by the Hon. Joseph W. Folk. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The following is the address referred to:

ADDRESS OF JOSEPH W. FOLK BEFORE THE COTTON STATES MERCHANTS ASSOCIATION CONVENTION, MEMPHIS, TENN., AUGUST 21, 1917.

"The American people are united as never before in a stern and resolute purpose. They were slow to arouse, but in the great heart of the Nation there is steadily awakening that

inherent loyalty to American ideals that has carried this Republic triumphantly through every crisis thus far encountered. We have before us a gigantic task, and a task upon the accomplishment of which depends all we have hoped for and striven for during the century and a half of our existence.

"No good American can question the justice of our entering the war with Germany, unless he be ignorant of why we did so. We have viewed for years the preparations for war being made by Germany, little dreaming that they might concern us, though occasionally there was apprehension as to the apparent ambition of the German rulers to be to the modern world what the Roman rulers were to the world of their time. When the day came for which Germany had been so long preparing, she suddenly hurled her tremendous military forces at the adjoining nations. Americans read with amazement of the ruthless violation of the rights of neutrals and the reckless disregard of treaty obligations on the part of Germany, but the war in its beginning seemed remote from our affairs and not necessarily to affect American rights. There were advocates of each of the contending nations among us, and a strict neutrality was maintained. The cruel treatment of the conquered and enslaved Belgians excited our sympathy and aroused our resentment, but there was no certainty then that these acts had the approval of the German rulers, so the American Republic remained neutral, and the American people hoped against hope that America might not become involved.

"As events followed events, and the frightfulness of the German military policy became more and more evident, those among us who sympathized with the German cause were little by little alienated. There was still an undercurrent of hope that we might not be drawn into the terrible conflict. President Wilson endeavored in every way possible, consistent with the national honor and dignity, to avert the disaster of war. On May 27, 1916, he urged the warring nations to state their peace terms, and pledged that the United States would become a partner in any scheme of lasting peace. The answer of Germany was evasive and unsatisfactory. Then came the sinking of the *Lusitania* and the wanton murder by drowning of hundreds of noncombatant American men and helpless women and children.

"This act was so conscienceless and inhuman, so contrary to all the rules of civilized warfare, that a shudder of horror ran throughout the American Republic, and the few remaining sympathizers with the German cause saw they could no longer continue their friendship for any nation guilty of such deliberate acts of brutality and savagery. The demand came from end to end of the Nation to declare war against this monster which was running amuck among the nations. The President, however, was patient. He hesitated to lead the Nation into the awful vortex of war, and endeavored to save the national honor without that dire necessity. He wrote a note of protest to the German rulers. They promised they would sink no more merchant ships without warning, and for a time it was thought that the crisis might pass, but it was only a hope to those who realized the German purpose of world domination. The President calmly waited, ignoring the malignant criticism and bitter attacks of some of those who insisted that we could no longer honorably remain out of the conflict. As late as January 22, 1917, the President addressed the Senate urging a plan of lasting peace among the nations through international arrangement. A few days thereafter it became known that on January 16, 1917, the German rulers had sent a secret note to Mexico and Japan attempting to unite them in a war against the United States, and promising to give Mexico in turn a part of the United States. Then Germany notified our Government that it would no longer keep its promise not to sink merchant ships without warning. By plain implication it admitted that it had given this promise merely to gain time for preparation for a warfare of hideous frightfulness. What was to be done? Every effort of diplomacy had been exhausted. American ships were being sunk without warning, the American flag was being insulted and fired upon, American men and women were being butchered, the mailed fist of Germany's war lord was being shaken at American institutions. German spies infested our country, endeavoring to incite discontent, strikes, and even civil war. It was plain that the German autocracy regarded this Republic with contempt, and its entrance or nonentrance into the war as a matter of indifference. National honor and national safety demanded that something should be done. Submission to such wrongs would have been unpardonable national cowardice. Only one thing could be done, all other means having been exhausted. The American people then realized that if the German autocracy should overcome the European allies our turn would be next. We had to fight to save our honor, to save our national existence, and to save democracy throughout

the world, for democracy and autocracy can not exist side by side. A state of war was recognized by Congress, and thus reluctantly we were brought into the world conflict after the President had done everything that could fairly be done to avoid the catastrophe. Now that we are in the war we see, with clearer vision, that it was inevitable that we should go in for it is our war as much as the war of England or France. It is a war to preserve our rights and our liberties as much as theirs.

"It is now evident to all thinking Americans that Germany must be conquered or else Germany will conquer us along with the rest of the world. There have been many fights for freedom since the beginning of history, but they were merely local, while this is universal. There have been many wars for the liberty of a race, while this war is for the liberty of all mankind. Other wars have been waged to free one people, while this war is not only to keep ourselves free but to make free humanity of every race and of every creed. The outcome will determine whether the world will be all democratic or all autocratic, whether government of the people and by the people shall obtain throughout the earth or shall perish everywhere. We are at war with Germany because there is an irreconcilable conflict between the ideals of this Republic and the dominating purposes of the German autocracy. If our ideals do not prevail, then the German autocracy will prevail over us. We are fighting Germany because of outraged Belgium, invaded and enslaved; because of France, unjustly and barbarously assailed and attacked; because of Russia, just emerging into the light of democracy and just freed from the shackles of tyranny; because of England, from which came our laws and civilization, and whose early entry into the conflict prevented that victory for German arms which would otherwise have been certain, thus saving us from the terrors of German militarism. We are fighting Germany because the success of Germany would mean the end of freedom here and everywhere. America can not remain free if Kaiserism wins. If Germany should triumph over our European allies, we would have to battle single-handed with a victorious Teuton autocracy, determined to conquer and subjugate the world.

"For 40 years Germany has been building up a military machine, the central thought of which has been world domination, and this terrible world calamity of blood and misery is the result of this aim of the German autocracy.

"Germany's method of warfare, in the sinking of merchant ships without warning, in the drowning of helpless women and children, in bombarding unfortified cities, in lurking like assassins beneath the waters and in the air, ready to strike and murder the unarmed, the unsuspecting and the helpless, has evidenced a savagery and brutality such as the world has never known before. Humanity will find it difficult to forgive, and history impossible to forget. Germany is the outlaw among the nations, tramping under foot every obligation of international law, threatening every ideal dear to the hearts of freeman, and the world will not be a safe place for liberty until the German autocracy is overthrown and crushed forever.

"We would have lost the respect of mankind and our own self-respect had we failed to take up the gauntlet so insolently thrown in our face by the German rulers. We are fighting for our own freedom and for the freedom of all men during all the years to come. It takes fighting to make the people free and more fighting to keep the people free. We want no conquered territory; we desire no indemnity. The mission of America in this war is to free mankind by enthroning justice and brotherhood in the hearts of men everywhere. We are fighting Germany in order to secure the permanent peace of the world, which is impossible as long as the German military system is allowed to exist, for there can be no enduring peace until further criminal aggressions against the other nations by the German autocracy have been rendered impossible. The same reasons which impelled us to enter the war must force us to keep up the war until its objects have been accomplished, for an inconclusive peace now would merely mean a death struggle later on between American ideals and an unconquered German autocracy.

"A truce now would be compromise, and there can be no compromise between liberty and tyranny. A truce now would be surrender, and surrender would be defeat. James Russell Lowell wrote these words in the long ago, and they come to us in the present crisis with a new and deeper meaning:

"Once to every man and nation comes the moment to decide,
In the strife of Truth with Falsehood, for the good or evil side;

Hast thou chosen, O my people, on whose party thou shalt stand,
Ere the Doom from its worn sandals shakes the dust against our
land?

Careless seems the great Avenger; history's pages but record
One death grapple in the darkness 'twixt old systems and the
Word;

Truth forever on the scaffold, Wrong forever on the throne,—
Yet that scaffold sways the future, and, behind the dim unknown,
Standeth God within the shadow, keeping watch above his own.

"Before we entered the war Americans had a right to be neutral as between other nations. Now that we are in no American can be neutral. The American who is neutral now is guilty of treason to the Republic. The American who is not for his country in this war must be counted as against his country. Whatever our internal differences may have been, in such a time as this we must be one people, loyal to a common country and devoted to a common flag. Any man or woman unwilling to render whatever service he or she may be called upon to give in this great hour is unworthy to be an American citizen.

"Millions of America's sons have answered to the Nation's call. They should have the full support of heart and soul and spirit of all American men and women; for in the name of America and in behalf of America they are going forth to battle in order that American honor may be sustained, American freedom preserved, to make the world safe for the common man and to make international justice supreme. The withholding of such support by any individual or organization is disloyalty to the Government and treason to the flag. In this crucial test of the fiber of the American spirit the future historian, I believe, will record the full fidelity of a great people to the principles of liberty and justice which America's sons are upholding on land and sea.

"The man in the White House who is guiding the destinies of this Republic in these troublous times with such a clear head and steady hand should be upheld by all who claim to be Americans. If I interpret American sentiment correctly, no President in our history has had the American people so solidly behind him as the people are behind President Wilson to-day. Supporting the President, and giving him inspiration, are the mighty hosts of American freemen, willing to serve and to sacrifice for the honor and safety of the Republic.

"This is the supreme hour in the life of this Republic and of the world. A new economic and social order is emerging in every land and a new internationalism is being produced by the blood and suffering of mankind. The ending of the great war in the only way it can rightly end will mark the beginning of a new epoch of world cooperation for the advancement of the common good. The public will no longer be the people of one section or of one nation, but all mankind, and the principles of humanity will then be applied between nations as they have long been applied between individuals. And why not? The inventions of the past few years that have annihilated time and space, and brought distant parts of the earth in touch with each other, have created new obligations in the relations of the nations. The civilized countries are nearer together in point of time and communication than were the States of this Union a century ago. No nation can live to itself and for itself alone. The time of the hermit nation is past. What each nation does affects in some degree the people of all other nations. These new conditions make it appropriate that the rights of nations throughout the earth be recognized and enforced by the common will through federated action. If there shall be born from the agony of Europe's battle fields an irresistible demand for some international arrangement to maintain the permanent peace of the world, the sacrifices of blood and treasure will not have been in vain.

"Men now living may see the day when the world will be ruled by right instead of might, by justice instead of selfishness. Men now living may see the time when the ideal of public right will be supreme throughout the world. Out of the black clouds of war that now envelop the earth may come a greater realization of the necessity for an international court of arbitration, with power to enforce its decrees. Then will dawn that day foretold of old, following the last great battle of the world, when there will be peace on earth and good will in the hearts of the children of men. The mission of America is to educate the world to this desired consummation. To fulfill this mission there must be loyalty and devotion to the ideals of America among the people of America. It is the mission of America by practical example to enlighten the world not only as to the rights of men but as to the duties of men toward their fellow men.

"The democracy that we are fighting for is the religion of brotherhood among men; the religion that says, 'Thou shalt not lie; thou shalt not steal'; the religion that demands the application of the Golden Rule in public and private life everywhere; the religion that does not array class against class, but preserves the rights of all, by causing each to respect the rights

of the other; that equalizes conditions, not by dragging down those who are up but by lifting up those who are down; that does not attack wealth honestly acquired, but wages unending war against conditions that create poverty; that protects property rights, but recognizes the fact that property rights should never be inconsistent with human rights; that seeks more government by the people, not less government by the people; that gives to each man an equal opportunity to live and to labor upon the earth that God has given to all, and to enjoy untrammelled and unrestricted the gains of honest toil; the religion that means more of service and less of selfishness.

"The capacity of a people for self-government is to be determined not by the extent of a nation's dominions, but by the happiness and welfare of the average individual. It is the average man for whom America stands and for whom this Republic has become the torchbearer of liberty for all mankind. We may not attain the ideals of democracy any time soon, but we can strive for them, with the assurance that this endeavor will lead us up the heights of achievement, and at last we may come to the summit, where there shall shine unobstructed the light of the Fatherhood of God and the brotherhood of man. Then the standards of the nations will be grouped in everlasting friendship, and above all will be our flag, with its ideals realized.

"She's up there, Old Glory, no tyrant-dealt scars,
No blur on her brightness, no stain on her stars;
The brave blood of heroes hath crimsoned her bars.
She's the flag of our country forever."

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had agreed to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 5723) to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed with amendment the bill (H. R. 4897) to amend section 10 of the national defense act approved June 3, 1916, and for other purposes; in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 730. An act granting certain coal lands to the town of Kaycee, Wyo.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 99) authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the entry of distilled spirits into bonded warehouses under bond conditioned for the export of such distilled spirits to some foreign country within one year from the date of entry into the United States.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution:

Senate resolution 149.

Resolved, That a committee of two Senators be appointed by the Vice President to join a similar committee appointed by the House of Representatives to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses having completed the business of the present session are ready to adjourn unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed the following resolution, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution 15.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 5723) entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department,' approved September 2, 1914, and for other purposes," the Clerk be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to strike out the words "of premiums in advance shall not be required for periods of more than one month each and may be deducted from the pay or deposit of the insured or be otherwise made at his election" as the same appear on page 30, lines 26 and 27, and lines 1 and 2, on page 31.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bills and joint resolutions of the following titles:

S. J. Res. 99. Joint resolution authorizing and directing the Secretary of the Treasury to permit the entry of distilled spirits into bonded warehouses under bond, conditioned for the export of such distilled spirits to some foreign country within one year from the date of entry into the United States;

S. 2531. An act to prevent the publication of inventions by the grant of patents that might be detrimental to the public safety or convey useful information to the enemy, to stimulate in-

vention, and provide adequate protection to owners of patents, and for other purposes;

S. 2603. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Wolf Creek Lumber Co. to maintain a bridge already constructed across Tug River;

S. 2947. An act granting the consent of Congress to the city of El Paso, Tex., to construct a bridge across the Rio Grande River within or near the city limits of El Paso, Tex., such construction to be made with the consent and cooperation of the Republic of Mexico;

S. 2920. An act authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the State of North Carolina two brass cannon, with carriage;

S. 2922. An act to amend the laws relating to the denominations of circulating notes by national banks and to permit the issuance of notes of small denominations, and for other purposes; and

S. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to expend funds in New Mexico and Texas for drainage purposes.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that on October 5, 1917, they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 6310. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Trumbull Steel Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mahoning River, in the State of Ohio;

H. R. 5082. An act providing for an amendment to section 2293 of the Revised Statutes, allowing homestead and other public-land affidavits to be taken before the military commander of any person engaged in military or naval service of the United States;

H. R. 5949. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3932. An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4232. An act extending the time for the construction of a bridge across Flint River, in the State of Georgia;

H. R. 5647. An act to provide for the reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost or destroyed in such service;

H. R. 6094. An act amending the act to increase the limit of the cost of certain public buildings, etc.;

H. R. 6175. An act giving the United States Shipping Board power to suspend present provisions of law and permit vessels of foreign registry and foreign-built vessels admitted to American registry under the act of August 18, 1914, to engage in the coastwise trade during the present war and for a period of 120 days thereafter, except the coastwise trade with Alaska.

H. R. 6306. To provide for the payment of six months' gratuity to the widow, children, or other previously designated dependent relative of retired officers or enlisted men on active duty;

H. R. 6362. To promote the efficiency of the United States Navy;

H. R. 6350. To authorize the issuance of Reserve Corps and National Army commissions in the lower grades of staff corps and to remove the fixed age limits requiring the discharge of Reserve Corps officers;

H. R. 6363. To provide for the service of officers of auxiliary naval forces on naval courts; and

H. J. Res. 116. For the purpose of promoting efficiency, for the utilization of the resources and industries of the United States, for lessening the expenses of the war, and restoring the loss caused by the war by providing for the employment of a discovery or invention called the "Garabed," claiming to make possible the utilization of free energy.

FORFEITURE PROVISION OF LAND LAWS.

Mr. MAYS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the committee and take from the Speaker's table for immediate consideration the bill S. 2918.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill S. 2918. Is there objection?

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object—

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title.

The Clerk read as follows:

An act (S. 2918) providing that the forfeiture provision of land laws shall not apply in the case of persons in the military or naval service during the present war.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, yesterday afternoon, when this bill was called up for consideration under unanimous consent, it was objected to. Now, what is there about the bill to-day that is different from what it was yesterday?

Mr. MAYS. The objection was made yesterday, I will say to the gentleman, because there had been no formal action by the Committee on the Public Lands of the House.

Mr. MADDEN. Is that the only objection?

Mr. MAYS. That was the only objection made at that time, except some suggestions of amendments that ought to be made, to which the Members interested in the bill have consented. The gentleman from Wyoming [Mr. MONDELL] offered an objection for the time being, and we have had a conference in the Committee on the Public Lands of such members as could be gotten together.

Mr. MADDEN. How many were here?

Mr. MAYS. Five members of the committee were present.

Mr. MADDEN. I am going to object to the consideration of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman object?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois objects.

WAR-RISK INSURANCE.

Mr. SIMS rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, the resolution just brought from the Senate, correcting the text of the war-risk insurance bill, I wish to have acted upon immediately so that the bill can be enrolled.

The SPEAKER. What is the number of it?

Mr. SIMS. I have not got it. It is at the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. The Chair lays before the House a Senate resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Senate concurrent resolution 15.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That in the enrollment of the bill (H. R. 5723) entitled "An act to amend an act entitled 'An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department,' approved September 2, 1914, and for other purposes," the Clerk be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to strike out the words "of premiums in advance shall not be required for periods of more than one month each and may be deducted from the pay or deposit of the insured, or be otherwise made at his election," as the same appear on page 30, lines 26 and 27, and lines 1 and 2 on page 31.

Mr. SIMS. Mr. Speaker, if there is no objection, I ask that the House concur in the Senate resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the Senate concurrent resolution.

The Senate concurrent resolution was agreed to.

COMMITTEE TO WAIT UPON THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I send to the Speaker's desk a resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina presents a resolution, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

House resolution 172.

Resolved, That a committee of three Members of the House be appointed by the Speaker, to join a similar committee to be appointed by the Senate, to wait upon the President of the United States and inform him that the two Houses have completed the business of the present session and are ready to adjourn unless the President has some other communication to make to them.

The SPEAKER. Is that a House resolution?

Mr. KITCHIN. Yes.

The SPEAKER. Here is a Senate resolution already passed.

Mr. KITCHIN. Then the Speaker can just appoint the Members.

The SPEAKER. But the gentleman's resolution has not passed.

Mr. KITCHIN. Then I call up the Senate resolution. I should think, however, that the House resolution is the proper one.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. What is it?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Do not both the Houses pass separate resolutions?

The SPEAKER. I believe that is correct. The question is on agreeing to the House resolution.

The resolution was agreed to; and the Speaker appointed as members of the committee Mr. KITCHIN, Mr. FITZGERALD, and Mr. GILLET.

IDA COTTRELL HODGSON.

Mr. BRAND. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 5833.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill H. R. 5833. The Clerk will report it by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 5833) granting six months' pay to Ida Cottrell Hodgson, widow of Frederick Grady Hodgson, deceased, colonel, United States Army, retired.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, this is a private pension bill, is it not?

Mr. BRAND. No; it is not a pension bill.

Mr. WALSH. Is it a gratuity?

Mr. BRAND. It is a six months' allowance or gratuity. It goes to every beneficiary of any dead soldier—private or officer—of the Regular Army.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That Ida Cottrell Hodgson, widow of Frederick Grady Hodgson, deceased, colonel, United States Army, retired, is hereby allowed an amount equal to six months' pay at the rate said Frederick Grady Hodgson was receiving at the date of his death.

SEC. 2. That said Ida Cottrell Hodgson, widow of Frederick Grady Hodgson, deceased, colonel, United States Army, retired, as aforesaid, be paid out of the Treasury of the United States a sum of money or an amount equal to six months' pay at the rate said Frederick Grady Hodgson, deceased, was receiving at the date of his death.

SEC. 3. That the payment of the amount of money hereby allowed and authorized to be paid to said Ida Cottrell Hodgson is authorized to be made from the appropriations for beneficiaries of officers who die while on the active list of the Army.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

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

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the question of fixing the price of coal and the implements used in its production.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent to extend in the RECORD his remarks on the subject of fixing the price of coal. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAINEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a résumé of the war activities of the several departments of the Government, prepared by the Committee on Public Information.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by publishing some matter sent in by the Committee on Public Information as to the activities of the various departments of the Government in the war. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by printing a patriotic resolution adopted by the Oklahoma State Federation of Labor.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by printing certain patriotic resolutions. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Reserving the right to object, I did not hear by whom these resolutions were adopted.

Mr. CARTER of Oklahoma. By the State Federation of Labor at Oklahoma City.

Mr. WALSH. I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Massachusetts objects.

MEDICAL AND DENTAL SURGEONS.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's desk the bill H. R. 4897, with Senate amendments, and move to concur in the Senate amendments. That is the bill amending section 10 of the national-defense act.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent to take from the Speaker's table the bill H. R. 4897, which the Clerk will report by title.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 4897) to amend section 10 of the national-defense act, approved June 3, 1916, and for other purposes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves to concur in the Senate amendments. Is there objection to considering them?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, let them be reported.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the Senate amendments.

The Senate amendments were read.

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I would like to inquire what is the effect of the Senate amendments?

Mr. DENT. The only substantial effect of the Senate amendments is that they create a Dental Corps. The Senate practically adopted the House bill, which the gentleman will recall—the bill authorizing appointments in the Medical Corps without having had five years previous service as first lieutenant. That was the construction given to the national-defense act. The Senate adopted the House bill with this amendment. The Senate puts in the words "first lieutenant," whereas the House bill just had "lieutenant." The material amendment of the Senate creates a Dental Corps and gives to the Dental Corps the same corresponding rank and grade as the Medical Corps under the jurisdiction of the Medical Department.

Mr. STAFFORD. That is the substance of the amendment under consideration?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. And that is the amendment that is now under consideration?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. STAFFORD. In listening to the amendment I understood that it also extends exemptions to dental students under call, the same as to medical students.

Mr. DENT. It does.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am sure all of us have received a great number of letters from students in dental colleges, and that is the purpose of the amendment now to be adopted?

Mr. DENT. That is one purpose. I will state to the gentleman that the Dental Corps now has no standing corresponding to the Medical Corps.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is to allow dental students to complete their college courses?

Mr. DENT. That is one of the purposes.

Mr. FOSTER. If the gentleman will yield, I wish to say that I think this is a very important bill, and that it ought to become a law. In war time there will be a great many calls upon the Dental Corps for oral surgery, so that it seems to me of vital importance that there be a Dental Corps corresponding to the Medical Corps. Then, further, a dental surgeon now, however lucrative his practice may be, when he goes into the Dental Corps as now constituted, must wait for several years before he can be more than a lieutenant. This simply places these dental surgeons upon the same footing as are the doctors.

Mr. STAFFORD. I assume that this Dental Corps is not merely for the emergency, but for all time.

Mr. FOSTER. I understand it is only for the emergency.

Mr. STAFFORD. I should like to inquire of the chairman of the Committee on Military Affairs whether the creation of this Dental Corps is merely for the emergency?

Mr. DENT. It is permanent.

Mr. FOSTER. Then I misunderstood.

Mr. STAFFORD. I thought it was to dignify the Dental Corps the same as the Medical Corps.

Mr. FOSTER. I think it ought to be. I think this ought to be permanent.

Mr. STAFFORD. What salaries will these members of the Dental Corps receive?

Mr. DENT. Salaries according to their rank.

Mr. STAFFORD. What is the highest rank a member of the Dental Corps can attain?

Mr. DENT. The rank of a major.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has this subject been considered at all by the Committee on Military Affairs?

Mr. DENT. It has; and my information is that the Surgeon General's Office are not opposed to this legislation. They objected to it being on the House bill, for fear that bill would lose out in the closing hours of the session. That was the only objection that the Surgeon General had, but as an independent measure I understand from his office that they have no objection to it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Has the matter ever been formally brought to the attention of the House Military Affairs Committee?

Mr. DENT. It has, time and time again, but no formal action has been taken.

Mr. FOSTER. It has been only a few years since the Dental Corps had any sort of standing whatever in the Army, and it has become more and more important.

Mr. DENT. Under the present law a dental surgeon must serve 24 years before he can become a major.

Mr. STAFFORD. This is certainly a very questionable practice, in the closing hours of a Congress, to create a Dental Corps for all time, without the subject ever having been considered by a committee of the House, and never having even received the formal indorsement of the Surgeon General of the Army. The only assurance we have from the chairman of the committee is that he thinks the Surgeon General is not opposed to it.

Mr. DENT. I know he is not.

Mr. FOSTER. There is no question about that.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. I object for the time being.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin objects.

Mr. DENT. Then I move to take the bill from the Speaker's table and agree to the Senate amendment.

Mr. STAFFORD. The gentleman can not do that, because it places a charge upon the Treasury.

The SPEAKER. That is true.

Mr. DENT. Then I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill.

Mr. STAFFORD. I make the point of order that the gentleman can not do that.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman can not do that, because the Senate has not yet passed the adjournment resolution.

Mr. KEATING. Mr. Speaker, the Senate has passed the adjournment resolution.

The SPEAKER. When?

Mr. KEATING. About 10 minutes ago.

The SPEAKER. The Chair has no official knowledge of that fact. No message has been received. We are not running on grapevine information here. [Laughter.]

The SERGEANT AT ARMS. Mr. Speaker, a message from the Senate.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had agreed to House concurrent resolution 25, providing for the adjournment of Congress at 3 p. m. to-day.

MEDICAL AND DENTAL SURGEONS.

Mr. DENT. Now, Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules, take from the Speaker's table House bill 4897, and concur in the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. DENT. I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama [Mr. DENT] has 20 minutes and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] 20 minutes.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I hope this bill will not be defeated because the Senate has tacked on this amendment in the closing hours of this session of Congress. This bill passed the House on June 25 last. Neither the House nor the Committee on Military Affairs is responsible for the delay in the passage of the bill by the other body. If this bill fails of passage it means that many officers lately in the National Guard, who were in the service as captains, who had the rank of captains in the National Guard, will have to serve in the Army of the United States after being called into the Federal service only as first lieutenants, because under the construction of the national-defense act every man in the Medical Corps has to have at least five years' previous service as a first lieutenant before he can receive the rank of captain.

Mr. TOWNER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Certainly.

Mr. TOWNER. Members of the House should understand that the provision regarding the Dental Corps is not by any means the only provision in the bill, and if the bill is refused a passage at this time the other provisions of the bill will be lost as well as the dental provision.

Mr. DENT. That is the point I am making. I said in the beginning that I hoped the bill would not be defeated because the Senate had tacked on an amendment creating a Dental Corps. I can not see any harm in that provision creating a Dental Corps.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. GORDON. What is the report of the Surgeon General of the Army with reference to the necessity of a Dental Corps as compared with the Medical Corps?

Mr. DENT. The Surgeon General, like every other medical man, considers that the Medical Corps is more important than the Dental Corps.

Mr. GORDON. Has he not said that there is a demand in the service for only one-sixth of the number of dentists as compared with medical men?

Mr. DENT. I do not remember the proportion, but probably the gentleman's memory is more accurate on that point than mine; but under the law as it now stands there are seven medical officers and one dental surgeon for every 1,000 men. That is in the Hay bill.

Mr. GILLET. And how does this change the law?

Mr. DENT. Under the present law dental surgeons are appointed and under the jurisdiction of the Surgeon General of the Army. There is no such thing as a separate dental corps. This changes it so as to create under the Medical Department a Dental Corps.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. Would this increase the number of dentists in the Army?

Mr. DENT. Not at all; not as provided in the national-defense act.

Mr. BRUMBAUGH. The number would remain the same.

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. How would it affect the number of officers in the Medical Corps?

Mr. DENT. Does the gentleman mean whether it would increase the number? It would proportionally, according to the increase of the Army, but that could not be helped.

Mr. KEATING. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. I will.

Mr. KEATING. It has been suggested to me that one proviso in the amendment might be construed to apply to dentists in the Navy—the provision that no dentist shall be commissioned who has not been confirmed by the Senate.

Mr. DENT. I am glad the gentleman has called my attention to that. It has been called to my attention by several Members of Congress over the phone. I took occasion to read the Record, and I can not see how by any possible construction that effect could be given to the language.

Mr. KEATING. I agree with the gentleman.

Mr. DENT. The act originally provided for the appointment of captains in the Medical Corps. An amendment was offered by the Senator from Ohio [Mr. POMERENE] providing for the creation of a dental corps, and the Senator from North Carolina [Mr. OVERMAN] offered an amendment to that amendment that no dental surgeon shall be recommissioned until confirmed by the Senate. The Pomerene amendment relates exclusively to the dental surgeons in the Army, and therefore the amendment to the amendment relates to the surgeons in the Army and could not by any construction include surgeons in the Navy.

Mr. DENISON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. DENISON. What is the rank for dental surgeons now in the Army under the present law?

Mr. DENT. They are ranked as lieutenants, captains, and majors. A dental surgeon can not become a captain until he has had at least five years' service as a first lieutenant. A major has to have 24 years'.

Mr. DENISON. Are there no captains and majors in the Dental Corps?

Mr. DENT. I think there are no majors.

Mr. FOSTER. I think there are some majors.

Mr. MOORES of Indiana. There are no majors; but six captains.

Mr. DENISON. Will the rank of these officers be changed by the provision of this act?

Mr. DENT. Does the gentleman mean will they be raised to a higher grade?

Mr. DENISON. Yes.

Mr. DENT. They will not; it creates a separate corps and gives the dentists the corresponding rank of the medical department.

Mr. DENISON. Will the man at the head of the corps have a higher rank?

Mr. DENT. Not at all; he will not have to have the previous service.

Mr. DENISON. Will the compensation of the dentists in the Army be increased by this act?

Mr. DENT. I do not see how it can possibly be so.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DENT. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. The amendment provides that the rank and pay and promotion and allowance of officers in the Dental Corps shall be of the corresponding grade of the Medical Corps. Would not that indicate that there might be in the

Dental Corps a rank higher than major, that they might rank as high as any man in the medical department?

Mr. DENT. I have not read that carefully. I wish the gentleman would repeat that.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Who shall have the rank, pay, promotion, and allowances of officers of corresponding grades of the Medical Corps.

Mr. DENT. I presume it would. I was mistaken about that.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I do not think they have been created yet, but it might provide for the creation of colonels.

Mr. DENT. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, here we have an instance of the worst possible practice in parliamentary procedure, namely, the passing of legislation in the closing minutes of the Congress which neither a committee of the Senate nor a committee of the House has formally considered. A simple bill introduced into the House in May last and passed on June 25 changed the national-defense act merely in one minor particular, so as to permit those attached to the Medical Corps of the Regular Army and the National Guard to be eligible to promotion to a captaincy upon such examination as may be prescribed by the Secretary of War. It was represented, and properly represented, that many doctors in the National Guard who held the rank of lieutenant were not receiving sufficient compensation, and that it was wrong for them to be held back and retained in that position of lieutenant when they were capable of filling the grade of captain. This bill goes over to the Senate, and, as we all know, because of conditions existing in the Senate important amendments are often hurriedly introduced from the floor of the Senate. One of the amendments adopted changed the Army reorganization act, an act which was as thoroughly considered by a master mind of military affairs, a man who knew all of the details and who framed that act not merely for times of peace but also for an army in time of war. That act made no provision whatever for the creation of a Dental Corps. It did create a Medical Corps. The Senate has attached an amendment providing for the creation of a Dental Corps, which has only one purpose, namely, to raise the grades of men now assigned to these various positions in the Army so that they may receive higher pay and rank. Following the profession of medicine and surgery is one thing. It is necessary at all times, even in times of peace, to have a well-organized body of eminent surgeons and pay them proper salaries so that as the years go on they will be retained in the service rather than resign; but that same argument does not apply to a Dental Corps. There is no such necessity for having high grades apply to these men who are dentists.

I can not conceive of any worse practice than this. One member of the Military Affairs Committee, who gives matters as much attention before his committee as any man can, asks questions of the chairman of the committee which show that he is not as fully informed about the particulars of this bill as he would like to be. I refer to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON].

How can other Members who have not the technical knowledge necessary to follow this legislation pass intelligently upon this amendment? If the rules were not suspended, this amendment, because it makes a charge on the Treasury, would have had to be referred to the Committee on Military Affairs. There is no urgency about this proposition. We will be in session again within two months. Even if the provision which was sought originally to correct conditions in the Medical Corps should be held in abeyance for two months it would not be as long as the Senate has been holding it up, because this bill passed the House on June 25. The Senate did not consider in all of these months there was any urgency even in that particular. We can correct that condition when the House meets again by passing a proper provision. When you adopt this practice of allowing some interested Senator in some project, without even the recommendation of the head of a department, to tack on an important amendment and have it ushered over here and submitted on the spur of the moment, without even the committee or any other Members of the House having time to consider its merits, you are passing legislation in a very loose way, and of a character which I for one will protest against as long as I am here. I reserve the remainder of my time.

Mr. DENT. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. TOWNER].

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Speaker, under ordinary circumstances I am inclined to think that many of us would concur in the criticisms that have been made by the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. STAFFORD] with regard to the fact that this amendment has been brought in so late in the session. However, I think

the criticisms that are made upon the substantive parts of the bill are not well-founded. This matter has been under consideration both in the House and the Senate. It has received the consideration of the Committee on Military Affairs. It has the approval of the Surgeon General's Department. There is nothing asked that is extraordinary in its nature or character. We must have these dental officers. They are already provided for. The only question raised here is as to whether or not they shall occupy the anomalous position of being a part of the Surgeon General's Department, a part of the medical staff, or whether they shall have a distinctive position which shall still be under the Surgeon General's Department, but which will be separately recognized as a dental department. That, it seems to me, is entirely a matter that ought to be approved by the House, but that is not the most serious question. If we vote down the passage of this bill it will not only kill that provision but it will kill the whole bill. Certainly the provisions of this bill are important enough now that they should be passed at this session. It is an emergency act. Its provisions are important, and we should pass it at this time. I presume there has not been a single bill passed to which objections could not be made.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TOWNER. In just a moment. But we are not given, Mr. Speaker, to making criticisms that we are not justified in concluding are vital when opposing necessary war legislation. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman says that this is an emergency measure and was so important that the House passed it on the 25th of June, and the Senate held it up until now.

The SPEAKER. Neither gentleman is in order in criticizing the Senate.

Mr. TOWNER. I said if it was in order.

Mr. GORDON. This is giving the House's opinion of the Senate's judgment.

The SPEAKER. The Chair knows; but the rule is that gentlemen must not reflect on the Senate or Senators.

Mr. TOWNER. I think, Mr. Speaker, we have no justification now in delaying the passage of this bill, and I hope that the objection raised will not be considered as of sufficient merit or weight to prevent the passage of this bill. I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I do not like this way of enacting legislation myself. Now, I did not intend, Mr. Speaker, to criticize the Senate. I was simply calling attention to the fact that in their judgment this bill, which we passed on the 25th of June, was not of such very great and pressing importance in the prosecution of this war, or they certainly would not have held it three or four months, until the closing hours of a session, when they could tack this on under suspension of the rules. Now, it has been said, it has been reported, that the Surgeon General has no objection to this amendment. If that report is correct we have received no communication from the Surgeon General upon that subject. We are creating brigadier generals and colonels in this Congress at a rate that has never been known before in this or any other country, and I tell you, gentlemen, it is time to call a halt on such legislation. As has been said, if this legislation is so important that we have got to create a Dental Corps and place it upon the same basis, with the same number of colonels and brigadiers as the Medical Corps of the Army has, it seems to me that we ought to have a formal communication from the Surgeon General of the Army upon that subject to lay before the membership of this House. I think this bill had better be defeated than to allow it to go through with this rider upon it at this time. Congress will meet again on the first Monday in December, and if this legislation is important and urgent, Congress can then enact it; and I do not think we ought to create here a corps, provide for a great lot of high-salaried officials, and undertake to place the Dental Corps upon the same basis as the Medical Corps of the Army. [Applause.]

Mr. DENT. Does the gentleman from Wisconsin expect to use some more time?

Mr. STAFFORD. I may; but I am willing to allow debate to close now.

Mr. DENT. I ask for a vote, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LINTHICUM). The question is on suspension of the rules and agreeing to the Senate amendments.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the rules were suspended and the Senate amendments were agreed to.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I demand a division.

Mr. DENT. I make a point of order that that comes too late.

Mr. STAFFORD. The Chair has not even decided.

Mr. LANGLEY. The Chair announced that the ayes had it.

Mr. STAFFORD. Upon the presentation—

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Does the gentleman withdraw the demand?

Mr. STAFFORD. On the request of the gentleman from Kentucky, I withdraw the demand.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Two-thirds having voted in the affirmative, the rules are suspended and the amendments are concurred in.

LAND FOR USE OF ORDNANCE DEPARTMENT, UNITED STATES ARMY.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the joint resolution which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky moves to suspend the rules and pass the resolution which he sends to the Clerk's desk, and which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 162) authorizing expenditure of money upon land purchased for use of the Ordnance Department of the Army without reference to section 355 of the Revised Statutes.

Resolved, etc., That section 355 of the Revised Statutes of the United States shall not apply to the expenditure of appropriations for the Ordnance Department of the Army now available for the purchase of land and for improvements upon such land.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois demands a second.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The gentleman from Kentucky has 20 minutes and the gentleman from Illinois has 20 minutes.

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, section 355 of the Revised Statutes provides that, before land shall be purchased or money expended in improvements on such land, the title shall have been certified to by the Attorney General of the United States and the consent of the State to the acquisition of the land shall have been given.

That is the sum total of the effect of section 355 of the Revised Statutes. Now, in the consideration of a number of matters heretofore, this Congress has waived the requirements of that section, and we had believed in the passage of the deficiency bill that we had taken care of such cases where it was necessary. But there has come to my attention this morning the fact that there are a number of purchases of land that have already been authorized to be made that could not be made without great delay if the requirements of this section were not waived. The resolution as drawn will not enlarge in the slightest degree the power of the Government to buy land or make any money available to buy land which is not now available, but it does permit moneys which have been appropriated for the purpose of particular pieces of land for particular purposes to be expended, and the land acquired and the buildings erected on it, without waiting for the certification of the Attorney General or the permission of States. Most of the States have passed general statutes touching such matters, in compliance with section 355, but some of the States have not. And in order to prevent delay this joint resolution is now presented.

Mr. TALBOTT. One moment. You have in mind the proving ground—

Mr. SHERLEY. No, I have not; because the proving-ground provision has already been taken care of by language carried in the deficiency bill, which is now a law. And I will say, to relieve any apprehension the gentleman has in mind, there is no contemplation in any way of taking Kent Island.

Mr. TALBOTT. I am not talking about Kent Island. I am talking about something else.

Mr. SHERLEY. We have made provision for the acquisition of land without regard to section 355 for proving grounds by express enactment.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. May I ask the gentleman just what the power of the Ordnance Department is under the deficiency bill to acquire land?

Mr. SHERLEY. No power in the world, except where moneys have been concretely appropriated to acquire land.

Now, I will give the gentleman an illustration of the situation that is confronting the Government now. Appropriations have been made for the acquisition of certain land near New York, and for certain other land near Norfolk, in connection with the building of storage warehouses for ordnance material. Also, we

passed a law in regard to the purchase of land for the establishment of the nitrate plant. Now, without the enactment of this joint resolution that money can not be expended until there has been both a certification by the Attorney General and action by the State in which the land is situated agreeing thereto. This resolution does not broaden the power of the department to spend money for land but simply waives those two requirements of the section referred to.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Will the gentleman in his explanation go one step further? He has made reference to Kent Island, which he said will not be taken for the purpose of a proving ground. Complaint has come from another section in the vicinity, where certain industrial plants are established, and where the people are employed at canneries, and things of that kind, in very fertile territory.

Mr. SHERLEY. I will answer the gentleman in this way: This does not involve in any way, shape, or form the expenditure of any money in connection with the proving grounds. And for this reason, namely, that when we carried a provision of \$7,000,000 for the purchase of proving grounds and improvements, we carried a provision similar to this, which is already the law on the statute book, and was one of the items in the urgent deficiency bill passed the other day.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. I can understand why you should request to waive the granting of the right by the States, but why do away with the certification of the Attorney General?

Mr. SHERLEY. That is one of the requirements of section 355.

Mr. GORDON. Does not the gentleman think it is very important before paying out public money for real estate that you have the opinion of the Attorney General as to the title?

Mr. SHERLEY. I just as leave, and a little bit rather, have the opinion of the lawyer who really makes the examination of the title. The certification of the Attorney General is of necessity a matter of form.

Mr. GORDON. But it is an official opinion.

Mr. SHERLEY. It is an official opinion, based on the opinion of the attorneys of the Government who examine into it. The district attorneys will examine into it or the attorneys of the War Department. We are not going to buy land without title.

Mr. GORDON. If this is adopted, they can buy land without any title at all.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SHERLEY. I will.

Mr. LINTHICUM. As I understand, the deficiency bill we passed a few days ago made sufficient provision for proving grounds without certification?

Mr. SHERLEY. Yes, sir.

Mr. LINTHICUM. There can be no delay in obtaining proving grounds now by the Government?

Mr. SHERLEY. Not by virtue of that section.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker—

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. MADDEN. I am in sympathy with the passage of the resolution offered by the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY], and my only interest in the case was that he might be given an opportunity to explain the details that have already been explained. So far as I am concerned, I have not any disposition to take up any further time of the House.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the joint resolution.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds having voted in favor thereof) the rules were suspended and the joint resolution was agreed to.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, I rise to present a privileged report.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will suspend just a moment.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. ALEXANDER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record by inserting a statement of the activities of the Shipping Board and the United States Emergency Fleet Corporation.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record by inserting a statement on the Shipping Board activities. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of waterways, and also to include a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Rivers and Harbors—Mr. SMALL, of North Carolina—on the establishment of transportation by water, from the Secretary of War, and his reply thereto.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the subject of waterways. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the anti-slacker proposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the anti-slacker proposition. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FLOOD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the causes of the war and to incorporate some patriotic resolutions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Virginia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on what caused the war and to insert some patriotic resolutions. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the present war.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the subject of the present war. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

FIVE CIVILIZED TRIBES.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on yesterday I was directed by the Committee on Indian Affairs to make a report on a bill. By inadvertence the number 1681 was embodied in the report. I now ask unanimous consent to withdraw report No. 196 to make certain corrections.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Oklahoma asks unanimous consent to withdraw the report referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. OVERMYER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing a resolution adopted by the Fremont (Ohio) Chamber of Commerce asking for the expulsion of Senators STONE, GRONNA, and LA FOLLETTE.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas objects. The House has nothing to do with the Senators, anyway.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of land legislation during this session of Congress.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

Mr. YOUNG of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of the marketing, handling, and grading of grain.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the subject of marketing and grading grain. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PRIVILEGES OF THE HOUSE (H. REPT. NO. 201).

The SPEAKER. Now the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. BARNHART] is recognized. The gentleman submits a privileged report, which the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Report of the special committee of five Members of the House of Representatives to inquire into the allegations and charges made by J. THOMAS HEFLIN, a Member of Congress from the fifth congressional district of Alabama, appointed on October 4, 1917.

Your committee, appointed to inquire into the allegations and charges made by J. THOMAS HEFLIN, Member of Congress from the fifth district of Alabama, on the floor of the House on September 21, 1917, and also to inquire into the allegations or charges made in an alleged interview or statement alleged to have been furnished by the said J. THOMAS HEFLIN and printed in the Washington Post of September 22, 1917, respectfully ask leave to report as follows:

The investigation made by the committee has necessarily been hurried, due to the fact that the resolution authorizing the appointment of your committee to make the investigation was introduced early in the afternoon of Thursday, October 4, 1917. Afterwards, on the same afternoon, a resolution was passed by the House fixing the hour of adjournment at 3 o'clock on the following Saturday.

The resolution authorizing the appointment of the committee and vesting them with authority is as follows:

"Be it resolved, That the Speaker of the House of Representatives is hereby authorized and empowered to appoint a select committee of five Members of the House, who shall make inquiry into the allegations and charges made by J. THOMAS HEFLIN, a Member of Congress from the

fifth district of Alabama, on the floor of the House on September 21, 1917, which is, in part, as follows:

"I do not know what Members of Congress, if any, have been influenced by this mysterious German organization. If I were permitted to express my opinion I could name 13 or 14 men in the two bodies, who, in my judgment, have acted in a suspicious manner by the introduction of resolutions or bills or by speeches in the Congress or out of it, that leads to the conviction that they are not loyal to this Government in the hour of its peril—they ought to be investigated, and if found guilty, they ought to be expelled from the House and the Senate of the United States."

"Also as to the allegations and charges made in an interview or statement alleged to have been furnished by the said J. THOMAS HEFLIN and printed in the Washington Post of September 21, 1917, as follows:

"I have heard a story that there is a gambling room in Washington where pro-German and peace-at-any-price Members of Congress get their pay by being extraordinarily lucky at cards. I demand that this matter be investigated and that the guilty Members be expelled from Congress in disgrace. I believe that some of this money has reached some Members of the Congress. I know I could name 13 or 14 Members of the House and Senate who have acted in a very suspicious manner."

"Said committee shall report to the House before the adjournment of this session of Congress the result of its inquiry and its recommendation as to the action which should be taken by the House touching any person or persons involved in or affected by or making these statements and charges."

Pursuant to this instruction, on the afternoon of October 4 the committee held a preliminary meeting to determine the scope of the inquiry, which meeting was continued to the morning of October 5. After careful deliberation your committee determined that the main question submitted for its investigation was whether the charges made by Mr. HEFLIN in his speech or alleged interview against Members of Congress involved the imputation of corrupt motives or the receipt by them of any portion of the alleged German corruption fund. For this reason your committee invited Mr. HEFLIN to appear, and he was closely questioned as to the meaning he conveyed or intended to convey by these charges. In the first place, he was questioned as to the accuracy of his reported interview in which it was specifically charged that Members of Congress had participated in gambling, as a result of which they received money from the German Government, or acted in a suspicious manner in that connection.

Mr. HEFLIN emphatically denied that he had made such a statement, and asserted that he had never, at any time or place, publicly or privately, made any charge that any Member of Congress had been influenced in any vote or action by the receipt, directly or indirectly, of any part of this or any other fund. He stated that he did not charge this, and did not intend to charge this, either in his speech on the floor of the House of September 21, or in any statement which he made to newspaper men which was alleged to have been reported in the Washington Post. With respect to the newspaper interview, however, Mr. Stuart Godwin, Washington representative of the International News Service, and Mr. Andrew Eldred, Washington representative of the United Press, appeared, at their own suggestion, and declared to your committee that Mr. HEFLIN had been correctly quoted, as they both heard his statement and reported it for publication.

After being questioned as to whether he had any proof of corruption by money of Members of Congress, Mr. HEFLIN most emphatically stated that he did not have any proofs of the receipt of money by Members of Congress and that he was unable to furnish or procure any such proofs.

On September 28, 1917, Frank L. Polk, Acting Secretary of State, wrote to Hon. EDWARD W. POU, a Member of the House from North Carolina, as follows:

"MY DEAR MR. POU: In response to your inquiry over the telephone to-day, addressed to the department, I beg to inform you that the State Department has no evidence that could in any way connect a Member of Congress with the payment of money by the German Embassy in its propaganda activities."

"I take the liberty of quoting a statement issued by the Secretary of State on September 22, which indicates his opinion on this subject:

"If there is any misunderstanding, I wish to say very emphatically I do not see how the Bernstorff message in any way reflects upon Congress or any Member. Apparently, it was the purpose to employ agencies to influence them, of which they would have no knowledge, and in case they were influenced would be entirely innocent. I do not know what the organization was. This exposé is apropos of German methods of peace propaganda, and there is no intention of casting suspicion on Members of Congress."

"Believe me, my dear Mr. Pou,

"Yours, very truly,

FRANK L. POLK,
"Acting Secretary of State."

On the above statement of Mr. HEFLIN, taken in connection with the letter from the Secretary of State's office, your committee is of the opinion that there is no justification for and no evidence upon which to base a further investigation of the question of the corrupt receipt of money by Members of Congress.

This question being disposed of, nothing remains for your committee to investigate but Mr. HEFLIN's charges that he believes certain Members of Congress have acted in a suspicious manner by the introduction of bills or resolutions, or in speeches made in Congress or out of it.

It is apparent that such an investigation would necessarily consume a great deal of time and involve considerable expense, no provision for which has been made in the resolution under which your committee is acting. Therefore it is apparent that it is utterly impossible for your committee to make a full and fair investigation of this phase of the question within the time limit.

While your committee makes no recommendation in the premises, we beg to state it as our opinion that in so far as Mr. HEFLIN's charges impute or might fairly be construed as imputing dishonest or corrupt motives to any Member of Congress, notwithstanding the fact that he now denies any intention of conveying any such imputation, his conduct in that respect is subject to criticism.

But inasmuch as the serious question of disloyalty to our country on the part of some Members of the House has been raised by Mr. HEFLIN, in the opinion of your committee the direct and parliamentary course of action would be in the institution by him of proceedings for expulsion from Congress of those whose loyalty he challenges.

Respectfully submitted,

HENRY A. BARNHART,
W. W. VENABLE,
ARTHUR G. DEWALT,
NICHOLAS LONGWORTH,
JOSEPH WALSH.

Mr. BARNHART. Mr. Speaker, the report of the committee just read expresses the unanimous findings of the members thereof, although, in justice to some of them it does not fully meet their personal opinions. On one hand it was believed that the report does not go far enough in its findings and, on the other that it goes too far. But the committee was handicapped by lack of time and means to make such an investigation as the resolution directed, and I think every Member of this body will concede this. But we made a preliminary investigation of sufficient scope to prompt the report we have made, and hope it will be accepted.

So far as the charges that Members of the House having been bribed, as was inferred by those who heard the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN] and as reported by the press, the committee was promptly advised by Mr. HEFLIN that he had no intention of giving out such an impression, had never heard of any such bribery, and, of course, had no proof. He also denies that he gave out the report that Members of Congress won money easily at a slush fund German poker room in this city, and so this incident at once became a question of veracity between Mr. HEFLIN and the newspaper men who interviewed him. That left your committee at a standstill, and the Members of the House and the country will have to draw their own conclusions.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BARNHART. I will not yield.

Mr. MADDEN. I should like to have the gentleman yield if he will.

Mr. BARNHART. With all respect to the gentleman from Illinois, I will not yield. But as to the matter of loyalty of Members of Congress, Mr. HEFLIN informed the committee that he believes he has evidence to corroborate his charges, which consists of speeches and resolutions, in and out of Congress, newspaper clippings, letters from constituents of certain Members, and opinions of some eminent men. However, the committee is not continuing, Mr. HEFLIN said he did not have his evidence immediately ready and could not have for some time, there is no provision in the resolution for defraying the expenses of such an investigation, hence we could only find and recommend on the brief outline of the situation before us.

Therefore, as the close of the session limited the possibilities of complying with the requirements of the disloyalty feature of the resolution, and as there are neither facts nor time available for a fair and full presentation and discussion of the matter, Mr. Speaker, I am directed by the committee to move the previous question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana moves the previous question.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, I hope the gentleman will withdraw the motion for the previous question, for I should like to make a statement. The gentleman has not correctly stated my position. I am ready to start with the investigation now.

The SPEAKER. Wait a minute. The gentleman from Alabama will have to get unanimous consent in order to make any remarks. That is the rule.

Mr. HEFLIN. I trust that the gentleman will be fair enough to withdraw the motion for the previous question in order that I may make a statement, because the gentleman's statement does not correctly quote what I have said or state my position.

The SPEAKER. That is within the power of the gentleman from Indiana, and he moves the previous question.

Mr. BARNHART. I move the previous question.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the report of the committee.

The question being taken, the report was agreed to.

EXPENSES OF FOREIGN ARMY OFFICERS.

The SPEAKER. The other day the House passed a bill to defray the expenses incurred by officers and enlisted men of foreign armies attached to the Army of the United States. It turned out that this feature had already been carried in the general bill. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. SHERLEY] the other day asked unanimous consent that the proceedings on this particular bill be vacated. Inadvertently the Chair had signed this bill, and, without objection, he now scratches his name off from it.

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment joint resolution of the following title:

H. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution authorizing the expenditure of money upon lands purchased for use of the Ordnance Department

of the Army without reference to section 355 of the Revised Statutes.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed without amendment bill of the following title:

H. R. 5833. An act granting six months' pay to Ida Cottrell Hodgson, widow of Frederick Grady Hodgson, deceased, colonel, United States Army, retired.

LEAVE TO EXTEND REMARKS.

Mr. LITTLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon food and foodstuffs.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. LITTLE] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on foodstuffs. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PUBLICATION OF INVENTIONS.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on Patents from the further consideration of S. 2531. This is a bill similar to a bill now on the House Calendar.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on Patents, and for the present consideration of S. 2531. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill by title.

The Clerk read the title of the bill (S. 2531) to prevent the publication of inventions by the grant of patents that might be detrimental to the public safety or convey useful information to the enemy, to stimulate invention, and provide adequate protection to owners of patents, and for other purposes.

Mr. MADDEN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I should like to ask the gentleman from New York to state to the House the special object of discharging the Committee on Patents for the purpose of considering this bill at this time?

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. We are considering the Senate bill. The House Committee on Patents reported a similar bill, which is now on the House Calendar.

Mr. MADDEN. What does this bill do?

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. The purpose of the bill is stated in the title. It is drawn by the Patent Office at the suggestion of the Secretary of War, the Secretary of the Navy, and the secretary of the Munitions Board. The purpose of it is to keep secret an application for a patent whenever in the opinion of the Commissioner of Patents the publishing of the application might be of benefit to the enemy.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. STAFFORD. Reserving the right to object, I realize the necessity of passing this Senate bill without amendment. Otherwise, I think the last paragraph should be amended so as to make more clear the intentment of the committee. I do not think the committee intends for a moment that, in case this patent is denied to the patentee during the pendency of the war, the patentee, upon the issuance of a patent, will be able to obtain compensation from the Government, in case it uses the patent, for damages by reason of the patent being withheld and the patentee prevented from using it during the pendency of the war. I call the gentleman's attention to the last paragraph:

When an applicant whose patent is withheld as herein provided and who faithfully obeys the order of the Commissioner of Patents above referred to shall tender his invention to the Government of the United States for its use, he shall, if and when he ultimately received a patent, have the right to sue for compensation in the Court of Claims, such right to compensation to begin from the date of the use of the invention by the Government.

I take it that this is not to give any right of compensation from the Government because of the deprivation of the right to use the patent during the war period, or for anything except the use by the Government.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. He is to have no compensation unless the Government decides that the application shall be kept secret.

Mr. STAFFORD. And no compensation from the Government, except for its use of the patent.

Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH. None whatever.

Mr. STAFFORD. I wanted that clearly stated, in case that ambiguity should ever be presented to the Court of Claims.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the bill.

The bill was read, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That whenever during a time when the United States is at war the publication of an invention by the granting of a patent might, in the opinion of the Commissioner of Patents, be detrimental to the public safety or defense or might assist the enemy or endanger the successful prosecution of the war he may order that the invention be kept secret and withhold the grant of a patent until the

termination of the war: *Provided*, That the invention disclosed in the application for said patent may be held abandoned upon it being established before or by the commissioner that in violation of said order said invention has been published or that an application for a patent therefor has been filed in a foreign country by the inventor or his assigns or legal representatives, without the consent or approval of the Commissioner of Patents or under a license of the Secretary of Commerce, as provided by law.

When an applicant whose patent is withheld as herein provided and who faithfully obeys the order of the Commissioner of Patents above referred to shall tender his invention to the Government of the United States for its use, he shall, if and when he ultimately receives a patent, have the right to sue for compensation in the Court of Claims, such right to compensation to begin from the date of the use of the invention by the Government.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee). Is there objection?

There was no objection.

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

On motion of Mr. CHARLES B. SMITH, a motion to reconsider the vote was laid on the table.

A similar House bill (H. R. 5269) was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] is recognized for 20 minutes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Will the gentleman yield for me to make a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. LONDON. I will.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that upon the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from New York the House stand in recess until 2 o'clock and 50 minutes p. m.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the remarks of the gentleman from New York the House stand in recess until 2.50 p. m. Is there objection?

Mr. AUSTIN. Reserving the right to object, I wish to state that I am anxious to submit a resolution after the gentleman from New York closes.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman's resolution will be objected to if it is for the extra month.

Mr. AUSTIN. I am going to move to suspend the rules and pass it.

Mr. KITCHIN. The gentleman can not get recognition for that.

Mr. AUSTIN. I will take my chance on it.

Mr. TREADWAY. Reserving the right to object, I want to say that my colleague, Mr. ROGERS, was expecting recognition. He is not in the room at present.

Mr. SLOAN. I want to say that I would like to have about two minutes.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw my request.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from New York will proceed.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I do not know that I shall occupy the whole of the time, but I will ask to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I am probably late with the appeal I intend to make now at the end of this most important session. Lawyers may differ as to the necessity of suspending the Constitution, but there can be no dispute that even in times of war common sense ought not to be suspended. Some of our greatest statesmen are the worst sinners in that respect. The supreme ruler of all the jungles, Theodore Roosevelt, declared more than once that whoever dares express any opinion which is not in harmony with his present opinion should be deported, lynched, crippled, mutilated, and eaten alive. This policy seems to be advocated by a number of big men who have lost all sense of proportion.

I am not in a facetious mood, and I do not like to be introducing frivolous resolutions, but I almost feel like introducing a resolution that Congress should make an appropriation for night schools to teach the various members of chambers of commerce who are now demanding the expulsion of Members of Congress for the courage they show in honestly expressing their views, to teach those chambers of commerce the elements of American democracy. [Applause.]

We are working ourselves into a frenzy before a single shot has been fired at the enemy. What will we do later, when the crippled, wounded, and mutilated will return from the trenches?

Mr. Speaker, there is one thing that the war has shown—the one silver lining in the dark cloud—and that is the great loyalty of the American people. [Applause.] The war came after a campaign conducted with the implied promise that there would be no war. Nevertheless, the people have accepted the decision

of the law-making body of the country and abide by it. No one will contend that conscription was popular. It had never been resorted to in previous wars except in the last extremity. Still the people, in their loyalty, in their submission to law, have yielded. When you deal with a people of such profound loyalty, when you deal with a people with such a devotion to law, when you deal with a people so thoroughly acquiescing in the principle of majority rule, the only rule possible in a Republic, all attempts to suppress freedom of speech, freedom of thought, and a full discussion of vital issues are acts of unpardonable oppression.

Things are becoming unbearable. In order to make the world safe for democracy, a very charming slogan, we have permitted to go unpunished one of the most abominable acts in the history of this country—the deportation of twelve hundred men by a lawless crowd speaking in the name of law and order in the State of Arizona. We have been too busy to take it up. This outrage was committed three months ago. The men are still in exile. They dared oppose a powerful corporation. We have tolerated the lynching of a man in Butte, Mont., because he stood for the rights of the laboring people.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, did not that man who was lynched in Butte persist in saying night after night, from a soap box, that soldiers were nothing but scabs in uniform?

Mr. LONDON. Yes; but if the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON] is willing to punish careless and foolish words by death nobody else would, particularly in the American Congress. No matter how foolish a remark may be, our laws and statutes provide a penalty, but that penalty is not death. The penalty of death, the penalty of lynching, can only be advocated by savages, by men who have lost all sense of right and wrong, and a Member of Congress should be the last person in the world to attempt to condone the infamous crime of lynching.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Did not this more or less mad man know that when he went one bit further each night he most certainly would bring serious consequence upon himself if he abused and defamed the soldiers of the United States?

Mr. LONDON. I do not know whether that man was mad.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. I say he was a half-mad man.

Mr. LONDON. I do know that the men who commit the crime of lynching are criminals, are a dastardly crowd, whether they consist of business men, corporation lawyers, or other tools of a corporation.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield.

Mr. LONDON. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. I would like to have the gentleman's opinion, while he is on this subject of lynching, of the proclamations of the governor of Illinois, of the governor of Minnesota, and the governor of Wisconsin recently withdrawing the right to peaceable assembly from citizens in those States.

Mr. LONDON. These gentlemen have suspended not only the Constitution, not only common sense, but they have suspended the decalogue. They have suspended every law of reason. Here we have this illustration of a Member of Congress trying to justify lynching on the floor of the House.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Oh, I beg the gentleman's pardon. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. No; I shall not yield any more.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. The gentleman must not charge me with defending that crime. I am saying that he knew what the consequence would be. This man defamed the soldiers, and he knew what the consequence would be, and if he got it he knew he was going to get it.

Mr. LONDON. Why, I tell you I can rightly say that the gentleman is an advocate of lynching.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. No; I am not.

Mr. LONDON. And I am quite sure the lumber interests of the State of Washington approve the attitude of the gentleman from Washington.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question.

Mr. LONDON. No; I shall not yield any more.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. LONDON. Nothing seems to be easier than to designate men as I. W. W.'s in order to put them outside of the protection of the law. It is the easiest thing now for corporations to suppress efforts of workers to improve their condition by denouncing their leaders as I. W. W.'s. Pleading for world democracy, we

have permitted a state of affairs where dozens of women are imprisoned right here within the shadow of the White House, where they are subjected to every sort of oppression. I know that the average American revolts against cruel treatment of a woman, but it is war psychology, and we are all more or less war mad, and we tolerate these things. I hope the President of the United States will do the gracious thing at the close of this session of Congress and open the doors of the prison for these women, who have suffered more than they bargained for. That is not a popular statement, I know.

Appealing to the social democracy of Germany to organize a revolution in Germany so as to save the world, we are suppressing socialist literature in this country. With the so-called espionage act as a pretext, they have suppressed a number of newspapers. We have made the Postmaster General the main reservoir of wisdom in the United States. We have made every assistant district attorney an expert upon internationalism, politics, economics, and the guardian of the people's liberties.

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONDON. No; I will not yield. We are destroying the freedom of the press. Mind you, in Europe, in every country, there is the fullest possible discussion of international relations.

In France cabinet after cabinet fell. In England there is not a man now in the Government who was there at the beginning of the war. The same, to a great extent, is true in Germany and in Austria. In Russia there was a revolution. Everywhere the people were permitted to talk, to discuss, to argue, to analyze, to scrutinize, to ask questions, to dream aloud, but here, in the name of democracy, we prevent them from discussing international relations. Here the Postmaster General is chief regulator of thought. War psychology, going mad. If the war lasts long enough, we may be justified in becoming mad, but it is too early now I respectfully submit.

The attempt to stifle the Socialist press is particularly inexcusable when one considers the importance of the Socialist movement as a permanent factor for international peace. In all countries of the world they have been, and are now, the foremost champions of an enduring peace.

The refusal by the Government of the belligerent nations to permit the holding of the International Socialist Conference at Stockholm was a blunder for which the full price has not yet been paid.

Nothing had such a demoralizing effect upon the democratized army of Russia than this refusal.

The program of the German Socialist minority which appears in a special cable to the New York Times of July 10, 1917, and which had been submitted to the Dutch-Scandinavian committee at Stockholm in advance of the conference, the holding of which was subsequently prevented, shows clearly the Socialist program for international peace. I give it in full:

In its peace views, as in its general policy, the German Independent Social Democratic Party proceeds from the common interests of the international proletariat and development of society. These interests demand immediate peace.

In the peace to be concluded we demand an international arrangement for general disarmament as being the chief means for strengthening the debilitated States. General disarmament is the only way to break any militarist supremacy and to obtain a lasting and peaceful understanding between the nations.

We demand the fullest freedom for international trade and intercourse, as well as the unlimited right of migration. We condemn all economic barriers and all economic struggles between States. All disputes between States must be settled by compulsory international arbitration.

We demand international treaties to make workers secure against impoverishment, especially as to women and children.

Political rights for women we regard as a social necessity. Equal rights should be granted to all the inhabitants of every country without regard to tongue, race, or religion. This would also mean securing to national minorities the right to declare their national life.

National and social liberation can not be achieved by the Governments at war; it can only be done by democracy. Democratic control of foreign policies will prevent aggressive measures. Secret treaties must be abolished, and all State treaties must be made dependent upon the assent of parliaments.

Though not regarding State boundaries as inviolable, we condemn the war and its prolongation as a means of regulating boundaries. Regulation of frontiers must be conditional upon the assent of the populations concerned and not an act of force. With all firmness we object to the violation of any nation in any form.

From the beginning of the war we have consistently demanded peace without annexations or indemnities, based upon material self-government.

It is not our affair to draw up a program covering all the questions to be dealt with in the peace settlement, but in regard to the questions raised in the discussions now going on we declare the following:

Reestablishment of Serbia as a self-governing and independent State is our absolute demand. The uniting of the Serbs in a single national State, and its combination with the other Balkan States in a republican Balkan federation we regard as the best way of removing the Eastern question as a cause of war.

To admit the right of Russian Poland to national independence but to deny that same right to Prussian and Austrian Poland is contradictory.

We condemn the prolongation of the war as a means of settling the question of Alsace-Lorraine. The population of Alsace-Lorraine, which in 1871 was annexed against its will, can obtain peace no sooner than by a direct and free vote to express its wish as to what State it shall belong.

The full independence and economic self-dependence—that is, freedom from economic interference—of Belgium is inevitable. In fulfillment of the German Government's promise at the beginning of the war the Belgian nation has to be compensated for the damage caused by the war, and especially for the economic values that have been taken away. Such repayment has nothing to do with various kinds of indemnities which simply mean the plundering of the vanquished by the victor, and which we therefore reject.

As opponents of any policy of conquest and foreign dominion, we reject, as we have always done, the policy of colonial conquest. Possession of any colony without its own self-administration is nothing else than possession of an unfree people, and, like slavery, is incompatible with our principles.

A peace treaty would be made secure only when there was a single international force to watch over it. We do not regard international government officials as such a force, but rather the international Socialist proletariat. Only when an international (force) is erected, independent and powerful, and the proletariat everywhere lends it its full force through keeping control over the governments and maintaining peace, will there come in the future a state of mutual confidence between the nations instead of a contest in armaments.

The proletariat in every country must now do its all to bring the war to an end. To attain this aim the independence of the Socialist Parties in relation to their imperial governments must be presupposed. Every government must be challenged to give unconditional adhesion to an international peace program. Credits are to be refused to any government which refuses this program or answers evasively or does not declare itself ready to enter upon peace conversations on the basis of this program. Such a Government must be fought in the sharpest manner.

The world will yet hear from the Socialists.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. LONDON. Mr. Speaker, I think I have leave to extend my remarks, which has been previously granted.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LONDON. Leave was granted before.

ENROLLED BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills and joint resolution of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 5723. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4897. An act to provide for the promotion of first lieutenants in the Regular Army and National Guard to the grade of captain and respecting the Dental Corps of the Army and medical and dental students, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5833. An act granting six months' pay to Ida Cottrell Hodgson, widow of Frederick Grady Hodgson, deceased, colonel, United States Army, retired; and

H. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution authorizing the expenditure of money upon lands purchased for use of the Ordnance Department of the Army without reference to section 355 of the Revised Statutes.

BILLS, ETC., PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that this day they had presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H. R. 4897. An act to provide for the promotion of first lieutenants in the Regular Army and National Guard to the grade of captain and respecting the Dental Corps of the Army and medical and dental students, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5723. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5646. An act to amend section 1585 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

H. R. 5648. An act to establish certain new ratings in the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5918. An act to authorize the President to organize provisionally as Field Artillery or Infantry, and to use as Field Artillery or Infantry during the existing emergency, such regiments of Cavalry as he may designate; and

H. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution authorizing the expenditure of money upon lands purchased for use of the Ordnance Department of the Army without reference to section 355 of the Revised Statutes.

PRINTING REVENUE LAWS AS A DOCUMENT.

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following concurrent resolution and ask its adoption.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the resolution.
The Clerk read as follows:

House concurrent resolution 26.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed as one document the following three revenue laws: The act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes, approved September 8, 1916; the act to provide increased revenue to defray the expenses of increased appropriations for the Army and Navy and the extensions of fortifications, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1917; and the act to provide revenue to defray war expenses, and for other purposes, approved October 3, 1917, of which 40,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 60,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, the apportionment of the House of Representatives to be distributed through the folding room.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of this concurrent resolution?

Mr. FITZGERALD. Where does it come from?

Mr. BROWNING. Mr. Speaker, I would tell the gentleman from New York that Mr. KITCHIN and myself have been discussing the question for several days. The gentleman from North Carolina has not had an opportunity to prepare the resolution, and he asked me to do so.

Mr. KITCHIN. I hope there will be no objection.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What are included in these?

Mr. KITCHIN. The three revenue bills.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Tulley, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment the following resolution:

House concurrent resolution 26.

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring), That there be printed as one document the following three revenue laws: The act to increase the revenue, and for other purposes, approved September 8, 1916; the act to provide increased revenues to defray the expenses of increased appropriations for the Army and Navy and the extensions of fortifications, and for other purposes, approved March 3, 1917; and the act to provide revenues to defray war expenses, and for other purposes, approved October 3, 1917, of which 40,000 copies shall be for the use of the Senate and 60,000 copies for the use of the House of Representatives, the apportionment of the House of Representatives to be distributed through the folding room.

LIABILITY OF ALIENS TO MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass House joint resolution 115, which I send to the Clerk's desk, and ask unanimous consent that the preamble, which has been stricken out by the Committee on Foreign Affairs before reporting to the House, be omitted in the reading.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the resolution, leaving out the preamble, which was stricken out by the committee.

The Clerk read as follows:

Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 115) requesting the Secretary of State to open diplomatic negotiations with certain Governments with a view to obtaining their approval and sanction for action by the United States permitting the inclusion in the armed forces of the United States of such citizens of the countries of such Governments as are within the United States.

Resolved, etc., That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested to open diplomatic negotiations with the Governments of the several countries at war with a country with which the United States is at war with a view to obtaining their approval and sanction for action by the United States looking to the imposition upon such citizens of those countries as are within the United States of the liability to and performance of military service in the armed forces of the United States during the continuance of the present war between the United States and Germany, and to report to the Congress of the United States as soon as practicable the result of such negotiations.

The SPEAKER. Is a second demanded?

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I demand a second.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that a second be considered as ordered.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio objects, and the Chair appoints the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] and the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] as tellers.

The House divided, and the tellers reported there were—ayes 58, noes 0.

So a second was ordered.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. STAFFORD. This resolution as introduced contains various whereases.

The SPEAKER. They have been stricken out.

Mr. STAFFORD. As reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs it strikes those out. Whatever action we take in the House on the committee amendments I assume the bill as read is the bill under consideration. My inquiry is, Is the motion of the gentleman from Massachusetts merely to suspend the rules

and pass the bill as reported from the committee?

The SPEAKER. It is to suspend the rules and pass the matter which has just been read by the Clerk. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 20 minutes and the gentleman from Ohio has 20 minutes.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, this resolution calls upon the Secretary of State to open diplomatic negotiations with the Governments of the allies, with a view to the inclusion of their subjects who are in this country in the armed forces of the United States. The so-called Chamberlain bill, Senate joint resolution 84, which passed the Senate early last month, was a much more drastic proposal than this. The Chamberlain bill looks to the inclusion in our armies of all subjects of all countries other than enemy countries except in the event that treaty rights protect them from the obligation to render such service. That bill after being passed by the Senate came before the House Committee on Military Affairs. The Secretary of State appeared before the committee about 10 days or two weeks ago and in a very forceful statement, which is now available to the Members, gave as his opinion that the passage of the Chamberlain bill might easily involve the United States in very serious diplomatic difficulties. He called attention especially to the unwisdom of legislating so as to include in our armies subjects of neutral countries.

I remember that he used this expression that "our relations with neutral countries are not precarious but are irritating." And the clear import of his statement before the committee was that the passage of the Chamberlain bill would seriously embarrass the State Department in its negotiations with foreign powers and in its handling of international matters. Under those circumstances the Committee on Military Affairs unanimously voted to take no affirmative action upon the Chamberlain bill at this time. That is the status of the alien-slacker situation in so far as the Chamberlain phase of the legislation is concerned.

Mr. GORDON. The action of the committee, I will say to the gentleman, was a little bit broader than he states. You heard the testimony of the Secretary of State before our committee, did you not?

Mr. ROGERS. I did.

Mr. GORDON. And did he not say in that statement which he made that no legislation upon the subject of drafting aliens was desired by the State Department at this time?

Mr. ROGERS. I do not recall that he made that broad statement.

Mr. GORDON. I recall it very distinctly.

Mr. ROGERS. His appearance before your committee was limited to the Chamberlain resolution, on which he had been summoned to appear.

Mr. FIELDS. If the gentleman will yield, I want to say that the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] is absolutely correct in his statement of what the Secretary of State said.

Mr. ROGERS. Of course the gentleman from Ohio and the gentleman from Kentucky were both present, and they know the situation from their point of view as well as I know it from mine. But bear in mind that Mr. Secretary Lansing was appearing before the committee only on the Chamberlain resolution.

On the 1st day of August the House Committee on Foreign Affairs had favorably and unanimously reported a resolution in the exact form which was just read at the Clerk's desk, and which I have now moved to be passed under suspension of the rules. That precise resolution had been indorsed by the Acting Secretary of State, Mr. Polk, in a formal communication which he sent to Mr. Flood, the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Affairs. I will read that letter:

DEPARTMENT OF STATE,
Washington, July 28, 1917.

MY DEAR MR. FLOOD: Referring to your letter of July 16 in regard to H. J. Res. 115, introduced in the House by Mr. ROGERS, and to the department's telephone communication to your clerk of July 25 to the effect that this resolution, together with other bills on the same subject, had been laid before the President for his consideration, I beg now to advise you that the President informs me that of the bills before the Congress relating to the enlistment or drafting of alien residents in the United States H. J. Res. 115 (or S. J. Res. 83, which appears to be identical) seems to him most appropriate in the circumstances, as, in his opinion, the matter is properly a subject for negotiation with the countries concerned.

Very sincerely, yours,

FRANK L. POLK.

HON. HENRY D. FLOOD,
House of Representatives.

In that letter we have not only the explicit approval of this precise resolution from the Acting Secretary of State in a formal communication, but also the approval of the President of the United States. After the hearing of Mr. Secretary Lansing before the Committee on Military Affairs, to which allusion has been made, I sought an interview at which both Mr. Lansing and

Mr. Polk, who had written this letter as Acting Secretary of State, were present. They authorized me to state that they had no objection whatever to the passage of this resolution. If any gentleman in this House doubts that statement, I ask him to go to the telephone, call up either of those gentlemen, and be convinced for himself.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. Will the gentleman permit an interruption?

Mr. ROGERS. Yes.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. This resolution, in fact, declares by Congress the very thing that the Secretary of State has assured us he is doing. Is that the fact?

Mr. ROGERS. I think that is a fair statement, and I think the only objection to this resolution which can possibly be advanced is that it is not especially important, because substantially what will happen if it is passed will happen if it is not passed.

Mr. SHALLENBERGER. But it does not contravene in any way the work of the department? In other words, it does not bother them in their work?

Mr. ROGERS. If it does anything at all it strengthens the hands of the department in negotiating with the friendly nations for the inclusion of their citizens in the Army of the United States.

Now, let us see what this resolution does, and its passage is of great consequence. I think the suggestion made by the gentleman from Nebraska [Mr. SHALLENBERGER] is important. The resolution enables the State Department to proceed with its negotiations with the full knowledge that the House of Representatives is in accord with these negotiations. That will be important. Why? The Secretary of State told the Committee on Military Affairs that the results of these negotiations with the friendly countries would probably be successful, and that they would probably require an amendment of the draft law so as to take advantage of the arrangements thus made. If that is true—

Mr. GORDON. May I interrupt the gentleman?

Mr. ROGERS. I can not yield just now. The gentleman has 20 minutes.

And if that is true, the enabling amendment to the draft law will be necessarily passed by both branches of Congress. I submit, therefore, that it is of consequent importance that the Secretary of State should know that the House of Representatives is in harmony with the action which he is taking and will take in order that he may feel himself empowered to proceed with the full knowledge that his action will probably have the approval of the House of Representatives.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. Certainly.

Mr. MADDEN. Is not the Secretary of State, as a matter of fact, doing now what the resolution of the gentleman proposes that he shall do?

Mr. ROGERS. The Secretary of State is doing it in a measure now. I understand that he has been proceeding for over two months in a somewhat general way. The gentleman from Illinois comes from a great State that has a great alien population. The alien-slacker injustice is not a thing that can go on forever. I think the House of Representatives ought to show that it has an interest in remedying it. There is an enormous growing call on the part of many of the States and many of the sections of this country for legislation of this sort.

In deference to the wishes of the Secretary of State the Committee on Military Affairs has reported no legislation "with teeth in it." But is the House to remain silent? Is the House to adjourn sine die this afternoon without showing the slightest appreciation of the importance of this problem and its anxiety to cope with it as best it can? It may be that we can not go very far. But, Mr. Speaker, I insist that in honor to ourselves and to the sections of the country which are aroused over the manifest unfairness to our own citizens resultant upon the general exemption of aliens, we ought to go as far as we honorably and patriotically can.

Here we have a measure which has the approval of the President, which has the approval of the Secretary of State, which has the approval of the Acting Secretary of State, which has been unanimously reported by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and which certainly can not be objected to on any conceivable ground. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman reserves 10 minutes.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, the most that can be claimed for this joint resolution is that it does not amount to anything. [Laughter.] That is, it is not effective; it simply requests the President of the United States to negotiate about drafting

aliens into our Army; and of course that involves the drafting of American citizens into foreign armies.

Now, I do not know, but the only practical result of the adoption of the resolution, I suppose, is that it will be used for home consumption with the electorate. But the Secretary of State testified before our committee that he was doing the very thing that this resolution asked him to do, and he stated very distinctly to the Committee on Military Affairs that no legislation on the subject of drafting aliens was necessary or desired at this time.

Now, I have very strong views myself on the subject of drafting aliens. I do not believe you have any right to do it. Every Secretary of State, including James G. Blaine, Thomas F. Bayard, and men like them, have notified foreign Governments in every single instance where there was a controversy, that under no circumstances would this Nation permit foreign nations to draft American citizens into their military service.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. ROGERS. Do I gather that the gentleman would not be in favor of including allied aliens in our armies, even if those countries specifically by treaty authorized their inclusion?

Mr. GORDON. No; I would not.

Mr. ROGERS. You would not approve of including them even if the countries were quite willing to have them included?

Mr. GORDON. Certainly not. What are you going to do with the political refugee that left one of those countries because he did not like their form of government, who came over here and has not been naturalized? Are you going to conscript them into the military service? What are you going to do with other foreigners who apply for naturalization and can not meet some educational test that we impose? Down in my country they are imposing very strict conditions on the naturalization of aliens, and I think there ought to be proper conditions imposed. Are you going to conscript a man into our military service who is an alien, and who tried to become a citizen and could not? Of course the aliens are like the Indians, not taxed, and minors, who have no votes, and therefore the demand is to force them into the Army. [Laughter.]

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. What did the Secretary of State say to the Committee on Military Affairs on this subject as to the power of Congress?

Mr. GORDON. He said Congress had no power to conscript an alien into the military service. That is what he said, and of course he is right about that.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Does not this resolution recognize that fact?

Mr. GORDON. No; it denies it. That is my objection to it. If you already have any lawful authority to conscript them into the military service, why do you want to have the Secretary of State get the consent of some potentate in Europe to do it? That is my objection to it.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Is it not the function of the Secretary of State to negotiate treaties with our allies, so that the aliens of those countries who are slackers here can be mustered into the American Army?

Mr. GORDON. There may be American slackers in those countries. Would you allow an American citizen to be conscripted in a foreign army?

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. Yes—to be fighting alongside of my son.

Mr. GORDON. He would not be fighting alongside of your son. He would be fighting alongside of foreigners.

Mr. CAMPBELL of Kansas. He would be fighting in the same cause.

Mr. GORDON. I do not think you have considered this question.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Suppose an American citizen has gone into one of these allied countries to avoid fighting in the American Army. Would you object to his being compelled to fight in the French Army or in the English Army?

Mr. GORDON. I would object to any American citizen being conscripted to fight in a foreign army on the same ground that Secretary Bayard and Secretary Blaine put it. That is what the War of 1812 was fought about.

Mr. FITZGERALD. That was a different situation. Here we are compelling our young men to fight.

Mr. GORDON. Do not blame that on me. [Laughter.]

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am not blaming it on you.

Mr. GORDON. Very well.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I am sincere in asking the question. Suppose some of our citizens who would be eligible under the draft law, in order to avoid being drafted should go to Canada or to France or to England?

Do you not think it would be proper for this country to consent that in order to prevent their escaping their obligations to the country, if they were unwilling to fight alongside of their own fellow citizens, under the flag of their own country, they should be compelled to fight in a common cause for their country under an alien flag, with aliens? [Applause.]

Mr. GORDON. Here is my answer to that: I would consent to legislation which would bring those men back here to perform the obligations which the law has imposed upon them.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I would make them fight under some other flag for the same purpose. I would not want to compel them to come back and fight under their own flag.

Mr. GORDON. Of course you are getting into deep water when you undertake to pass a law authorizing foreign Governments to impose compulsory military service upon American citizens. You are establishing an exceedingly dangerous precedent, and one that will arise to confront you forever after, and the Secretary of State said that in substance before our committee.

Mr. PLATT. I want to know if the gentleman was not opposed to the drafting of American citizens into our own Army?

Mr. GORDON. Of course I was.

Mr. PLATT. That is the whole thing.

Mr. GORDON. Being opposed to drafting them into our own Army, I certainly would not favor legislation that would permit them to be drafted into a foreign army.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Is not the solution of the problem this, to give them a chance to fight in this Army or go home where they belong?

Mr. GORDON. Of course gentlemen can solve this question offhand here without difficulty. You have an unquestioned and an undoubted legal right to expel from the United States, under certain limitations, aliens domiciled in the United States. That you have a legal right to do. But our Government protested at one time very strongly to the Russian Government because it expelled an American citizen who was resident in Russia, and did not give him an opportunity to close up his affairs, but required him to leave the country rather suddenly. Now, what situation have you here? You pass a law which will expel European aliens from the United States. You are driving them right across this submarine zone. They can not be conveyed. We have no means of providing a convoy for them. I do not think under international law you have a moral right to drive those men across the sea at a time like this without affording them any protection.

Mr. MAGEE. I want to ask the gentleman a question for information.

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. MAGEE. Aliens, as I understand it, under the selective-draft act, have been included in the quotas of the different cities in the country.

Mr. GORDON. Yes; unfortunately they have, in many States.

Mr. MAGEE. And the population of many of those cities has been greatly overestimated.

Mr. GORDON. Yes; that is true.

Mr. MAGEE. The population of my home city of Syracuse was estimated, I think, at 197,000, while the actual population is about 157,000.

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. MAGEE. Now, I will ask the gentleman if, in the quota drafted under the selective-draft act, those aliens have not been eliminated?

Mr. GORDON. No; they have not. That is the great injustice of the operation of this law as it is executed. There ought to be legislation that would base military service upon the population liable to military service.

Mr. MAGEE. Perhaps the gentleman did not understand me. They have been counted in making up the quotas.

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. MAGEE. But when the men are actually called, as I understand it, the aliens are eliminated from the call.

Mr. GORDON. Of course. They are exempt under international law. You can not lawfully conscript an alien into the military service of the United States.

Mr. MAGEE. Now, the point I call attention to is this: It seems to me it is a great injustice first to overestimate the population of a city, then to include in the quota of that city the aliens, and then when the call is made, to exclude them from the quota; because in many manufacturing cities like my own city most of the American boys are called.

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. MAGEE. The result being that the aliens are left at home, because they have not been included in the draft.

Mr. GORDON. No.

Mr. MAGEE. And they take the places of our boys who are sent abroad.

Mr. GORDON. For you have no lawful authority to force aliens into the military service. But that being so, would you include them, anyway?

Mr. MAGEE. That is what I think we ought to do, to give an expression of our opinion in accordance with the resolution of the gentleman from Massachusetts, and place ourselves on record upon this subject. [Applause in the galleries.]

The SPEAKER. The people in the galleries are here as the guests of the House. It is against the rule for them to display their assent or dissent by applause or otherwise, and if there is any more of it the Chair will have the galleries cleared.

Mr. GORDON. The last question propounded here would seem to indicate that all this resolution is wanted for is just for home consumption. I look upon it as a more serious matter than that. When the Congress of the United States requests the President to enter into negotiations with a foreign nation, with a view to drafting aliens, of course those negotiations would include drafting American citizens in those countries. I take it that no American administration would have the impudence to ask a foreign Government to permit this Government to draft their citizens and subjects into our military service, without at the same time offering to allow our citizens to be conscripted into their military service.

Mr. ROBBINS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. ROBBINS. Does not the gentleman know that there are no more Americans over in Europe; or if there are any, this country has offered the money to pay their way home? And if they are there under those conditions, they ought to be forced into those armies if they do not come home?

Mr. GORDON. Forced into foreign armies?

Mr. ROBBINS. What protection are they entitled to? They are not native Americans?

Mr. GORDON. That is the gentleman's opinion. I do not agree with him. We have American citizens domiciled in various countries, representing business concerns in the United States. They are over there on business.

Mr. ROBBINS. Does the gentleman know of any such?

Mr. GORDON. Plenty of them. I do not know of a foreign nation, that has any civilization, in which there are no representatives of American business concerns.

Mr. ROBBINS. I am speaking only of those with whom we are at war.

Mr. GORDON. Well, nobody proposes to draft our enemies into the military service; no sane man would seriously consider doing that. You would not want to draft the nonnaturalized Germans into our service, would you?

Mr. ROBBINS. There are American citizens residing in Germany.

Mr. GORDON. One of the principal grievances of the civilized world against Germany is that they have conscripted Belgians for nonmilitary service. I do not want any conscripted aliens in our Army. Personally I do not want anybody but American citizens in the American Army, unless they come in voluntarily.

Gentlemen seem to think that the way to make an army is by machinery. It is all involved in the draft, which a good many gentlemen regret that they ever voted for. They think you can make an army out of aliens, even our alien enemies. Well, you would have a strange mixture of men fighting for this country if you did it. There has been a tremendous amount of misinformation disseminated through Congress on this subject. They say the aliens are here, and they ought to fight for the flag. What flag? An alien does not owe any allegiance to the American flag. An alien has no such obligation as a citizen of this country has.

Mr. DALLINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. DALLINGER. Does the gentleman from Ohio think these men ought to enjoy the privileges of an American citizen, have all their protection at the expense of the public, and not take the responsibilities and burdens that go with it?

Mr. GORDON. That illustrates the very point I want to make. Of course, I do not believe that aliens should enjoy all the privileges of an American citizen, and, as a matter of fact, they do not enjoy any privileges peculiar to the citizenship of the United States.

Mr. DALLINGER. Will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. DALLINGER. Do not they enjoy every privilege except that of voting?

Mr. GORDON. No; they have no privilege of citizenship. Of course they pay taxes, and they are allowed to live here, but they can not sue in your courts on many questions.

Mr. DALLINGER. Oh, yes.

Mr. GORDON. Is that so? Mr. Speaker, there is unquestionably a very great need of instruction in this House before we legislate upon this subject. [Laughter.] Let me call your attention to the fact that the only way you can put aliens in the military service and keep them there is because they can only appeal to this Government through their own governments. They can not appeal as individuals because the Government will not recognize them, and in many cases the courts are closed to them.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. Does the gentleman favor legislation authorizing or permitting a foreign nation, through their properly accredited military representative, to come over here and draft the aliens into the foreign army?

Mr. GORDON. Unquestionably. Although I voted against the draft law, the fact that we passed it would seem to me to justify or require such legislation. As a matter of fact, we have passed legislation along that line.

Mr. WALSH. It does not permit a draft, it permits recruiting.

Mr. GORDON. I do not know as I would allow them to be drafted.

Mr. WALSH. What is the gentleman's objection to drafting them?

Mr. GORDON. I will tell you. Some of them are not subject to draft at home. They come to this country and they are aliens. Now, are we going to authorize a draft of those aliens when they are here by our permission? An alien can only come into a foreign country by permission, and every alien is here by the express authority of this Government. Now, that would be a funny way to treat a guest, to undertake to conscript him into the military service when his own country does not do it.

Gentlemen forget the obligations that we owe to these people who are here. I do not believe that we have any moral right to drive these people back across the submarine zone and subject them to the risk and hazard of losing their lives.

Mr. WALSH. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. WALSH. The gentleman is perfectly willing to have American citizens subjected to that danger of the submarine zone.

Mr. GORDON. No, sir.

Mr. WALSH. He prefers that they should encounter the danger, while aliens shall stay here in peace and quietness.

Mr. GORDON. The gentleman is mistaken; there is no analogy between the two cases. Aliens in the United States are here by permission of this Government. We have an unquestioned legal right to expel them from the country, but we should exercise that right with due regard to the circumstances and conditions, exactly as we contended that the Russian Government should exercise it in reference to American citizens. You talk about aliens fighting our battles; why should aliens fight the battles of a country of which they are not citizens?

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GORDON. Yes.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. The gentleman speaks about the duty that we owe aliens. Does he think that we owe them any further or greater duty than we owe to our own people?

Mr. GORDON. We owe to them a different duty than we do to our own citizens.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. Does the gentleman think we owe a duty to protect them more than we do our own citizens?

Mr. GORDON. No; we do not owe them so much.

Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois. If they live in this country, should they not be subject to the same law of conscription as our own people?

Mr. GORDON. Certainly not, and for this reason: They are under no obligation to fight for the United States. A man who is not a citizen of this country is not under any legal obligations to take up arms in prosecuting its wars. There is no civilized country on the face of this earth that ever contended it could

demand and require military service from the citizens of other countries.

The only reason for which I rose to discuss this bill, Mr. Speaker, is because I want to appeal to the membership of this House during the coming vacation to consider carefully the question that has been discussed here since this joint resolution has been under consideration.

A great many men have said hastily that of course aliens have the rights and privileges here and ought to be required to perform the same duties for the country that citizens do. That statement, when made by an intelligent person, of course is made without due consideration. Aliens are under no such obligations as citizens. We went to war with Great Britain in 1812 because she insisted upon conscripting in her navy former Englishmen. England based her contention upon the doctrine, once an Englishman always an Englishman, and that they could not expatriate themselves. That was the main reason for the War of 1812. If you will read the dispatches in the archives of the State Department upon this subject, you will find that such Secretaries of State as Thomas F. Bayard and James G. Blaine have thundered against the proposition that any foreign country could ever lay hands upon an American citizen and put him into their military service.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

REPORT OF THE COMMITTEE TO WAIT ON THE PRESIDENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, your committee appointed to wait upon the President and inform him that the House was ready to adjourn, and ask him if he had any further communication to make, have, in company with a like committee on the part of the Senate, performed their duty. The President directs us to inform the House that he has no further communications to make.

THE WORK OF CONGRESS.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, the President of the United States has given out a statement about the work of Congress at this session, and I ask unanimous consent that it may be read at this time.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent that a statement of the President about the work of Congress be now read. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

STATEMENT BY THE PRESIDENT.

OCTOBER 6, 1917.

The Sixty-fifth Congress, now adjourning, deserves the gratitude and appreciation of a people whose will and purpose I believe it has faithfully expressed. One can not examine the record of its action without being impressed by its completeness, its courage, and its full comprehension of a great task. The needs of the Army and the Navy have been met in a way that assures the effectiveness of American arms, and the war-making branch of the Government has been abundantly equipped with the powers that were necessary to make the action of the Nation effective.

I believe that it has also in equal degree, and as far as possible in the face of war, safeguarded the rights of the people and kept in mind the considerations of social justice so often obscured in the hasty readjustments of such a crisis.

It seems to me that the work of this remarkable session has not only been done thoroughly but that it has also been done with the utmost dispatch possible in the circumstances or consistent with a full consideration of the exceedingly critical matters dealt with. Best of all, it has left no doubt as to the spirit and determination of the country, but has affirmed them as loyally and as emphatically as our fine soldiers will affirm them on the firing line.

LIABILITY OF ALIENS TO MILITARY SERVICE.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. ROBBINS].

Mr. ROBBINS. Mr. Speaker, in the limited time given me I desire to call attention to the situation that exists in my own county of Westmoreland, Pa. There we have 26,940 men registered for military service under the selective-draft law, and of these 9,570 claimed the right to exemption upon the ground that they are aliens. More than 33 per cent of the population of my district, therefore, will escape military duty because they are foreign born and have not taken out naturalization papers; but an investigation by the sheriff and the exemption board showed that more than about 95 per cent of these men have been here the required length of time and could have taken out citizenship papers if they had so desired. That indicates that these men are living in our country, not, as the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON] says, without the right to acquire and own property, but, on the contrary, they have every right that an American citizen has to own and acquire and sell property, and they are to-day standing on the streets when our men are marching off to war, and are smilingly saying that they are going to get the jobs of the young American men who are going to war. This is an outrage upon American citizens, and it is up to this Congress to pass some law to remedy that evil.

Mr. Speaker, there has been a bill introduced for consideration known as H. R. 5667, reported from the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization, entitled "A bill to provide for the deportation of certain aliens, and for other purposes," one that is exceedingly important and should be considered and either enacted in the form it is presented by the House committee or else amended and passed.

It appears that this bill aims at an existing evil, which is exceedingly pressing throughout the country. Under the selective-draft law, which is entitled "An act to authorize the President to increase temporarily the Military Establishment of the United States," which was approved on the 18th of May, 1917, it is provided in section 3 as follows:

Third. To raise by draft as herein provided, organize, and equip an additional force of 500,000 enlisted men, or such part or parts thereof as he may at any time deem necessary, and to provide the necessary officers, line and staff, etc.

And by section 2:

Such draft as herein provided shall be based upon liability to military service of all male citizens or male persons not alien enemies who have declared their intention to become citizens, between the ages of 21 and 30 years, both inclusive, and shall take place and be maintained under such regulations as the President may prescribe not inconsistent with the terms of this act. Quotas for the several States, Territories, and the District of Columbia, or subdivisions thereof, shall be determined in proportion to the population thereof, and credit shall be given to any State, Territory, District, or subdivision thereof for the number of men who were in the military service of the United States as members of the National Guard on April 1, 1917, or who have since said date entered the military service of the United States from any such State, Territory, District, or subdivision, either as members of the Regular Army or the National Guard.

Under this section of the bill unnaturalized residents of the United States are exempt from the selective draft, and while the quota of the number of soldiers to be furnished is based on the population, which includes aliens, yet when it comes to furnishing the actual soldiers, these aliens escape responsibility and the burden falls upon the native and naturalized Americans. That this process of selection and this method of assigning quotas to the several States and subdivisions thereof is unfair is apparent from an examination of the law; but a concrete statement from my own district, composed of the counties of Westmoreland and Butler, Pa., will demonstrate the unfairness of the application of the selective-draft law.

In the county of Westmoreland, Pa., there were registered on June 5, 1917, 26,940 men within the military age eligible to the selective draft, made up as follows:

White male citizens.....	16,789
Black male citizens.....	485
Total.....	17,274
White male aliens.....	9,570
Alien enemies.....	96
Total.....	9,666

Of these aliens 40 per cent are subjects of Austria, with whom we are not at war. Thus in my native county more than 35 per cent of the registered male citizens subject to military duty under the selective-draft law are exempt and the quota must be filled, not from 26,940, but from 17,274 men, which imposes a great burden on the native and naturalized Americans.

In Butler County there were 1,626 aliens within the military age not subject to draft. These aliens, most of them having resided in the United States the required length of time to become citizens, had they taken out their papers when they were first eligible to do so, would have been citizens of the United States, but the majority of them do not intend to take out naturalization papers. They believe by not becoming citizens, and not voting, that they escape the burdens of taxation, which they do, and they prefer that situation to the duties, obligations, and pleasures of citizenship.

That such conditions can not be tolerated and allowed to exist is very plain to every patriotic American citizen, and it is the duty of this Congress to remedy this unbearable situation.

This has resulted in great dissatisfaction among the Americans who have been drafted, all over the country, and it is only the belief that Congress will correct it that has kept down the feeling that is so strong against this inequality of the burdens imposed upon American citizens by the selective-draft law.

This resolution is entitled:

Joint resolution requesting the Secretary of State to open diplomatic negotiations with certain Governments with a view to obtaining their approval and sanction for action by the United States permitting the inclusion in the armed forces of the United States of such citizens of the countries of such Governments as are within the United States.

It is now asserted that it ought not to pass because the Secretary of State is negotiating with foreign countries to correct this situation. The bill above referred to was reported on the

4th of August, over two months ago, and so far as we are now advised, the State Department has made no noticeable progress toward solving this difficulty.

The objection that is made against this resolution is that it will interfere with treaty obligations, and that if we impress citizens of foreign nations with whom we are not at war and may even be our allies, into the military service of the United States, such nations might also impress our citizens residing within their territorial limits into their military service.

I think it should be admitted that the citizens of every country engaged in this war wherever they reside are entitled to take part in it and assume their fair share of its burdens. If they are not willing to fight under the American flag, they should be compelled to go back and fight in their own country and under their own flag, and alien enemies residing within the jurisdiction of the United States should be interned and compelled to earn their support in some civil employment, just as we seized the alien enemy ships of Germany when the United States declared war against Germany. This would be no hardship on the citizens of Italy, France, England, or Russia. They are our allies in this great war. They will be benefited by our winning this war, and they certainly should be compelled either to fight in the armies of the United States and commingle with our troops or be placed in separate regiments and commanded by separate officers of their own nationalities, over whom the American officers should exercise authority, or else they should be deported to their native country, to which they owe allegiance, so that such countries might impress them into the military service.

It is unfair to draft our own native American boys into the military service and to permit one-third of the men who are of the draft age and capable of rendering military service, and who reside within the United States, to escape by simply stating they are "not citizens." The effect of this has been to require two-thirds of the population to furnish the full quota of soldiers for the Army, and in some small communities every American has been taken and only foreigners remain. In other communities where a large per cent of the Americans have been taken the foreigners remain to fill their good positions and to enjoy the blessings of comfort and peace while the American boys fight the war.

This situation, created by the existing treaties, is intolerable. Mr. Speaker, the resolution only requests the Secretary of War to take up negotiations so that when we return here in December we can promptly pass a law, let us hope, in time for the next draft that will compel these "slacker aliens" to enter the armies of the United States and bear their full share of the burdens of this war.

A singular condition was disclosed by the various exemption boards throughout the country, who made examination into the facts, as to how many of these slacker foreigners are justly entitled to be exempted. That is, how many of them had been in the country long enough to become naturalized, if they had promptly applied to the courts for that purpose, and it has been disclosed that over 90 per cent have been here sufficient length of time. Therefore it is very apparent that these men are intentionally evading the duties of citizenship, and especially military service. I contend that no government is so impotent as to be required to permit this evil to be unchallenged and uncorrected.

The whole theory of the selective-draft law is that it will muster the entire strength of the Nation for military and industrial purposes; that the entire man power will be utilized for national defense between the ages of 21 and 31. But apply this law as it now stands and over one-third of the population escape all obligation, civil as well as military.

This situation has become acute, and has been accentuated and emphasized by the departure of the American boys for the training camps and permitting the foreigners to remain at home. The feeling is intensified, and it is only the belief that Congress will remedy this critical situation that has, in a measure, satisfied our people and lulled them into waiting for such congressional action.

Now, Mr. Speaker, it appears that the State Department has prevented the enactment of any law on this subject, and now opposition is raised to even the passage of this resolution, the purpose of which is only to strengthen the hands of the administration in taking up diplomatic negotiations to correct this evil; and we are compelled to go home to our constituents without having done anything and without any consolation to give them except the fact that the State Department is negotiating, or proposes to negotiate, as it presumably has been ever since war was declared, to correct this evil. For my part, I think this is unsatisfactory. I think this resolution should pass, and I think, further, that some law should have been enacted that would have permitted the United States to compel every alien resident of the United States, if a citizen of an ally country,

either to enter our armies or be deported, and every alien enemy to be either confined or compelled to enter some industrial pursuit where he would have been kept from plotting against or committing overt acts against the United States.

Mr. Speaker, it is unfair to permit foreigners to live in the United States, enjoy our free schools, acquire property, be employed and receive liberal wages, accumulate a competence, and yet escape all the obligations of government that are imposed upon our own citizens. Such conditions are simply intolerable.

International law does not require that any such burdens be imposed upon the United States, and we have a high authority to the effect that no such discrimination ought to be allowed in favor of aliens. I quote:

Since compulsory military service to a foreign country can always be avoided by timely departure from it, there appears to be no reason why, in itself, it should necessarily form any exception to the general rule that a government may, if it chooses, require the same support, whether personal or pecuniary, of aliens whom it permits to reside within its borders, as it requires of its own citizens. Discrimination against aliens is doubtless contrary to the trend of modern civilization, but there is no foundation in international law for requiring discrimination in their favor. (American Society of International Law, vol. 5, p. 223.)

This seems to be a fair statement of international law and it is founded on principles of equity and justice. It certainly would be no hardship to enforce this proposition against the alien residents of the United States at this time. It would subject them to the same burdens and duties that are now imposed by law upon our own citizens. In fact, Mr. Speaker, these foreigners ought not to expect to remain in the country and escape military service and by their presence create dissatisfaction among the people at home and discontent in the ranks of our soldiers at the front. In fact, I think it is most conducive to dissatisfaction in the ranks of our soldier boys to have them march away with a crowd of alien slackers standing along the streets witnessing their going, then know that they will turn back and fill their places in the industrial life.

Congress certainly has power to legislate for the "general welfare," and this seems to have been one of the grounds upon which the Supreme Court rested its decision in the following case:

The right to exclude or expel aliens, or any class of aliens, absolutely or upon certain conditions, in war or in peace, [is] an inherent and inalienable right of every sovereign and independent nation, essential to its safety, its independence, and its welfare. (Fong Yue Ting v. United States, 149 U. S., 698.)

During our Civil War foreigners fought in the armies of the United States with great distinction; in fact, whole regiments of German, Irish, and other nationalities were enlisted, and when the question was raised by the British Government their minister was instructed that—

There is no rule or principle of international law which prohibits the Government of any country from requiring aliens resident within its territories to serve in the militia or police of the country or to contribute to the support of such establishment.

These authorities go directly to the point that we have a legal right to impress foreign alien residents within our territory into the military service. The principle goes even further, Mr. Speaker, because we certainly have a right to expel a foreigner whose conduct makes him an undesirable resident, and we can enforce that authority at all times and against all nations. The right has been unchallenged, and ought to be accepted as settled law applicable to this situation. One further citation of authority, Mr. Speaker, is sufficient to sustain the soundness of this contention:

Treaties and declarations by which a Government stipulates for its citizens a right of sojourn, of acquiring real property, of carrying on an industry on foreign territory, ought not to be interpreted as involving a renunciation on the part of the other contracting power of its right to expel aliens whose conduct should make it desirable. (Diplomatic Protection of Citizens Abroad, Borchard, p. 49.)

Now, Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to further cite legal authorities to establish the soundness of the position that the United States, under existing law, has a right to impress these foreigners into the military service or to deport them out of the country, but we can apparently well do neither. Hence, it is necessary for us to legislate to correct this evil and compel some action that will relieve this critical situation. This resolution merely proposes to aid the State Department in its diplomatic negotiations.

We have already granted the right to our allies to come into the United States and establish recruiting stations, and, if possible, induce citizens of their country residing within the territory of the United States, who are not citizens, to volunteer in the military service of such allies. England alone has established such stations, but few have volunteered. Therefore it is apparent that some legislation must be immediately enacted to correct this evil and catch the alien slackers.

Mr. Speaker, we have come to a time in this war when legislation on this subject is imperative.

The laws of our country should be amended so that aliens, upon entering the United States, should be required to declare their intention, whether they are coming here for the purpose of permanent citizenship or merely a temporary residence. If for temporary residence they should be required to register, indicating the time and purpose of their stay in the United States. If for permanent residence they should be required to make such declaration, to obtain a knowledge of the English language and of our form of government, and at the expiration of a year should be examined, and if they prove undesirable they should be deported; if not, at the end of two years they should be required to take out naturalization papers, and at the end of five years to become full citizens; but after one year, if their residence is to be permanent, they should be liable to military service, the payment of taxes, and the other burdens of government such as is imposed upon citizens residing within the limits of the United States. This would impose no hardship upon foreigners who come in good faith to become citizens of this great Republic.

Mr. Speaker, for those who desire to come here and become part of us we still have a most earnest welcome. Our institutions, our country, and all of the liberties of our great freedom is theirs, merely for the coming here and becoming citizens of our country. No burdens will be imposed upon them that are not already carried by the native born or the naturalized. Political liberty, religious freedom, unbounded opportunity is open to them and to their children. To all such this country ever will be a haven and a home; but to those who seek to avoid responsibility, to shirk the burdens of our country, light though they be, we can not extend the welcome hand.

Mr. Speaker, this session of Congress is closing. It is the most memorable one that ever assembled in the Capital City. Within the limits of its six months' life it has passed more laws fraught with importance, not only for the citizens of our country but for the world, than any previous Congress. I myself have voted for all the measures that the administration desired or asked for as essential in the prosecution of this great war. I have forgotten party politics. I have acted only from motives of patriotic impulse. I have stood always for that which I believed to be for my country's good. I endeavored to sustain the President and the administration in every policy deemed proper and necessary for the prosecution of this great war to a speedy and successful termination. Every law that would contribute to the comfort of our soldiers I supported most earnestly. I believe the American people are stirred by patriotic fervor by this war. They are willing to make any sacrifice necessary to win a complete victory. America is sending its soldier boys to the battle fields in Europe, because by so doing we are defending our rights and battling against our assailant—the German Kaiser and the military oligarchy that supports him. A victory for American arms means that hereafter and in the future American ships, under the American flag, can sail the high seas free from assassination by submarines, and that American lives will be secure on sea and on land.

Let us not adjourn without passing some law that will correct this yet uncorrected evil of the alien slacker in our midst.

Mr. ROYERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JOHNSON].

Mr. JOHNSON of Washington. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] complains that persons do not understand socialism. Perhaps not; but who is there who can distinguish the 57 varieties of socialism? Why a Socialist should defend the I. W. W. is more than I can understand. It is not so many years ago that the Socialist Party was well-nigh disrupted by a fight in the national convention between the "reds" and the "yellows"—that is, between the direct actionists and the more peacefully inclined. But many Socialists continue to make the troubles of the I. W. W. their troubles. They continually bring up this case of Little, who was lynched in Butte, Mont., a while ago. The gentleman from New York [Mr. LONDON] has just referred to it, and has charged me with defending that crime. Now, Mr. Speaker, I neither defend nor approve lynching or mob law anywhere. But I have taken the floor to repeat some observations made by me at the time of that unfortunate act. I said then that responsibility for the lynching of Little could be charged to the Federal Government. I repeat it. The demise of that unfortunate, half mad, fanatical man was at the hands of infuriated citizens. Why? Because he stood on a soap box night after night in that city and denounced the soldiers of the United States. Called them scabs in uniform. Urged citizens to spit at the soldiers and belittle them. Why did he do that? Because he wanted to bring on a

riot. He wanted to create class hatred. He went the limit. Perhaps he wanted to be a martyr to the revolution he and his kind are engaged in fomenting—a revolution which is to be of "blood and iron," as certain radical Socialists tell you in their newspapers and speeches. Little was a member of the general executive board of the I. W. W. He was one of Haywood's right-hand men. He was not so mad that he did not know what he was doing. He was sane enough to know that if he was sufficiently vicious in his street speeches he could bring on a riot. He did bring on a riot. He was the victim. He was lynched.

And then his followers complained bitterly that one of their number had become a victim of riot and mob law. Mr. Speaker, invariably they claim the protection of the very laws they themselves are breaking. That is one of their ways of promoting class hatred and discord, and hoping to bring on the revolution of which they are always prating.

Now, who was to blame for the lynching of this man at Butte? The Federal Government itself. Simply because it did not act quickly enough in suppressing soap-box sedition in Butte and elsewhere.

The responsibility lies at the door of the Federal Government. Little had preached sedition from a soap box for weeks. He had said everything he could think of against the Government of the United States. Nightly he referred to those in military service as "Uncle Sam's scabs in uniform."

The officials stood around and listened to Little and wondered what they were going to do about it. They even wrote letters to the Department of Justice in Washington, asking for advice. Little's speeches were anarchistic, treasonable, and seditious. City and State authorities said that it was a matter for the Federal Government to handle, and the Federal Government passed it right back to the States and cities, saying, "Handle your own riots."

Mr. Speaker, you and I and all of us deplore lynch law. It is a blot upon civilization and is never invoked where constituted authority acts vigorously and swiftly. When such authority is lax the people are likely to take affairs in their own hands. This is proved by the Butte tragedy. Such action should never become necessary, but history tells us that it is done whenever constituted authority falters and indulges in correspondence instead of cutting all red tape and precedent and nipping impending trouble in the bud.

The point that I make is that interference by the strong arm of the law should never be delayed to the stage where either a citizen or a disturber loses his life. The law is all right and omnipotent. Only its execution is at fault. Since the lynching at Butte the Government has acted. The Department of Justice has shut down on treason, and on sedition, and on conspiracy, and on enemies of the Government, foreign and domestic. Thus we may hope the Butte occurrence will not be repeated at any place in the United States. The Post Office Department has, under the law, refused to circulate newspapers that preach damnable treason; that teach seditious; that urge on those who would hurt this Government of ours. Who shall say that these departments are not acting for the best interests of this great Government? There can be but one answer.

Mr. Speaker, if seditious publications were permitted to continue there would be many other crimes such as the lynching of that man out at Butte. To have continued the circulation of such printed stuff as I have seen in the office of the Postmaster General, clipped by the yard from these red revolutionary newspapers, would have caused lynchings and mob law everywhere. Under the law which refuses mail privileges to such publications Postmaster General Burleson does not become a dictator; he becomes a magistrate. The law empowers him to act, and all who know that sterling American know that he will act with discretion but with firmness.

The man who was lynched in Butte could not have stood on a soap box in New York or Philadelphia, or here in the Capital City, night after night for three weeks, belittling and defiling our marching soldiers, without being lynched. True, he and his kind did that very thing in time of peace and received the plaudits of their misguided followers and no complaint was made by the authorities. But we were at peace then. Now we are at war. And every one of us has to give up many claimed rights for the general good of the whole Government.

Have we been generous as to free speech and a free press? Why, we have been generous beyond the danger point. Because of her abuse of the right of free speech Emma Goldman should have been deported. She is a revolutionist. Her lieutenant, Alexander Berkman, also. He is a revolutionist; and he is a Russian.

Why not send Berkman back to Russia and let him help his own countrymen settle their revolution? That might occupy him

for the rest of his lifetime. It took France 82 years, or from 1789 to 1871, to permanently establish a stable government after the French had overthrown Louis XVI.

Revolutions do not end in a minute. The French beheaded Louis XVI in 1793. They established a directorate. It was as feeble as the Russian Government is now. Napoleon came to the front, established a consulate, absorbed that, and became First Consul. Then came the Empire, followed by its collapse, and the imprisonment of Napoleon at St. Helena. Then the Bourbons returned to power. In 1830 Louis Philippe was made king, not of France but of the French. He lasted until 1848—18 years—when the second Republic was established. That lasted three years, and then Louis Napoleon became Emperor, and he lasted 18 years. Then the Commune, followed by the third Republic, the latter permanent and successful, and now fighting to the death for its territorial rights.

So, my friends, those who preach revolution in this country had better give a little study to the matter, and they had better be citizens before they prescribe rules for us. And they had better postpone their attempts to put their theories into practice until we get through with the business at hand. Now, then, I do not assail socialists in general. Thousands of them, like Russell and Lunn, have come out strong for this Government just as it is in this crisis.

Treason is punishable by death. Only at the risk of his life should any person be permitted to say or do anything that imperils the success of our course in this war. Our boys who go to the front have a right to expect and demand loyalty behind them. Our country must not only ask it; our country must and does demand it.

I do not pick out the I. W. W. aggregation for particular assault, while others go scot free. The Federal Government has exposed the I. W. W. Its leaders have been jailed. Patriotic union-labor organizations of my section and all other sections have repudiated it. I do not find it advantageous to call every man who does not think as I think an I. W. W. No; I go further than that. I declare that every man who is not for the Government is against it. Minor differences must give way. The President must be given full military power. Undivided Americanism must show in every one of us. Save the country, and then we will settle our differences in a greater and freer America than we have ever dreamed of.

Oh, my friends, the time has come when the American people must be fully aroused to the vast proportions of the task they have undertaken in this war. We are not only fighting the greatest and most effective military organization ever gotten together in the history of the world, but we are constantly engaged in a struggle against an insidious and vicious German propaganda in our own country as well as in neutral countries friendly to us, the slimy tentacles of which extend down to the very foundation of the Government itself.

We must prepare ourselves not only to meet and defeat the enemy upon the field of battle, but we must meet and defeat him in the dark passageways of intrigue and espionage, where frequently, in the guise of a friend, he seeks to assassinate the patriotic impulses and sentiments of the people and to poison their minds against their own Government.

My friends, free speech must not be used as a mask for such as these, neither shall a free press become a poisoned arrow. Free speech remains to us—and always shall—but free sedition is marked for destruction. A free press remains, but the free right to preach treason is gone.

In spite of the startling revelations recently made by the State Department and the Department of Justice, few of us have a real conception of the vast scheme of plotting, conspiracy, and intrigue going on in the United States under various forms, many of them clumsily attempting to hide their cloven hoofs and foul purposes under the snowy plumage of the dove of peace.

Thus does the ravisher of Belgium make war and attempt to undermine the liberal governments of the world. This is Germany, whose vaulting ambition is not confined to the territory of the entente, but who has fixed its greedy and avaricious eyes upon the vast wealth and wonderful resources of this country, realizing, as it does, that the shadow of this giant Republic of the West is cast across its pathway only before complete world domination can be theirs.

And yet there are people in this country who sympathize with the cause of Germany, and many others who are lukewarm to the cause of the democracies opposed to her! Before war was declared there might have been some excuse for division among us. Patriotic citizens may have disagreed as to the wisdom of plunging the United States into the mighty maelstrom of the European struggle. But now that war has been formally declared by our Government there is no place for the patriot except squarely under the flag of his country and behind its Com-

mander in Chief in the supreme struggle before us. If he occupies any other place, if he raises his voice in any other cause, he is giving aid and comfort to the enemy, which is treason to your country and my country—the United States of America!

We must be one for all and all for one, and we shall see in the end the grand old Stars and Stripes triumphantly planted upon the heights of victory, there to stand as freedom's beacon light forever. [Applause.]

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. PARKER].

Mr. PARKER of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield the same period of time to the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. WILSON].

Mr. WILSON of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I desire to extend my remarks in the RECORD upon this resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I yield one minute to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. FESS].

Mr. FESS. Mr. Speaker, I have a communication from one of the district members of one of the exemption boards of Ohio stating that under the present working of the conscription law there will scarcely be a single American citizen left subject to the draft in certain districts in Ohio, and all that will be left will be aliens not subject to the operations of this law, and that the palpable injustice of such operation is producing a bad state of mind. He asks that something be done to relieve the bitterness that that situation is creating. I wrote him that the only thing I saw in the way was the diplomatic situation, and that this resolution was introduced to relieve that. I have letters of similar tenor from members of the local boards. There is a widespread dissatisfaction over the operations of the law in this regard. I hope that this resolution will pass.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FESS. I will.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. The gentleman from Ohio is a well-informed man, and he understands that the Secretary of State is now doing, and has been for some time doing, the very thing that this resolution requests him to do, does he not?

Mr. FESS. I understand that he is making an effort to that end.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. If the gentleman will permit, I do not think it is fair to the Government, to the Secretary of State, to let the impression go by that there is nothing being done. The Secretary of State is now doing the very thing, and has been for some time, that this resolution requests him to do.

Mr. FESS. This resolution can not interfere with the Secretary of State, but will be of some advantage to him, it seems to me, in the expending of it. The gentleman knows I would not vote to embarrass the State Department in any of its problems, but I am sure this resolution will help rather than hinder the work of the department.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ROGERS. I yield a quarter of a minute to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SHOUSE].

Mr. SHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROGERS. And the same period of time to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MAGEE].

Mr. MAGEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend and revise my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has eight minutes remaining.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I do not propose to make another speech; but for the possible benefit of some Members who have come in since this debate began, I want to call attention to just one thing, and that is that there is no opposition to this proposal at all except from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON].

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. ROGERS. I do not yield.

Mr. GORDON. Well, the gentleman will let me correct him?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman does not yield.

Mr. ROGERS (continuing). Except from the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GORDON], who is wholly out of sympathy with the idea of including in our Army a single alien, who is

wholly out of sympathy with my insistence that these aliens must be required to do something in return for the privileges of American residence. Gentlemen, that is the crux of this resolution—whether you believe in requiring the aliens within the United States to do their duty to the United States or whether you are content to let them step in and take the jobs left vacant by the American boys who are on their way across the sea and into the trenches of Europe.

Mr. GORDON rose.

Mr. ROGERS. I do not yield.

Mr. GARRETT of Tennessee. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ROGERS. I do not. The only way by which we can show our opinion upon that point is by passing this resolution. This resolution has been unanimously approved by the Committee on Foreign Affairs. It has in its terms been approved by the President of the United States; it has in its terms been approved by the Secretary of State of the United States; it has in its terms been approved by the Acting Secretary of State of the United States, and it can not, I submit, be objected to by any reasonable man. It puts the Congress of the United States and the House of Representatives in the position of taking an interest in this alien-slacker problem, which is one of the most vital questions before the United States to-day. It does not commit the United States in any way whatever. It calls upon the Secretary of State to report back to the American Congress the results of his deliberations. It strengthens his hands in his negotiations and it tells the people of America that we are not satisfied to have conditions continue as they have been continuing, to have the aliens profit at the expense of our American boys. Mr. Speaker, I ask for a vote.

The SPEAKER. The question is on suspending the rules and passing the resolution.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER. In the judgment of the Chair, two-thirds having voted in favor thereof—

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, it is now within 15 minutes of the hour fixed by the joint resolution for the moment of adjournment. It is evident from the situation that a quorum of the House is lacking—

SEVERAL MEMBERS. No!

Mr. ROGERS. A roll call being necessary and the time being inadequate for calling the roll, and my preference, and I am sure that of the House, being that we should not be in the midst of a roll call when the hour of 3 arrives, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings on this bill up to the present time be vacated.

The SPEAKER. Withdraw the joint resolution; that is the easiest way.

Mr. ROGERS. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the joint resolution.

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio withdraws the point of no quorum.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to take a recess until two minutes of 3 o'clock p. m.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. SEARS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an article on the "Constitution of a World Court," by A. S. Hough, of Jacksonville, Fla.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Florida asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting the article referred to. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks unanimous consent that the House take a recess until two minutes before 3 o'clock.

Mr. SLOAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I would like leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the soil-products exposition.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the question of soil products. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. DAVIDSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the legislation of this session.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the legislation of this session. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SIEGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the subject of soldier mail.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the subject of soldier mail. Is there objection?

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, I object.

Mr. LANGLEY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP] has informed me that he wants the privilege of extension of his remarks on the revenue bill. He was called out of the city and could not get back here.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Virginia [Mr. SLEMP] be permitted to extend his remarks on the revenue bill. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LINTHICUM. Mr. Speaker, I beg leave to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the work of this extra session.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Maryland asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD on the work of this extra session. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on the work of the session.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Dakota asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the work of the session. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. LUNDEEN. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Minnesota makes the same request. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado. Mr. Speaker, I make the same request.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado also makes the same request. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

PRESIDENTIAL APPROVALS.

A message from the President announced approval of the following bills and joint resolutions:

On October 5, 1917:

H. R. 5839. An act extending the time for the construction of a bridge across the Mississippi River in Aitkin County, Logan Township, State of Minnesota.

On October 6, 1917:

H. R. 5949. An act making appropriations to supply urgent deficiencies in appropriations for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1918, and prior fiscal years, on account of war expenses, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4232. An act extending the time for the construction of a bridge across Flint River, in the State of Georgia;

H. R. 5082. An act providing for an amendment to section 2293 of the Revised Statutes, allowing homestead and other public land affidavits to be taken before the military commander of any person engaged in military or naval service of the United States;

H. R. 5647. An act to provide for the reimbursement of officers, enlisted men, and others in the naval service of the United States for property lost or destroyed in such service;

H. R. 6094. An act amending the act to increase the limit of the cost of certain public buildings, etc.;

H. R. 6175. An act giving the United States Shipping Board power to suspend present provisions of law and permit vessels of foreign registry and foreign-built vessels admitted to American registry under the act of August 18, 1914, to engage in the coastwise trade during the present war and for a period of 120 days thereafter, except the coastwise trade with Alaska;

H. R. 6306. An act to provide for the payment of six months' gratuity to the widow, children, or other previously designated dependent relative of retired officers or enlisted men on active duty;

H. R. 6310. An act granting the consent of Congress to the Trumbull Steel Co., its successors and assigns, to construct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Mahoning River, in the State of Ohio;

H. R. 6350. An act to authorize the issuance of Reserve Corps and National Army commissions in the lower grades of staff corps and to remove the fixed age limits requiring the discharge of Reserve Corps Officers;

H. R. 6362. An act to promote the efficiency of the United States Navy;

H. R. 6363. An act to provide for the service of officers of auxiliary naval forces on naval courts;

H. R. 4960. An act to define, regulate, and punish trading with the enemy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 3932. An act to prohibit the manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession in time of war of explosives, providing regulations for the safe manufacture, distribution, storage, use, and possession of the same, and for other purposes;

H. R. 4897. An act to provide for the promotion of first lieutenants in the Regular Army and National Guard to the grade of captain, and respecting the Dental Corps of the Army and medical and dental students, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5646. An act to amend section 1585 of the Revised Statutes of the United States;

H. R. 5648. An act to establish certain new ratings in the United States Navy, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5723. An act to amend an act entitled "An act to authorize the establishment of a Bureau of War-Risk Insurance in the Treasury Department," approved September 2, 1914, and for other purposes;

H. R. 5918. An act to authorize the President to organize provisionally as Field Artillery or Infantry, and to use as Field Artillery or Infantry during the existing emergency, such regiments of Cavalry as he may designate; and

H. J. Res. 162. Joint resolution authorizing the expenditure of money upon lands purchased for use of the Ordnance Department of the Army without reference to section 355 of the Revised Statutes.

RECESS.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York [Mr. FITZGERALD] asks that the House stand in recess until 2 minutes of 3 o'clock. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 45 minutes p. m.) the House stood in recess until 2 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.

AFTER RECESS.

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at 2 o'clock and 58 minutes p. m.

ADJOURNMENT SINE DIE.

The SPEAKER. We have two clocks here, and neither one of them is right. [Laughter.] I go by my watch.

Gentlemen of the House of Representatives, I congratulate you on the ending of the most important session of Congress in the history of the Republic. The amount of business that we have transacted is absolutely amazing and stupendous. I think every Member of this House has contributed all that was in him to the support of the Government of the United States in this great emergency. [Applause.] So far as I have been able to observe—and I have observed very closely—partisan politics has been temporarily banished from this House. [Applause.]

I think every man has given the utmost of patriotism to his service here. I doubt very much whether any other Congress from now until the day of judgment will ever vote as much money in one session as we have voted; I hope not. [Laughter.] Every dollar that the departments have asked, or the President has made it appear they needed, they have got, and the Sixty-fifth Congress has deserved well of the country.

This House has been very fortunate in one thing, and that is the general good health of the Members and the very few deaths that have occurred. I served in one House when we had only 350 Members and lost 17 Members, and 3 of them were dead in the city at the same time. We ought to thank God for His blessings in that regard.

And now, the hour of 3 o'clock having arrived, at which time we were to adjourn, I adjourn this House, in this the first session of the Sixty-fifth Congress, sine die, with the hope that God will have us all in His holy keeping during the recess. [Applause.]

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

1. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a letter in reference to the meeting of the International Parliamentary Conference of Commerce to be held in Rome, Italy, October 11 to 14, 1917 (H. Doc. No. 377); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

2. A letter from the Secretary of State, transmitting a copy of a dispatch from the American chargé d'affaires at Tokyo, Japan, together with copies of the inclosures therewith, reporting that on October 18, 1917, a party of five members of the lower house of the Japanese Diet would sail from Yokohama for the United States for the purpose of studying political, social, and economic conditions in the United States (H. Doc. No. 378); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. HAYDEN, from the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 3135) to amend section 4 of the act entitled "An act to provide for an auxiliary reclamation project in connection with the Yuma project, Ariz.," reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 199), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HASTINGS, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 906) making an appropriation to Stuart, Lewis, Gordon & Rutherford in payment of legal services rendered by them to the Creek Nation, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 200), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WELTY: A bill (H. R. 6489) to renew and extend certain letters patent; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. BANKHEAD: A bill (H. R. 6490) to require the Commissioner of Education to devise methods and promote plans for the elimination of adult illiteracy in the United States; to the Committee on Education.

By Mr. NORTON: A bill (H. R. 6491) to amend section 2 of part B of an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the Department of Agriculture for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1916," approved August 11, 1916; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 6492) authorizing the President to reinstate John A. Harman as assistant paymaster in the United States Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. LANGLEY: A bill (H. R. 6493) authorizing and empowering the President of the United States to fix prices of commodities and of articles required for their production and to regulate and control the production, sale, and disposition thereof; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. HULL of Tennessee: Joint resolution (H. Res. 163) amending section 201 of the act entitled "An act to provide revenue to defray war expenses, and for other purposes," approved October 3, 1917; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ROGERS: Resolution (H. Res. 173) requesting the President of the United States to use his good offices to prevent the shipment of the George Grey Barnard statue of Abraham Lincoln to London, England; to the Committee on the Library.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

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

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 6494) granting an increase of pension to Bernard Magoonah; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6495) granting a pension to John Zanger; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM of Illinois: A bill (H. R. 6496) granting an increase of pension to James N. Dennis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 6497) granting an increase of pension to Mary Lenz; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LONERGAN: A bill (H. R. 6498) granting an increase of pension to Butler George; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6499) granting a pension to Mary C. Kelsey; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6500) granting a pension to Rose L. LaValley; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. OSBORNE: A bill (H. R. 6501) granting a pension to Estefano A. Johnson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Miss RANKIN: A bill (H. R. 6502) granting a pension to John F. Smoot; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6503) granting a pension to Mary A. Walter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6504) granting a pension to Lizzie M. Baker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6505) granting a pension to Lucinda Harrington; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6506) granting a pension to Alice J. Farmer; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SMITH of New York: A bill (H. R. 6507) granting an increase of pension to Charles Hammelman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNOOK: A bill (H. R. 6508) granting a pension to Canada D. Hicks; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6509) granting a pension to Percival C. Bishop; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6510) granting a pension to Francis Marion Davis; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 6511) granting an increase of pension to David Smith; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

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

By the SPEAKER (by request): Petition of 30 citizens of Detroit, Mich., signed by Rollin H. Stevens, secretary, favoring woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania: Petition of Hero Council, Junior Order United American Mechanics, of McKeesport, Pa., favoring further restriction of immigration; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of Turtle Creek Council, Fraternal Patriotic Americans, favoring Senate joint resolution 84; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition from the Upholsterers and Trimmers' Union, Local No. 101, of Baltimore, Md., protesting against the proposed prohibition amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. O'SHAUNESSY: Petition from 33 women from the first congressional district of Rhode Island, asking for the immediate submission of the Federal suffrage amendment to the several States of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of nine men from the first congressional district of the State of Rhode Island, asking for the immediate submission of the Federal suffrage amendment to the several States of the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
PUBLISHED WEEKLY
CHICAGO, ILL., U.S.A.
Vol. 41, No. 1, January 1, 1927

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
PUBLISHED WEEKLY
CHICAGO, ILL., U.S.A.
Vol. 41, No. 1, January 1, 1927

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
PUBLISHED WEEKLY
CHICAGO, ILL., U.S.A.
Vol. 41, No. 1, January 1, 1927

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
PUBLISHED WEEKLY
CHICAGO, ILL., U.S.A.
Vol. 41, No. 1, January 1, 1927

THE JOURNAL OF THE AMERICAN MEDICAL ASSOCIATION
PUBLISHED WEEKLY
CHICAGO, ILL., U.S.A.
Vol. 41, No. 1, January 1, 1927