

Also, resolutions adopted by the Twenty-seventh Infantry Association, in favor of returning our soldiers from Siberia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. ESCH: Petition of Twenty-seventh Infantry Auxiliary, Chicago, Ill., urging return of American soldiers from Siberia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of jewelers of the United States, urging that the entire Title IX, covering sections 900 to 907, inclusive, be taken from the revenue act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, relating to the league of nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. FULLER of Illinois: Petition of sundry citizens of Kingston, Ill., for the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Twenty-seventh Infantry auxiliary, asking for return of American soldiers from Siberia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. HERNANDEZ: Petition of New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, urging that railroads be turned back to their owners; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, favoring import duty on live stock and its products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of New Mexico Cattle and Horse Growers' Association, indorsing the Kendrick bill; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KIESS: Petition of citizens of Tioga County, Pa., favoring the repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. LINTHICUM: Petition of David Cowan, Robert Macdonald, and Gustav J. Merbach, of Baltimore, Md., asking support of the initiative and referendum amendment to the Constitution of the United States and also the noninterest bond bill, as advocated by Jacob Sechler Coxey, sr.; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

Also, petition of Leon Simon (Inc.), Baltimore Fur Manufacturing Co., Bernheimer Bros., Big Home Stores, Stewart & Co., all of Baltimore, Md., urging repeal of luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of National Retail Dry Goods Association, New York City, asking for immediate repeal of section 904 of luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Maryland Federation of Women's Clubs, relating to Lewis-Raker bill (S. 4811; H. R. 12698), giving military rank to Army nurses; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of Baltimore, Md., urging repeal of luxury taxes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MacGREGOR: Petition of National Garment Retailers' Association, urging repeal of section 904 of revenue bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of sundry citizens of New York, protesting against the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MAGEE: Petition of many residents of the city of Syracuse, N. Y., protesting against the imposition of luxury taxes and asking for the immediate repeal of section 904 of the revenue law of 1918, as well as the other sales taxes in title 9; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. MOTT: Petition of citizens of Fulton, N. Y., opposing repeal of war-time prohibition; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. NEELY: Petition of United Presbyterian Congregation of Chester, W. Va., urging constitutional amendment against polygamy and polygamous cohabitation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. NELSON of Wisconsin: Petition of farmers from Polk County, Wis., for repeal of the daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of central committee, Socialist Party of Douglas County, Wis., transmitting certain demands of the Socialist Party; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of County Board of Taylor County, Wis., for the repeal of daylight-saving law; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Iron River, Wis., relating to the sale of medicines; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. O'CONNELL: Petition of Self-Determination League, of Liberty, N. Y., asking for repeal of war-time prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of jewelers of the United States, urging repeal of revenue-tax sections 900 to 907; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Twenty-seventh Infantry Auxiliary, Chicago, Ill., urging immediate return of American soldiers from Siberia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. OSBORNE: Petition of California Goldsmiths' and Silversmiths' Association, in opposition to the extent of the sales tax imposed upon their products; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Messrs. Lensky & Laewn, of Los Angeles, Calif., in opposition to the tax imposed on furs; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Sacramento Valley Development Association, of California, in support of the Mondell bill proposing a soldier settlement plan for reclamation of arid and swamp lands; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. RANDALL of California: Petition of Bethel Friends Church, of Long Beach, Calif., against repeal of war prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Federal Council of Churches, favoring enactment of laws to rigidly enforce war and constitutional prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Council of Churches, favoring a Federal law to remove the disgrace of lynching from America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of First Church of the Nazarene, Pasadena, Calif., protesting against repeal of the war prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Woman's Christian Temperance Union, Pasadena, Calif., against repeal of war prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Federal Council of Churches, favoring inclusion of a clause in the league of nations constitution guaranteeing freedom of religious belief; also guaranteeing equality of race treatment in respect of law and its administration; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

Also, petition of Federal Council of Churches, favoring restriction of immigration based on just and equitable regard for the rights of the nations concerned; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

Also, petition of prohibitionists of California against repeal of the war prohibition act; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. RHODES: Petition of Twenty-seventh Infantry Auxiliary, of the city of Chicago, for an early return of the American soldiers from Siberia; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of William Lorenz et al., of Farmington, Mo., for the repeal of daylight-saving act; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TEMPLE: Papers in support of House bill 1331; to the Committee on Pensions.

## SENATE.

MONDAY, May 26, 1919.

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

Almighty God, we thank Thee for the religious instinct and passion that Thou hast put into Thy creature, man. As we face the difficult tasks of life with faith and feel the need of the high inspiration for noble endeavor, we constantly turn back to the source of our life and our noblest thought and our highest inspiration. So we turn to Thee this day and pray that Thou wilt so guide us that our lives may count for the upbuilding of civilization, for the advancement of man, and the prosperity and interest of the world for the glory of Thy name. For Christ's sake. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Friday last was read and approved.

CONNERS BROS. V. THE UNITED STATES (S. DOC. NO. 8).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims certifying that the cause of Milton C. Conners and George G. Conners, doing business under the firm name of Conners Bros., v. The United States, which was referred to the Court of Claims August 5, 1916, under the judicial code, was dismissed by the court March 24, 1919, for nonprosecution on motion of the defendants, which was referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

FINDINGS OF THE COURT OF CLAIMS (S. DOC. NO. 9).

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the chief clerk of the Court of Claims, transmitting certified copies of the findings of fact and conclusions filed by the court in the following causes:

The Fore River Ship & Engine Co. v. The United States and Genevieve Griswold Kennon v. The United States.

The foregoing findings were, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Claims and ordered to be printed.

#### SILK INDUSTRY OF JAPAN.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented the statement of Sobel Mogi, a director of the Japan Silk Association and president of the United Export Silk Textile Association of Japan, concerning relations between the United States and Japan, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by D. K. Hempstead, its enrolling clerk, announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1200) making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and for other purposes, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

#### COLUMBIA INSTITUTION FOR DEAF AND DUMB.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. POMERENE a director of the Columbia Institution for the Deaf and Dumb, under the requirements of the act approved June 10, 1872.

#### COLUMBIA HOSPITAL FOR WOMEN.

The VICE PRESIDENT appointed Mr. CHAMBERLAIN a director of the Columbia Hospital for Women and Lying-in Asylum, under the requirements of the act approved June 10, 1872.

#### PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE PRESIDENT presented resolutions adopted by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, favoring legislation providing for the adequate protection of the lives and property of aliens by the Federal authorities, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented resolutions adopted by the Federal Council of the Churches of Christ in America, favoring the enactment of legislation for the suppression of lynching, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. SHERMAN presented a memorial of sundry citizens of Owanece, Ill., remonstrating against the proposed modification of the prohibition act, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. MOSES presented a petition of sundry citizens of Belmont, N. H., praying for the repeal of the luxury tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

Mr. SPENCER presented a telegram in the nature of a petition from sundry citizens of Clinton, Mo., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. GRONNA. I present a telegram, which is very brief, and I ask that it may be read.

There being no objection, the telegram was read, as follows:  
FARGO, N. DAK., May 22, 1919.

Hon. ASLE J. GRONNA,  
United States Senate, Washington, D. C.:

The Woman's Christian Temperance Union of North Dakota, representing 3,000 women, strongly protests against the repeal or weakening of war-time prohibition.

ELIZABETH PRESTON ANDERSON, *President*.  
BARBARA H. WYLIE, *Secretary*.

Mr. GRONNA. I present a petition of the Niagara-Shawnee Agricultural Club, which I ask may be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Hon. ASLE J. GRONNA,  
Senator from the State of North Dakota, Washington, D. C.

SIR: We, the undersigned committee, were duly appointed to present to you the following resolution adopted at one of the club's regular meetings, in which you were respectfully requested to obtain, if possible, the repeal of the daylight-saving law, for the following reasons:

First. In our State we have many frosty mornings early in the spring. It is impossible to do good work and start early, so the men and teams lose time and the men refuse to make it up in the evenings. The same holds good in haying and harvesting time. On account of the dewy mornings it is absolutely impossible to make hay or harvest grain in the early hours, and the men refuse to work later. In thrashing, it is the same. It has caused untold loss of grain.

Second. We find it impossible to combine the two systems because it confuses our work and operations in such a manner that we can not attend meetings and gatherings conveniently if we work under the old time and conform with the new in other ways.

Third. We find that for the foregoing reasons it damages the producer more than it benefits the consumer.

Fourth. We find it works a hardship on the very young children attending the consolidated high schools. They have to make long drives and do not get sufficient rest under the new system.

Respectfully, yours,

F. A. MUNSON,  
*Chairman*.  
FRANK GEORGEON,  
DAVID KIRK.

Mr. CURTIS presented a memorial of the Central Labor Union of Arkansas City, Kans., and a memorial of sundry citi-

zens of Satanta and Clyde, Kans., remonstrating against the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Sedgwick County Republican Club, of Kansas, praying for the separation of the peace treaty from the league of nations plan, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Lawrence, Detroit, Topeka, Pretty Prairie, Valley Falls, Netawaka, Oskaloosa, and Ozawkie, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Kansas and Michigan Association, praying for the establishment of a national soldiers' home at St. Cloud, Fla., which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented a petition of Dick Yates Post No. 50, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Eureka, Kans., and a petition of Princeton Post No. 111, Grand Army of the Republic, Department of Kansas, of Richmond, Kans., praying for an increase in the pensions of Civil War veterans and widows of deceased Civil War veterans, which were referred to the Committee on Pensions.

He also presented a petition of sundry soldiers, members of Ambulance Company 347, Eighty-seventh Division, in France, praying for a congressional investigation of certain actions by the War Department, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Russell, Kans., praying for the deportation of aliens who, in order to escape military service, dropped their first naturalization papers, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Manhattan, Topeka, Utopia, Nortonville, Paola, Columbus, Olathe, Oswego, and of Wheat Belt Grange No. 1735, Patrons of Husbandry, all in the State of Kansas, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Emporia, Kans., and a petition of sundry citizens of Arkansas City, Kans., praying for Government ownership of railroads, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of Local Council No. 976, Knights of Columbus, of Newton, Kans., praying for the self-determination of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Chamber of Commerce of Atchison, Kans., praying for the return to private ownership of the railroad, telegraph, and telephone lines, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a petition of the Trades and Labor Assembly of Wichita, Kans., praying for the removal from office of Postmaster General Burleson, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of Pomona Grange No. 1498, Patrons of Husbandry, of Holton, Kans., praying for an investigation of the interference by the Department of Agriculture with the work of the Bureau of Farm Management, which was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

He also presented resolutions adopted at a mass meeting of sundry citizens of Columbus, Kans., favoring the repeal of the espionage act, the withdrawal of American troops from Russia, the reestablishment of the rights of free speech, free press, and free assemblage, self-determination by any country of their form of government without interference from troops abroad, and the immediate release of all political, religious, industrial, and other prisoners incarcerated for their views, etc., which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the congregation of the Church of the United Brethren in Christ, of Beloit, Kans., praying for the independence of Korea, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a resolution adopted by the United Trades and Labor Council of Pittsburg, Kans., favoring the adoption of an amendment to the Constitution providing for the election of all Federal judges, with short terms of office, and placing the power to recall Federal judges in the people, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of sundry citizens of Winfield, Kans., praying for the repeal of the tax on shoes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Independence, McPherson, and Kansas City, all in the State of Kansas, pray-

ing for the establishment of a department of education, which were referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. ASHURST presented a petition of Yavapai Council, No. 1032, Knights of Columbus, of Prescott, Ariz., praying for the self-determination of Ireland, which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. HALE presented a petition of the Norumbega Club of Bangor, Me., praying for the establishment of a department of education, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

Mr. TOWNSEND presented petitions of Local Grange No. 166, Patrons of Husbandry, of Tecumseh, of sundry school-teachers of Highland Park, and of sundry citizens of Ann Arbor, all in the State of Michigan, praying for the ratification of the league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the Pattern Makers' Association of Grand Rapids, Mich., praying for Government ownership of railroads and the merchant marine, and also for the ratification of the league of nations treaty, which was referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

He also presented a memorial of the Chamber of Commerce of St. Joseph, Mich., remonstrating against the repeal of the present zone system of postage rates, which was referred to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

He also presented a petition of the Common Council of Detroit, Mich., praying that Fort Wayne, in that State, be turned over to the city of Detroit, Mich., for park and recreational purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Mr. FERNALD presented petitions of sundry citizens of Sanford, Berwick, and Pittsfield, all in the State of Maine, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

Mr. McLEAN presented petitions of the New Haven Theosophical Society of New Haven; Connecticut Alumni Association of Wesleyan University; Machinists' Lodge, No. 819, International Association of Machinists, of Meriden; Silver City Council, No. 21, F. B. L., of Meriden; Meriden Grange, of Meriden; Nepaug Congregational Church of New Hartford; Beacon Valley Grange of Naugatuck; citizens of Middletown; Court Silver City Friendly Society; and Daughters of the American Revolution of New Haven; of the Men's Club of the First Congregational Church of West Haven; St. John's Church of Washington; Arawanna Tribe, No. 17, I. O. R. M., of Middletown; American citizens of Polish descent of New Haven; Excelsior Council, No. 2, O. U. A. M., of Waterbury; Admiral Foote Camp, No. 17, Sons of Veterans of New Haven; of the vestry of Christ Church of Westport; of Company D, First Regiment, Knights of Washington; of the Methodist Episcopal Church of Watertown; First Church of Waterbury; congregations of the Grace Methodist Episcopal Church, Howard Avenue Congregational Church, and the Howard Avenue Methodist Episcopal Church, all of New Haven; St. Michael's vestry of Naugatuck; faculty of Wesleyan University, of Middletown; the vestry of St. John's Church, of Warehouse Point; Men's Club of the South Park Methodist Episcopal Church of Hartford; of Local Division, No. 281, A. A. of S. E. R. E. of A.; Central Labor Union of Waterbury; the First Church of Christ of New Haven; Visiting Nurse Association of New Haven; Lord Nelson Lodge, No. 137, O. S. of St. George, of Ansonia; Red Cross Lodge, No. 162, of New Haven; and Immanuel Congregational Church of Hartford, all in the State of Connecticut; and of the New England Regional Conference of the Interchurch World Movement of North America, of Boston, Mass., praying for the ratification of the proposed league of nations treaty, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

He also presented a petition of the New Haven District of Epworth League, of Waterbury, Conn., praying for national prohibition, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a memorial of the Trades Council of New Haven, Conn., and a memorial of the Central Labor Union of Hartford, Conn., remonstrating against national prohibition, which were referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

He also presented a petition of the National Garment Retailers' Association, of Hartford, Conn., praying for the repeal of the so-called "luxury" tax, which was referred to the Committee on Finance.

He also presented petitions of sundry citizens of Brooklyn, Putnam, Thompson, Taftville, Ellington, Litchfield, Canterbury, Wauregan, and Ivoryton, all in the State of Connecticut, praying for the repeal of the so-called daylight-saving law, which were referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN presented a petition of Local Lodge No. 135, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Orange,

N. J., and a petition of Local Lodge No. 1246, Benevolent and Protective Order of Elks, of Summit, N. J., praying for the deportation of those aliens who, in order to escape military service, dropped their first naturalization papers, which were referred to the Committee on Immigration.

Mr. McKELLAR. I ask to have printed in the RECORD a very short petition from the Private Soldiers and Sailors' Legion.

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

PRIVATE SOLDIERS AND SAILORS' LEGION  
OF THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
Washington, D. C., May 19, 1919.

To the honorable the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled:

GENTLEMEN: Your petitioners of the Private Soldiers and Sailors' Legion of the United States of America, an organization incorporated in March, 1919, under the act of Congress of those who served as privates in the military and naval forces of the United States during the World War in the years 1917 to 1919, inclusive, hereby respectfully petition the Congress of the United States for the enactment at the earliest possible date of the following legislation, believing as we do that this legislation will not only do a measure of justice to the private soldiers, sailors, and marines of the United States who bore the burdens, hazards, and losses of the war but will promote in the highest degree the welfare and prosperity of all the people of the United States.

We respectfully ask:

First. That Congress enact legislation to provide employment on public works for all soldiers, sailors, marines, and war workers who are unable to secure employment in private business.

Second. To tide over the change from military to civil life, and as a scant measure of justice to the soldiers, sailors, and marines who fought the war to save civilization in 1917 to 1919, we ask that Congress enact legislation to pay each private soldier, sailor, or marine upon his honorable discharge from the service the sum of \$500, this payment also to be made to those who were already discharged previous to the passage of this law.

Third. That as thousands of soldiers were subject to needless hardships and privations by the unjustly heavy fines and penalties imposed on soldiers by incompetent and unfit officers in courts-martial for insignificant, petty infractions of military regulations, Congress should at once take necessary action to see that these fines for petty offenses should be promptly repaid to the honorably discharged soldiers, sailors, and marines. Legislation should also be enacted to review all court-martial findings, with a view that justice may be done.

Fourth. In aid of the foregoing policy for providing work for the unemployed we ask prompt action by Congress to open up for demobilized soldiers, sailors, and marines the opportunity to employ their labor on the unused lands and natural resources of our country. And we don't want to be confined to swamp lands, cut-over stump lands, and desert lands, either. We hold that the hundreds of millions of idle acres of good agricultural, mineral, and timber lands and vacant city lots are none too good for the use of the soldiers who are conceded to have saved civilization at \$30 per month, minus large reductions for court-martial fines, insurance, etc. Nature's bounty has provided Uncle Sam and all his nephews with ample opportunity for all to work if the Government will only let down the bars of monopoly and privilege.

Fifth. We ask that the burdensome and onerous taxes now levied as a war measure on ice cream, soda water, and soft drinks, and those levied by section 906 of the revenue act of 1918, approved February, 1919, on the private soldier's and poor man's theater, known as the film tax, be repealed.

Respectfully submitted.

MARVIN GATES SPERRY,  
National President Private Soldiers and Sailors'  
Legion of the United States of America.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Reports of committees are next in order.

#### WOMAN SUFFRAGE.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, on Friday last the Senator from Washington [Mr. JONES] made a motion to discharge the Committee on Woman Suffrage from the further consideration of the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 1) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States extending the right of suffrage to women. I rise for the purpose of calling up that motion in order that the joint resolution may be placed on the calendar.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I do not understand that the motion was formally made, and I do not think it is in order to-day.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is in order to make the motion now.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Yes; but it must go over for a day.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The motion was made on Friday under the rule and entered on the Journal.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion was made on Friday. The question now is on the motion of the Senator from Indiana.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I think it is proper before the motion is put to state what the Committee on Woman Suffrage did on Saturday. I presented the question to the Senate on last Friday as to the authority and duty of the committee. Under the resolution adopted at the last session of Congress all the old committees were continued in power and authority, and likewise were subjected to the burdens and duties of whatever matters might properly be referred to the committees. After that announcement was made here on Friday I felt that I was under obligations, at least, to relieve myself of any duty that might devolve upon that committee, and there-

fore I called a meeting of the committee for Saturday morning last.

We had a meeting of the committee. Of course, I recognize the delicate situation with respect to my successor on the committee, but at the same time I did not feel that I could avoid taking some action and assuming the responsibility of my position. When we met we decided that the quickest way to bring the joint resolution before the Senate for action was to favor the motion made by the Senator from the State of Washington, that the committee be discharged from its further consideration. Under the rules, if we had made a report from the committee, on objection that report would have had to lie over a day for consideration. The Senator from Washington made this motion on Friday and let it lie over under the rule, so that it can be acted upon at this time, and as representing the Committee on Woman Suffrage I desire to support the motion of the Senator from Washington.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion to discharge the Committee on Woman Suffrage from the consideration of the joint resolution.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I ask that the motion be read from the Secretary's desk.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I call for the regular order. I do not think it comes up until later in the day under the order of business.

The VICE PRESIDENT. It is as much in order now as at any other time.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. It will occupy the attitude of a resolution. It is in the shape of a resolution and comes up when we reach resolutions. There is a prescribed order of business—petitions, reports of committees, and so forth.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The motion will be read, as requested by the Senator from Alabama.

The Secretary read from page 129 of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of May 23, 1919, as follows:

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I desire to enter a motion to discharge the Committee on Woman Suffrage from the consideration of House joint resolution No. 1 that was referred to that committee to-day, and I ask that the motion lie over for one day under the rules.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. WALSH of Massachusetts in the chair). That action will be taken.

The VICE PRESIDENT. This is an entirely new question to the Chair. Resolutions that go over under the rule, of course, are never taken up until after the conclusion of routine morning business; but this is not a resolution. This is a motion to discharge a committee. The Chair believes it was the appropriate time when reports of committees were called to take up the motion. Unless there is an appeal from the Chair, we will go ahead with it. The Senator from Alabama.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Do I understand the ruling of the Chair to be that the Chair is going to proceed with the ordinary business?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No. The question has never arisen before, but the Chair believes that under the call of reports of committees the motion to discharge the committee is in order.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, I do not intend to delay the Senate by any extended debate on this motion, but I desire to say a few words in giving my reasons why I shall vote against the motion at this time.

Mr. BORAH. Will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Certainly.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Senator from Indiana [Mr. WATSON] if it is his purpose to proceed at once to a vote to-day?

Mr. WATSON. I think so, if we can reach it on the calendar. My understanding is that a motion to discharge a committee, if carried, carries a bill to the calendar, and if, under the rules, it could be taken up to-day, I should be very glad. I have not consulted the Vice President to know whether or not that is in order.

Mr. BORAH. I presume it will be in order if the Senator is disposed to make the motion to take it up at the proper time. I want to know whether the Senator is proposing to do that.

Mr. WATSON. I am.

Mr. BORAH. Very well.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Rule XXVI provides that—

All subjects from which a committee shall be discharged shall lie over for one day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

Mr. WATSON. That is my understanding. It has to lie over for a day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Mr. President, this body has been called in extraordinary session at an unusually early date. There are nearly two years before under the Constitution the life of the Congress will expire. This particular resolution came over here without any lengthy consideration by the House of Representatives. It was sent through without any extended debate. It is

a matter of grave interest to the American people, whether it be decided in the affirmative or the negative.

I recognize that under the rules of the Senate there is a provision for the discharge of a committee, but I also recognize that under the rules of the Senate committees are organized to aid in the transaction of the business of the Senate. You may say in answer to that that whether there is a two-thirds majority of the Senate in favor of the joint resolution or not, there is unquestionably a majority in favor of the joint resolution, and a majority determines. All of which is true. But there is an orderly way of doing business, and there is a way to conduct business under the rules of the Senate.

That is the purpose of appointing committees. The rule requires every piece of legislation that is not passed by unanimous consent to go to some committee of the Senate, not merely that the will of the majority may be worked out in that committee, but the rules of the Senate and the rules of all parliamentary bodies are primarily made to protect the minority. The majority can always do what it pleases. The rules of a parliamentary body are for two purposes. One is to conduct business in an orderly way, and the other is to protect the minority and give it a reasonable opportunity to be heard on all questions, to present its amendments and present its view to the country, and afford an opportunity to be heard. If you wipe out the rules and wipe out the committees, you proceed then to the brutal will of the majority. I am one of those who have always believed that the majority have a right to act. I was one of those who supported the cloture rule at the last session of the Senate, because I believe a majority have a right to act. I would support a cloture rule in the Senate of this Congress. But that does not excuse the majority from living up to the rule and conducting business in an orderly way.

There is no reason for the immediate consideration of this proposal unless it be that Senators who are in favor of the resolution desire to show that they are more enthusiastic about its immediate adoption than anybody else in the Senate. There can be no question whatever that the majority of the Senate will bring the joint resolution before the Senate for consideration. They did so two or three times at the last session of Congress, and there can be no question that when they bring it before the Senate they can keep it here until it is disposed of. There are a number of amendments that may be proposed to the joint resolution. Amendments, whether they are adopted or not, are entitled to consideration. The committee is already organized. We know that to-morrow or the next day the new committees of the Senate as proposed by the majority will be elected. We know that the committee can consider it, can give hearings on it, and ought to give such hearings. It is idle to say that the question was heard in the last Congress and that that bars the consideration by the committees of this Congress, for the complexion of the Congress has changed, and possibly there may be some change in public sentiment.

I see no reason why a motion should be made at this early hour to discharge a committee that has consideration of the matter, everyone knowing that a majority of the members of that committee are in favor of the resolution and will report it in an orderly way, if they are allowed to do so. The only purpose that can be accomplished by this procedure is possibly to hasten the passage of the resolution by a day or two. I can not see, if the resolution commands a two-thirds vote, why this is necessary; and, if it can not command a two-thirds vote, then there is no object to be accomplished by the motion anyway.

I do not think we ought to make the precedent in the very first act of this new Congress of breaking down the committees, of breaking down the protection of the minority by proposing at once to discharge a committee that has not had the opportunity to consider this resolution, for if it had considered it the committee would have reported the resolution to the Senate. It can get just as good a place on the calendar and have practically as early a hearing, barring possibly a day or two, by being considered in the proper and orderly way, being reported by the committee and brought up from the calendar in due course, as it can by this motion. For that reason I think a protest ought to be made against this method.

Of course I recognize what the rule of the Senate is for. It is to prevent a committee from suppressing legislation that a majority of the Senate desires to consider. If this resolution had been before this committee for days or weeks possibly, and there had been no consideration of it and no report, and a majority of the Senate desired to consider the resolution—

Mr. JONES of New Mexico rose.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Just one moment. I recognize that in such case it would be in perfect order and perfectly proper to move to discharge the committee. That, however, is not the case.

There is no Senator here who says that this committee is not in favor of the joint resolution; there is not a Senator here who says that this committee in the new Congress has had an opportunity to consider it. It is simply adopting revolutionary tactics in the Senate in order to railroad a piece of legislation through as the very opening method of this Congress.

Now I yield to the Senator from New Mexico.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Does not the Senator from Alabama recognize the fact that the Committee on Woman Suffrage met on last Saturday and considered this question, and would not that have any bearing upon the argument which he is now presenting?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. The committee had possession of the documents, did they not?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. The committee had possession of the documents; they considered the situation; and, in order to expedite the consideration of the resolution by the Senate, instead of reporting the resolution favorably, the committee decided to support the motion of the Senator from Washington in order that there might not be any delay in coming to a vote upon the resolution.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I am always glad to listen to the Senator's arguments, and he always has sound grounds behind them. The Senator says that the Committee on Woman Suffrage pursued this course in order to expedite the matter. I suppose there was a majority of the committee present?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. There was.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. With a majority of the committee present and desiring to expedite the resolution, instead of ordering some member of the committee, either the present acting chairman of the committee or the Senator who will be the chairman in a few days, to report the resolution to the calendar—and it would have been on the calendar right now if that course had been pursued—instead of doing that, conducting it in the orderly way, bringing the resolution up here in the most expeditious way, the committee resolved in favor of adopting revolutionary methods. I can not see how such action expedites the legislation.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It seems to me the Senator from Alabama overlooks another rule of the Senate, that any report of a committee must lie over for one day in order to be considered, except by unanimous consent.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. That does not change this proposition in the least.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It changes the proposition to this extent, that by the committee supporting this motion the matter can be brought to a vote to-day by a majority of the Senate, and if it came up on a report of the committee any Senator could object and require the report to go over for one day.

Mr. UNDERWOOD. Now, my friend from New Mexico is again stepping into deep water, for the President of the Senate has just announced a ruling that, if this motion is adopted, on objection it must go over for one day before it can be considered, and that is the rule of the Senate. So the situation will not be expedited at all.

Therefore I ask why these revolutionary methods? Why was it necessary for a committee that had the power to report the joint resolution and had the power to bring the measure before the Senate to disregard the rules of the Senate, disregard the situation in the case, when it would really have expedited the matter if it had pursued the usual course in an orderly and proper manner? That I can not understand.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Does the Senator from Alabama yield to the Senator from Idaho?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. I yield.

Mr. BORAH. May I ask the Senator from New Mexico why it was that the committee thought it more desirable to support a motion to discharge the committee than to report the joint resolution?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. As I have already stated, it was for the purpose of expedition.

Mr. BORAH. In what respect? It does not change the rule at all. The matter goes over a day under the same circumstances.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It was the understanding of the committee that it would expedite the consideration of the joint resolution to-day.

Mr. SWANSON. Mr. President, there has been a specific ruling on this question, which is found in Gilfray's Precedents, in which Mr. Pettigrew, on the 26th of February, 1901, made a motion to discharge a committee. It came up on the 28th, and Mr. Platt, of Connecticut, raised a point of order—

That the consideration of the resolution was not in order during the morning hour; that it not only proposed to discharge the committee from the consideration of the bill but to consider it on the same day, and therefore the resolution was not in order.

The President pro tempore sustained the question of order and decided that the resolution was not in order.

It is not stated whether the President pro tempore decided so on account of the motion being made during the morning hour or because of the motion then to proceed to its consideration. Clearly the motion ought to go over for one day; there is no dispute about that. Nothing can be considered in the morning hour except by unanimous consent. It seems to me that after the morning hour has been concluded this motion would come up regularly, but clearly it would have to go over under this decision until to-morrow for action upon it, unless by unanimous consent objection was waived.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do not so consider the decision just referred to by the Senator from Virginia. I think it is quite probable that this joint resolution, after it goes to the calendar, must then wait at least until 1 o'clock, or until the morning business shall have been disposed of, but that then, like any other measure upon the calendar, it can be brought up on motion.

Mr. SWANSON. The decision was specific on this point. The resolution was introduced on the 26th of February, and it came up on the 28th, when a point of order was made against it on two grounds: First, that it could not be considered during the morning hour—until morning business was disposed of; and, second, that it could not be brought up for consideration on the same day, except by unanimous consent; that all motions must lie over for one day. The point of order was sustained by the Chair, and no appeal was taken from the decision, which was specific.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I call the Senator's attention to the point that the heading of this decision, or that which might be called the syllabus of the decision, in capital letters, simply declares, "Motion to discharge not in order in morning hour." That was the point that was decided by the Chair at that time.

Mr. SWANSON. If the Senator from New Mexico will read the decision, he will find that the point of order was made on two grounds: First, that the resolution could not be considered in the morning hour; and, second, that even if the motion carried it could not be considered on that day but would have to go over one day. The point of order was sustained, as the Senator will find if he reads the decision.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I should like to ask if the Senator from New Mexico contends that the syllabus to a decision ever controls the decision or that it affords even an index to govern in any way the decision unless the syllabus is written by the deciding power itself? In this case, of course, it was written by some Public Printer.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Nobody knows better than does the Senator from Missouri—and I suppose he will concede that it is a subject with which we are all quite familiar—that what he has stated is undoubtedly sound; but where a case involves two propositions, either one of which might be good, and the heading or syllabus indicates the ground on which it was decided, I think the syllabus can be taken into consideration for that purpose.

Mr. REED. In other words, the Senator thinks that a Public Printer can decide what part of the decision of the Senate is controlling.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do not take it that a Public Printer framed these rules or made the syllabus to them; I take it that that was done by the Committee on Rules of the Senate, as going to indicate and make explicit what the rules intended to convey.

Mr. REED. But it is not a rule; it is a decision we are talking about.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Yes; but it is in this volume that we are talking about.

Mr. SMOOT. Mr. President, I think the rules are very plain that this discussion is out of place. I will merely refer to Rule XXVI, paragraph 2 of which provides:

All reports of committees and motions to discharge a committee from the consideration of the subject, and subjects from which a committee shall be discharged, shall lie over for one day for consideration, unless by unanimous consent the Senate shall otherwise direct.

I do not think that the case cited by the Senator from Virginia [Mr. SWANSON] is parallel; but our rules are so plain on the question it seems to me that there is not any need of discussion.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico obtained the floor.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Will the Senator yield to me for a question?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I will yield in a moment. I desire to call attention to and to read the decision referred to by the Senator from Virginia.

The President pro tempore [Mr. Frye] laid before the Senate the resolution submitted by Mr. Pettigrew on the 26th instant to discharge the Committee on Education and Labor from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 6882) limiting hours of daily service of laborers and mechanics—

And so forth.

Mr. SMOOT. I call for the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has already ruled, probably incorrectly, that this motion to discharge the committee was before the Senate. No objection has been made to debate; but the Chair has heretofore ruled on all such motions that prior to the hour of 1 o'clock they are not debatable, and unless there is an appeal from the Chair—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to ask the Senator from New Mexico one question, and that is, if he relies upon the syllabus of the decision, then is it not true that the decision of the Senate was that a motion to discharge a committee, going over a day, could not be considered during the morning hour?

The VICE PRESIDENT. That decision is perfectly plain. The motion in that case was not the same as the pending motion at all; that motion was to discharge a committee and then proceed to the immediate consideration of the question.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I desired to ask the Senator from New Mexico a question. He insisted that the syllabus controlled; that the effect of the decision was that the motion had to go over one day, and that it could not be considered in the morning hour. If he is right about that, is not our entire procedure now out of order?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks that is true.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona and Mr. SMOOT called for the regular order.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It is entirely immaterial to me. What I am after is to have this motion acted upon now.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has ruled, and that ruling stands unless there is an appeal, that this is not a debatable question. The question is, Shall the committee be discharged?

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I rise to a parliamentary inquiry. Is that motion in order at this time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair so ruled, and there was no appeal.

Mr. BORAH. The Chair has since modified his opinion, has he not?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Chair stated that he did not know whether he was ruling right or not, but he was ruling.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Then I desire to enter an appeal from the decision of the Chair as to this matter being in order at this time.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I make the point of order that the appeal comes too late.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair will have to sustain the point of order of the Senator from New Mexico, that the appeal comes too late. The question is, Shall the Committee on Woman Suffrage be discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. UNDERWOOD. On that I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Upon that question I wish to be heard.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has ruled that it is not a debatable question before 1 o'clock.

Mr. WILLIAMS. I understood the Chair to rule that the point of order is not a debatable question.

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; that the motion to discharge is not debatable before 1 o'clock under the rules of the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, does the Chair rule that an appeal can not be taken from the decision of the Chair?

The VICE PRESIDENT. No; the Senator can appeal from that decision, if he wishes to do so, because that is the last one made.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The decision I desired to appeal from was the decision of the Chair that this motion could come up at this time.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair understands that; but the Senator did not appeal until there was intervening business; that was the trouble.

Mr. REED. What intervening business?

Mr. WADSWORTH. Did not the Chair permit it to intervene?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair permitted it until the Senator from Utah [Mr. Smoot] raised the question.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Did the Senator from Utah raise the question?

Mr. SMOOT. Yes; I called for the regular order, because it seemed to me that it was a waste of time, under the rules of

this body, to talk about the question whether this matter can be discussed now or acted upon on this day.

Mr. WADSWORTH. It seems to me an inconsistency to deny the right of appeal because it is too late, and at the same time shut off debate, no matter how late objection to debate is raised.

Mr. SMOOT. Regular order!

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is—

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gronna	McNary	Simmons
Ball	Hale	Martin	Smith, Ariz.
Bankhead	Harding	Moses	Smith, Ga.
Beckham	Harris	Myers	Smith, Md.
Borah	Harrison	Nelson	Smith, S. C.
Brandegee	Henderson	New	Smoot
Calder	Hitchcock	Newberry	Spencer
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Norris	Stanley
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Nugent	Sterling
Colt	Jones, Wash.	Overman	Sutherland
Culberson	Kellogg	Owen	Swanson
Cummins	Kendrick	Page	Townsend
Curtis	Kenyon	Penrose	Trammell
Dial	Keyes	Phelan	Underwood
Dillingham	King	Phipps	Wadsworth
Elkins	Knox	Pittman	Walsh, Mass.
Fall	La Follette	Poindexter	Walsh, Mont.
Fernald	Lenroot	Pomerene	Warren
Fletcher	Lodge	Ransdell	Watson
France	McCormick	Reed	Williams
Frelinghuysen	McCumber	Robinson	Wolcott
Gay	McKellar	Sheppard	
Gore	McLean	Sherman	

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I move to lay upon the table the motion to discharge the committee; and on that I call for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays having been ordered and taken, the result was announced—yeas 27, nays 64, as follows:

YEAS—27.			
Bankhead	Fletcher	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Gay	Penrose	Swanson
Borah	Gore	Reed	Trammell
Brandegee	Harrison	Shields	Underwood
Dial	King	Simmons	Wadsworth
Dillingham	Lodge	Smith, Ga.	Wolcott
Fall	Moses	Smith, Md.	

  

NAYS—64.			
Ashurst	Harding	McKellar	Ransdell
Ball	Harris	McLean	Robinson
Calder	Henderson	McNary	Sheppard
Capper	Johnson, Calif.	Myers	Sherman
Chamberlain	Jones, N. Mex.	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.
Colt	Jones, Wash.	New	Smoot
Culberson	Kellogg	Newberry	Spencer
Cummins	Kendrick	Norris	Stanley
Curtis	Kenyon	Nugent	Sterling
Edge	Keyes	Owen	Sutherland
Elkins	Kirby	Page	Townsend
Fernald	Knox	Phelan	Walsh, Mass.
France	La Follette	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Pittman	Warren
Gronna	McCormick	Poindexter	Watson
Hale	McCumber	Pomerene	Williams

NOT VOTING—5.		
Gerry	Johnson, S. Dak.	Martin
Hitchcock		Thomas

So the motion to lay on the table was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I move that the Senate take a recess until 1 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Georgia. [Putting the question.] By the sound the "noes" seem to have it.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I ask for the yeas and nays.

Mr. WATSON. I insist on the regular order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The request is for the yeas and nays. Is it seconded?

The yeas and nays were not ordered, and the motion was rejected.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question now is, Shall the Committee on Woman Suffrage be discharged from the consideration of the joint resolution?

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Capper	Dillingham	Frelinghuysen
Ball	Chamberlain	Edge	Gay
Bankhead	Colt	Elkins	Gore
Beckham	Culberson	Fall	Gronna
Borah	Cummins	Fernald	Hale
Brandegee	Curtis	Fletcher	Harding
Calder	Dial	France	Harris

Harrison	McCumber	Phipps	Spencer
Henderson	McKellar	Pittman	Stanley
Hitchcock	McNary	Poindexter	Sterling
Johnson, Calif.	Martin	Pomerene	Sutherland
Jones, N. Mex.	Moses	Randsell	Swanson
Jones, Wash.	Myers	Reed	Townsend
Kellogg	Nelson	Robinson	Trammell
Kendrick	New	Sheppard	Underwood
Kenyon	Newberry	Sherman	Wadsworth
Keyes	Norris	Shields	Walsh, Mass.
King	Nugent	Simmons	Walsh, Mont.
Kirby	Overman	Smith, Ariz.	Warren
La Follette	Owen	Smith, Ga.	Watson
Lenroot	Page	Smith, Md.	Williams
Lodge	Penrose	Smith, S. C.	Wolcott
McCormick	Phelan	Smoot	

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

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I desire to offer the following amendment to the pending motion:

That the committee be discharged at the end of three days, unless they shall have sooner reported.

Upon that amendment I ask for the yeas and nays; and I ask that the amendment be stated.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. It is proposed to amend the motion by substituting the following:

That the committee be discharged at the end of three days, unless they shall have sooner reported.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The yeas and nays are requested. Is the request seconded?

The yeas and nays having been ordered and taken, the result was announced—yeas 24, nays 63, as follows:

## YEAS—24.

Bankhead	Gay	Overman	Smith, S. C.
Beckham	Harrison	Reed	Swanson
Brandeggee	Hitchcock	Shields	Trammell
Dial	King	Simmons	Underwood
Dillingham	Lodge	Smith, Ga.	Wadsworth
Fletcher	Moses	Smith, Md.	Wolcott

## NAYS—63.

Ashurst	Harding	McNary	Robinson
Ball	Harris	Myers	Sheppard
Capper	Henderson	Nelson	Sherman
Chamberlain	Johnson, Calif.	New	Smith, Ariz.
Colt	Jones, N. Mex.	Newberry	Smoot
Culberson	Jones, Wash.	Norris	Spencer
Cummins	Kellogg	Nugent	Stanley
Curtis	Kendrick	Owen	Sterling
Edge	Kenyon	Page	Sutherland
Elkins	Keyes	Penrose	Townsend
Fernald	Kirby	Phelan	Walsh, Mass.
France	La Follette	Phipps	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Pittman	Warren
Gore	McCormick	Poindexter	Watson
Gronna	McKellar	Pomerene	Williams
Hale	McLean	Randsell	

## NOT VOTING—9.

Borah	Gerry	Knox	Martin
Calder	Johnson, S. Dak.	McCumber	Thomas
Fall			

So the amendment of Mr. SMITH of Georgia was rejected.

At this point Mr. MYERS introduced sundry bills, which appear under the appropriate heading.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I call for the regular order.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. I understood the Chair to rule that debate was out of order until 1 o'clock.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair did so rule, but now the motion to discharge the committee is debatable from this time forward.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I should like to say a word on the question of order, as to whether or not it is now debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair rules that it is.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I dislike to appeal from the decision of the Chair, but let me state a proposition for his consideration. I have looked through the rules and I can not find anywhere a statement that when a motion is made that is undebatable it becomes debatable at any subsequent period. The question is as to the time when the motion was made. If it is debatable when made, it continues to be debatable; and if it is not debatable when made, then I find nothing in the rule to show that it becomes debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from New Mexico is exactly right. The ruling of the Chair was based upon a former ruling of the Chair to the effect that until the hour of 1 o'clock had arrived motions are not debatable. The Chair is ruling consistently, admitting that the ruling was perhaps altogether wrong. The hour of 1 o'clock has passed, and after the hour of 1 o'clock motions are debatable.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. In view of the statement of the Chair, I appeal from his ruling.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Business has since intervened and no appeal was taken from the decision of the Chair at that time. As I understood the Chair a little while ago, I was unable to

appeal from the ruling of the Chair that a motion was in order, because I did not appeal at once.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair has no recollection of having ruled that it was debatable until just now.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Chair announced that it would be debatable only after 1 o'clock and stopped debate upon it about half past 12.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Senator from Georgia rose to get the opinion of the Chair as to whether the motion was debatable. The Chair ruled, to be consistent, that at that time it was debatable. The Chair feels that the Senator from New Mexico has appealed from the ruling of the Chair within the proper time.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The appeal from the ruling of the Chair is debatable, I think.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair thinks so; but we might as well go ahead and talk a little while on suffrage.

Mr. WATSON. In this connection I would like to make a parliamentary inquiry. Is the motion debatable until 2 o'clock or after that time?

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair was not here when the Senate adjourned on Friday. Is there a special order for 2 o'clock?

Mr. WATSON. I have been informed that there is a special order, which is the resolution of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. I was wondering whether or not when we reach the hour of 2 o'clock the special order must be taken up to the exclusion of this motion.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Certainly.

Mr. SWANSON. It seems to me the prohibition on debate until 2 o'clock comes under Rule VIII, which is that—

All motions made before 2 o'clock to proceed to the consideration of any matter shall be determined without debate.

This is not a motion to proceed to the consideration of any matter; it is a motion to discharge a committee. I do not see anything in the rules that prohibits debate on the pending motion. Rule VIII limits it to a certain kind of motion that shall be determined without debate. I have not been able to find any rule of the Senate which prohibits debate on this motion. A motion to proceed to the consideration of a bill, resolution, report of a committee, or other subject on the calendar before 1 o'clock is not debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If Senators will listen to the Chair for a moment, they will hear the reason for the ruling. It was based upon a former ruling of the Chair, from which no appeal was taken, that a motion to discharge a committee was not debatable prior to 1 o'clock. At 1 o'clock the Senator from Georgia asked whether it was debatable or not and the Chair said that it was. The Senator from New Mexico appealed. The Chair thinks the question, whether or not the appeal is well taken, is debatable.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. It seems to me that whether it is debatable depends upon the decision on the other appeal. An appeal with respect to a question which is not debatable is itself not debatable under the decision, and so in this case whether the appeal is debatable depends upon the question whether the prior motion to which it relates is debatable or not. It seems to me there must be a decision upon the other appeal.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. The Senator is debating now the very point he makes. I submit that the ruling of the Chair that the subject was debatable on an appeal is also a ruling according to the view expressed by the Senator from New Mexico that the appeal is debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Was the Senator from New Mexico rising to a point of order?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I raise a point of order.

The VICE PRESIDENT. That the appeal from the Chair is not debatable?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. That the appeal from the Chair is not debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair overrules that point of order. Do you appeal from it?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I suppose it would do no good to appeal from it.

The VICE PRESIDENT. If you do not, it stands.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President—

The VICE PRESIDENT. Just a moment. Let us find out what the Senator from New Mexico wants to do.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I want to call the attention of the Chair to the prior decision that where the original motion is not debatable, then an appeal from a decision on that motion is not debatable.

The VICE PRESIDENT. But the Chair has ruled.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I do not want to multiply appeals here. It not only takes time but it may take more time than the

discussion which is likely to follow. Nevertheless, I appeal from that decision of the Chair.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Now, that appeal is not debatable. The Chair calls attention to the rule:

When an appeal is taken, any subsequent question of order which may arise before the decision of such appeal shall be decided by the Presiding Officer without debate, and every appeal therefrom shall be decided at once and without debate.

Now, the Chair has decided that the appeal from the ruling of the Chair is debatable. The Senator from New Mexico raises the point of order that it is not debatable and appeals from the ruling of the Chair. The question is, Shall the ruling of the Chair stand as the judgment of the Senate?

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I ask for the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered, and being taken, resulted—yeas 70, nays 10, as follows:

## YEAS—70.

Ashurst	Harding	Nugent	Smith, S. C.
Ball	Harris	Overman	Smoot
Bankhead	Harrison	Owen	Spencer
Beckham	Hitchcock	Page	Stanley
Brandegee	Kellogg	Penrose	Sterling
Chamberlain	Kendrick	Phipps	Sutherland
Colt	Keyes	Pittman	Swanson
Dial	King	Pomerene	Townsend
Dillingham	La Follette	Ransdell	Trammell
Edge	Lenroot	Reed	Underwood
Elkins	Lodge	Robinson	Wadsworth
Fletcher	McCormick	Sheppard	Walsh, Mass.
France	McLean	Sherman	Walsh, Mont.
Frelinghuysen	Moses	Shields	Watson
Gay	Myers	Simmons	Williams
Gore	Nelson	Smith, Ariz.	Wolcott
Gronna	New	Smith, Ga.	
Hale	Newberry	Smith, Md.	

## NAYS—10.

Capper	Jones, N. Mex.	McKellar	Poindexter
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	McNary	
Henderson	Kirby	Phelan	

## NOT VOTING—16.

Borah	Fall	Johnson, S. Dak.	Martin
Calder	Fernald	Kenyon	Norris
Culberson	Gerry	Knox	Thomas
Cummins	Johnson, Calif.	McCumber	Warren

So the decision of the Chair was sustained.

Mr. SMITH of Georgia. Mr. President, I wish to disclaim any purpose of delaying action upon the proposed constitutional amendment. I think action should be had in a few days, and I certainly would be the last simply to consume time in order to prevent a vote upon this question after a reasonably decent opportunity had been given to those of us who are opposed to it to express ourselves. The little delay that I helped to cause, from half past 12 until 1 o'clock, was due to a conviction upon my part that Senators who intended to vote against this motion to discharge the committee ought to have an opportunity to express themselves. By consuming a half hour's time of the Senate I was sure they would have the opportunity to say why they desired some little delay on the adoption of this motion to discharge the committee, as after 1 o'clock the Chair had said debate would be in order.

I agree with the Senator from Alabama [Mr. UNDERWOOD] that it would be much better if the committee were allowed to consider the subject in order to see if any amendment were needed to this proposed constitutional amendment, to perfect it, if it needs perfection in any way, and to bring it back to the Senate. It can be brought to the Senate within a week; indeed, it could be brought to the Senate in two or three days. It seems that the committee did not consider it yesterday, because they hoped by failing then to consider it the committee could be discharged to-day and the Senate could proceed to-day with the consideration of the proposed amendment to the Constitution. Mr. President, that is not giving due consideration to so important a subject. If the Senate shall determine to-morrow, or when the time comes to vote upon the motion, that they prefer to discharge the committee, of course the Senate has the right to do so, and we shall all submit; the amendment will then go to the calendar; and the day after it goes to the calendar a motion will be in order to take it from the calendar.

Mr. President, at the time the attention of the Senate was called to the motion to discharge the committee we were engaged in "morning business," and the Senate rules prescribe what that business shall be. There was no report of a committee. If there had been a report of a committee, it would have gone over for a day before any action or the report of the committee could have been had. Although the Chair ruled upon it, and there was no appeal, I wish to say, as an explanation in part of the course which I have pursued, that, in my opinion, a motion to discharge the committee could not be taken up during the morning hour. The rules of the Senate prescribe the business to be transacted during the morning hour. Such a motion as this motion to discharge a

committee is not found in that list. It might possibly be passed as a resolution and be called up in that way; but it was not a report of a committee, and it could not properly be taken up, with all due deference to the ruling of the Chair, I submit, as a report of a committee or in connection with that part of the order of business which provides for reports of committees. I was inclined to think that the Chair also had changed his opinion as to the proper ruling.

Mr. President, under the rules of the Senate, during the morning hour until 1 o'clock no motion is debatable. A motion to discharge a committee frequently involves matters of serious importance. To permit it to be called up or to provide for it to be called up at a time when debate is impossible would be to make an order of business unwise and unsafe.

I feel sure that the motion to discharge the committee should not have been taken up when it was, and several of us concluded that it was desirable to delay action until 1 o'clock in order that those of us who had opposed the immediate consideration of the motion might have an opportunity to say briefly, not with any consumption of time that amounted in any sense to a filibuster, but merely for the purpose of making it known that we did not intend in any way to filibuster and that we did not intend in any way to unduly delay a vote upon this proposed constitutional amendment, but that we thought a few days should pass before action should be had. I have no doubt that within the week, certainly next week, we will vote on this proposed amendment. I for one shall take less than an hour, perhaps not half an hour, to say what I wish to say about the condition in my State and to express my objections to a proposed constitutional amendment which would interfere with the right of each separate State to settle this question to suit itself.

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. President, I do not think this question needs debating; it needs settling. It has been debated for some 20 years. Big men, little men, and middle-sized men have talked about it until the whole country is tired of hearing talk upon this subject. The advocates of it have consumed time enough. Let us, the opponents of it, not imitate their example. I think the sooner we can get a vote upon this question the better. I expect to vote against this proposed constitutional amendment, but I do not want to retard its consideration.

Now, the whole world—not only America, but all the world—is messed up and muddled up with every sort of important question, and this question is not of the slightest importance on the thoughts or the habits or the legislation of men or of women here or elsewhere. The trouble has been that the advocates of it have thought that the entire civilized world depended upon its passage, and the opponents of it have thought that the home life and morality of the world depended upon its defeat.

The truth is that in some 11 or 12 States where for 20 years or more it has been tried it has done neither good nor harm. So far as I am concerned, I was opposed to it, and am yet, because I think it affects to a certain extent the social fabric of the South; but I see the handwriting on the wall. I do not want to imitate old Jonathan Higginbotham, who during the war refused to secede with Arkansas, and after the war refused to make peace when Arkansas surrendered but who carried on war against both the State of Arkansas and the Federal Government for about two years afterwards, until he had to be hunted up and rooted out of the Ozark Mountains.

What is the use? We have many matters to get through with here. The world has got to reconstruct itself; it has to demobilize from a war basis and remobilize upon a peace basis, to reconstruct industry and society. Those of us who are opponents of this measure who can see anything when written upon the book of fate at all can see that this is written there. The question is settled. Why not simply satisfy ourselves in voting against it, and why not benefit the country and the world by getting it to a vote just as soon as possible?

I am in favor of making a fight to the last ditch when you have got to fight and making it as long as there is a scintilla of hope upon the horizon, making it as long as you think you can beat your opponents in any proper, honest, or right way. One of the proper and honest and right ways is, if you think you can defeat a proposition next week, and you can not defeat it now, to carry it over until then; but nobody believes that in this case; everybody knows it is a question of whether the thing shall come to a vote now and be passed or whether it shall come to a vote, according to the judgment of the Senator from Georgia [Mr. SMITH], in three days and be passed. What good will talking do? I have done my share of talking upon it privately and publicly, although I never made a stated speech about it. It seems to me that it is having the Federal Government take a power and authority that was intended originally for the States. This Union never would have been formed if anybody had known that the Federal Government was ever going

to try to exercise a power of that sort; but when two-thirds of Congress are in favor of submitting a joint resolution to the States for adoption by the usual three-fourths, and when you know beforehand that that is the case, and when you know that the country and the world have important business to attend to, and when you know that the practical results of the adoption or defeat of woman suffrage will amount to nothing, as the experience of the world wherever it has been adopted has demonstrated beyond cavil or doubt, then why should we stand here and just delay things for parliamentary advantage of one or two days or something else?

There is no one in this body to whom, temperamentally and sectionally, this motion is more obnoxious; but my ancestors have been through this temperamental and sectional opposition once before, and when they found out that the game was lost no less men than Robert E. Lee and Joseph E. Johnston and other great men said, "We will not carry on a war by ambush. When we have lost the last regular battle that we can lose, and the last regular army that we have, we will quit, and we will make peace in good faith, and we will keep it in good faith."

I am sorry that it is written upon the book of fate, but it is written there. Now, let us face the situation, and go down in honor, as we do in defeat, which we can not help. Let us not spend any time trying to get three or four more days to talk in; and, by the way, here I have just been taking fully my share of what would have been the three or four days to talk in.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, I understand, of course, this measure will at no distant day be passed. It seems to be a settled proposition that the votes have been secured to submit it to the States for ratification; and it has not been my purpose to unduly delay the vote.

If those who have charge of the measure and are anxious that it shall be voted on will suggest a day when we can take it up and proceed with its consideration to its final disposition, I certainly shall not stand in the way of any such proposition. I had expected to submit some reasons why I shall vote against the joint resolution, and I shall be brief in doing so. If an arrangement may be had so that we may proceed in an orderly but expeditious way to final submission of the question, giving those who have not yet been converted to the program an opportunity to state their reasons, so far as I am concerned they may proceed. I have not changed my view; and while anything said here will not change a vote, I nevertheless, for reasons satisfactory to myself, would like to make some observations.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I just want to suggest to the Senator that we will be in a position to do that just as soon as this motion is carried, and the joint resolution goes to the calendar; and I feel that that would be the disposition—to try to fix a definite time, so that every Senator would know when the matter was coming up to be considered and voted on just as quickly as possible.

Mr. BORAH. Mr. President, the Senator will recall that I asked the Senator in charge of the measure if it was his purpose to proceed to-day, and he said it was if he could. Of course, he could not bring it to a vote to-day as long as Senators desired to discuss it. I think there might be some question as to whether it would be in order to move to take it up to-day; but I feel satisfied that if it goes on the calendar an agreement can be made, satisfactory to everybody, to fix a time.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I wish to say that I voted for the motion to table the motion to discharge the committee. I would not have it inferred from that vote that I am adverse to the proposed constitutional amendment. I have voted for it on two or three previous occasions. In fact, I have formed the habit; and I shall vote for this amendment whenever it comes in a regular parliamentary way to a vote. My objection was against the procedure. The committee on Saturday last could have voted a favorable report upon this amendment, and it could have been reported to-day, and after going over one day under the rule it would have been in order. If the motion to discharge the committee prevails, the amendment will still have to go over for one day under the rule, if there be objection; so, if there be any responsibility for this one day's delay, that responsibility attaches to the committee.

I see no reason why we should not proceed in the regular way to the consideration and adoption of this constitutional amendment. The tactics proposed are somewhat revolutionary in their character. The friends of this constitutional amendment might justify those revolutionary tactics in this particular instance; perhaps I could overlook it myself; but I do not like to have a revolutionary procedure established so early in the session, just after the change in the control of the Senate—a revolutionary method which might hereafter be invoked as a precedent, and there might be universal objection on this side.

I do not wish to be committed in advance, and I am sorry to see this side committed in advance, to revolutionary methods of procedure of this sort.

Mr. SIMMONS. Mr. President, I feel with reference to this matter as the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] has expressed himself. I think the sooner we have a vote upon this joint resolution the better. I have myself, therefore, absolutely no disposition to delay action for one day; but I do think that this is a very important matter. I do believe that every Senator desires to be recorded upon this question; and I think the best solution of it would be—and I wish to suggest that to the Senator from Washington—to fix a day as early as he pleases, but sufficiently in the future to give Senators an opportunity to be present, and let us agree to a unanimous-consent rule to take up the matter on that day and bring it to a final vote.

I make that suggestion to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I was interrupted, and did not catch the Senator's suggestion.

Mr. SIMMONS. My suggestion was, in order to give every Senator an opportunity to be recorded upon this very important matter, that the proponents of this joint resolution ask for unanimous consent to vote at a certain time, making that sufficiently far in the future to enable Senators to be present if they desire.

Mr. JONES of Washington. The Senator refers to a vote upon the joint resolution submitting the amendment, not upon this motion?

Mr. SIMMONS. Yes.

Mr. JONES of Washington. I should be very glad myself to do that. I do not know that it would be in order, however, to do it until the joint resolution is brought before the Senate. The joint resolution is now before the committee, and the purpose of this motion is to get it from the committee and get it on the calendar. Then we can make just such an arrangement as the Senator suggests; and I think that is a very good suggestion.

Mr. SIMMONS. I have no particular interest in the procedure by which the joint resolution is brought before the Senate, but I have some interest in the question of whether we are to vote here without due notice to Senators that this important matter is to be acted on.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Oh, no; I agree with the Senator that it should be set down in plenty of time so that every Senator will have notice to be here, and I have no doubt that that will be done.

Mr. FALL. Mr. President, I shall vote against the motion to take this action, as proposed by the Senator from Washington, at this time. I am consistently a friend of the constitutional amendment itself, and shall vote for it whenever opportunity offers, and shall vote for any legitimate method of expediting that opportunity.

Under the ruling of the presiding officer this morning, if such ruling continues to be the rule of the Senate with reference to all legislation, the situation would be this: An appropriation bill coming over from the House, and being referred to a committee, any Member of the Senate the next morning, or immediately, could make a motion to discharge the committee. That motion would lie over one day; and under the ruling of the Chair the next day, under "Reports of committees," it could be brought up, and must be voted on without debate before 1 o'clock.

I can not vote to sustain any such ruling of the Chair. That ruling was erroneous. I will not vote to take a measure from a committee which does not exist. According to my interpretation of the joint resolution, the committee had no jurisdiction of this measure at all, and has not had the joint resolution in its hands; and therefore a motion to discharge it should not be entertained.

For those two reasons I can not vote in favor of this motion, and shall vote against it. It will pass; it will be adopted, and I shall cheerfully vote for the constitutional amendment whenever I have an opportunity; and I will vote for any motion which I consider a proper motion to expedite a vote upon the constitutional amendment itself.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. Mr. President, I want to say just a word in reply to those who consider this action revolutionary.

The Committee on Woman Suffrage met and considered this very situation and decided to support this motion; so the committee has considered this joint resolution, which came from the House, proposing the amendment, and it has decided to take this course in order to bring the matter to a vote in the Senate. It is a joint resolution which has been before the Senate and the country for a generation, and no one can say that he has not had an opportunity to consider it fully.

When the committee charged with the duty of considering the joint resolution decides to bring it before the Senate in this way, I can not understand how anyone can claim that it has not had consideration, that it is revolutionary, or that it sets any bad precedent. The committee has considered it time after time, brought it to a vote before the Senate at least twice during the last Congress, and it is the same thing, the same committee; and can anyone say that to recommend this procedure is revolutionary?

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

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. STANLEY in the chair). The Secretary will call the roll.

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

Ashurst	Gay	McCormick	Sherman
Ball	Gore	McCumber	Shields
Bankhead	Hale	McKellar	Smith, Ariz.
Brandegee	Harris	McLean	Smith, Md.
Calder	Henderson	McNary	Smoot
Capper	Hitchcock	Moses	Spencer
Colt	Johnson, Calif.	Nelson	Stanley
Cummins	Jones, N. Mex.	New	Sterling
Curtis	Jones, Wash.	Newberry	Sutherland
Dial	Kellogg	Norris	Townsend
Dillingham	Kendrick	Nugent	Trammell
Edge	Kenyon	Overman	Wadsworth
Elkins	Keyes	Page	Walsh, Mass.
Fernald	King	Pittman	Warren
Fletcher	Knox	Poinexter	Watson
France	La Follette	Reed	Wolcott
Frelinghuysen	Lenroot	Sheppard	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Sixty-seven Senators having answered to their names, a quorum is present. The hour of 2 o'clock having arrived, the Chair lays before the Senate the unfinished business, which is Senate resolution No. 12, submitted by the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON]. The pending question is the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. WATSON. Mr. President, in the absence of the Senator from California, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution may be temporarily laid aside until we dispose of the other proposition. It will take only a few minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there objection?

Mr. FLETCHER. I object.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is objection.

Mr. WATSON. Do I understand the Senator from Florida to object?

Mr. FLETCHER. I do.

Mr. JOHNSON of California entered the Chamber.

Mr. WATSON. The Senator from California is now here.

Mr. JONES of New Mexico. I did not know the Senator from California was entering the Chamber. A request was made that the resolution be temporarily laid aside, but unanimous consent was not granted for that purpose, and in the absence of the Senator from California I expected to move that it be laid aside temporarily for the purpose of disposing of the motion which has already been considered this morning. I should like to ask the pleasure of the Senator from California regarding the matter.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. I have no objection if the matter is to be concluded within a brief period. I do not want the particular matter which is now the unfinished business to be supplanted indefinitely.

Mr. TOWNSEND. Does the Senator from California understand that a motion can not be made to lay aside the resolution temporarily, but that it is supplanted by the matter that comes up? However, the Senate can afterwards take up this particular resolution if it sees fit.

Mr. JOHNSON of California. If that be the case, I ask that we proceed with the unfinished business.

Mr. JONES of Washington. Mr. President, I simply wish to make a suggestion. I am satisfied there is no one on this side of the Chamber who desires to discuss the motion. I have the impression that no one on the other side cares to discuss it further, and we could probably dispose of it in three or four minutes. I suggest to the Senator from Florida that he withdraw his objection to laying aside temporarily the unfinished business in order that we may see if we can not get a vote on the motion to discharge the committee.

Mr. FLETCHER. Mr. President, I notice the absence of a good many Senators who are interested in the subject which has been under consideration, and I did not feel that it was fair to them to let the matter come to a vote in their absence.

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, I have heard several Senators who are opposed to this constitutional amendment express a de-

sire to discuss it. I understand that some of those Senators are now absent from the Chamber. It seems to me the difficulty could be met if the chairman of the Woman Suffrage Committee, if there be such a committee, would call a hurry-up meeting of the committee in the cloakroom. It would not take two minutes for that committee to report the resolution, and it would then take its place on the calendar properly and obviate this discussion. It would have to go over for a day in either case, and it would facilitate the consideration of the constitutional amendment, which I favor. I do not think we should adopt a method which some regard as revolutionary.

#### BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS INTRODUCED.

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

By Mr. POMERENE:

A bill (S. 731) for the retirement of employees in the classified civil service; to the Committee on Civil Service and Retrenchment.

A bill (S. 732) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Canton, Ohio, one German cannon; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEYES:

A bill (S. 733) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Milford, N. H., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CALDER:

A bill (S. 734) for the promotion of Col. William A. Simpson, United States Army, retired; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMOOT:

A bill (S. 735) granting an increase of pension to Thomas J. Redman (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 736) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Idabel, Okla.; and

A bill (S. 737) to provide for the acquisition of a site and the erection thereon of a public building at Hugo, Okla.; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CURTIS:

A bill (S. 738) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Wakeeney, Kans., for use in library grounds.

A bill (S. 739) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Coffeyville, Kans., for use in Forest Park;

A bill (S. 740) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Greenleaf, Kans., for use in City Park;

A bill (S. 741) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Pittsburg, Kans., for use of the Manual Training Normal School;

A bill (S. 742) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Lawrence, Kans., for use in the Memorial High School grounds;

A bill (S. 743) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Topeka, Kans., for use in the State capitol grounds;

A bill (S. 744) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles for use in the City Park, Salina, Kans.;

A bill (S. 745) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to John A. Dix Post, No. 59, Columbus, Kans.;

A bill (S. 746) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Baker University, Baldwin City, Kans.;

A bill (S. 747) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Kirwin, Kans.; and

A bill (S. 748) donating captured field guns and unloaded projectiles to Wellington, Kans.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 749) for the relief of Ellen Oglesby (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 750) granting an increase of pension to Lewis Fulton (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 751) granting a pension to Laura E. Hugess (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 752) granting an increase of pension to John J. Boles (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 753) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Chapman (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 754) granting an increase of pension to Ethalemia Scott (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 755) granting an increase of pension to Elijah G. W. Ebert (with accompanying papers); and

A bill (S. 756) granting an increase of pension to Thomas E. Keith (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A bill (S. 757) to found and maintain a mutual insurance fund for depositors in national banks, to be kept available in the United States Treasury, and to be administered by a bureau in the Treasury Department organized and regulated for that purpose; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 758) to provide for a commission to investigate commissions and to make recommendations concerning the same; to the Committee on Appropriations.

A bill (S. 759) to authorize certain late physicians and surgeons of the United States Volunteer Army in the War with Spain to practice their respective professions in any Territory, district, dependency, or possession of the United States under the constitutional jurisdiction of Congress upon the presentation and proof of certain facts; to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

A bill (S. 760) to revive the right of action under the captured and abandoned property acts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 761) to establish a drainage fund and to provide for the reclamation of swamp and overflowed lands in certain States; to the Committee on Public Lands.

A bill (S. 762) to provide for the erection of memorials and the entombment of bodies in the Arlington Memorial Amphitheater, in Arlington National Cemetery, Va.; to the Committee on the Library.

A bill (S. 763) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the National Military Park, Vicksburg, Miss., two German cannons or fieldpieces; and

A bill (S. 764) to place Lieut. Col. Junius L. Powell on the retired list of the Army with the rank of brigadier general; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 765) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to readjudicate the cases of Mattie W. Jackson, widow, and others against the United States, and Mattie E. Hughes against the United States;

A bill (S. 766) for the relief of the representative of the estate of Haller Nutt, deceased;

A bill (S. 767) for the relief of the heirs of W. H. Sneed, deceased;

A bill (S. 768) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, at Sageville, Lauderdale County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 769) for the relief of the legal representatives of James M. Brabston and Roche H. Brabston;

A bill (S. 770) for the relief of the trustees of the Sageville Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Sageville, Lauderdale County, Miss.;

A bill (S. 771) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Decatur, Miss.;

A bill (S. 772) for the relief of the Methodist Episcopal Church South, of Decatur, Miss.;

A bill (S. 773) for the relief of the trustees of Evergreen Lodge, No. 77, Free and Accepted Masons, of Decatur, Miss.;

A bill (S. 774) for the relief of M. T. Sigrest;

A bill (S. 775) for the relief of the heirs of Jacob Kuykendall;

A bill (S. 776) for the relief of James K. Hamblen;

A bill (S. 777) for the relief of the estate of Capt. John Belino, deceased;

A bill (S. 778) to authorize the Postmaster General to settle the accounts of Capt. J. H. Estes;

A bill (S. 779) for the relief of Maria Elizabeth Burnett;

A bill (S. 780) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and adjudicate claims for the destruction of private property and damage thereto as the result of the construction of levees along, and other improvements of, the Mississippi River; and

A bill (S. 781) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and adjudicate claims for the destruction of private property and damage thereto as the result of the construction of levees along, and other improvements of, the Mississippi River; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 782) granting a pension to John H. Isiley (with accompanying papers);

A bill (S. 783) granting an increase of pension to Mary A. McElroy;

A bill (S. 784) granting a pension to Susan A. Strickler;

A bill (S. 785) granting a pension to Eva A. Trager;

A bill (S. 786) granting a pension to Elvis R. Street;

A bill (S. 787) granting an increase of pension to David W. Herriman;

A bill (S. 788) granting an increase of pension to Nancy Brooks;

A bill (S. 789) granting an increase of pension to Elie Jones Quinby;

A bill (S. 790) granting a pension to John E. Hall; and  
A bill (S. 791) granting a pension to Robert Webb Banks; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MYERS:

A bill (S. 792) providing for cooperation between the United States and State governments in the rural settlement of soldiers, sailors, and marines, and to promote the reclamation of lands, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 793) authorizing the issuance of patent to the Milk River Valley Gun Club;

A bill (S. 794) granting lands for school purposes in Government town sites on reclamation projects;

A bill (S. 795) to provide for the disposition of public lands withdrawn and improved under the provisions of the reclamation laws, and which are no longer needed in connection with said laws;

A bill (S. 796) for furnishing water supply for miscellaneous purposes in connection with reclamation projects;

A bill (S. 797) providing for noncontiguous homestead entries within the former Fort Peck Indian Reservation, Mont., of land of the character described in the enlarged homestead act of February 19, 1909;

A bill (S. 798) giving the right to an additional homestead to all persons who have exhausted or who shall exhaust their original right of entry through the purchase of Indian lands; and

A bill (S. 799) for the relief of private owners of lands within or near the Bitter Root, Lolo, or Missoula National Forests, Mont.; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. OWEN:

A bill (S. 800) to indemnify depositors in "member banks," as defined by the Federal reserve act, against loss in the event of the failure or suspension of business of such bank; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A bill (S. 801) to provide for carrying into effect of the agreement between the United States and the Muskogee (Creek) Nation of Indians ratified by act of Congress approved March 1, 1901, and supplemental agreement of June 30, 1902, and other laws and treaties with said tribe of Indians;

A bill (S. 802) to pay the balance due the loyal Creek Indians on the award made by the Senate on the 16th day of February, 1903;

A bill (S. 803) to adjust and settle the claims of the loyal Shawnee, Cherokee-Shawnees, and loyal Absentee Shawnee and Delaware Tribes of Indians;

A bill (S. 804) authorizing the Ponca Tribe of Indians, residing in the States of Oklahoma and Nebraska, to submit claims to the Court of Claims;

A bill (S. 805) to provide for a determination of heirship in cases of deceased members of the Cherokee, Choctaw, Chickasaw, Creek, and Seminole Tribes of Indians in Oklahoma, and conferring authority on the courts of said State in reference thereto, and for other purposes;

A bill (S. 806) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in claims of the Iowa Tribe of Indians against the United States;

A bill (S. 807) to adjust and settle the claims of the loyal Shawnee, Cherokee-Shawnees, and loyal Absentee Shawnee and Delaware Tribes of Indians; and

A bill (S. 808) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment in the Osage civilization fund claim of the Osage Nation of Indians against the United States; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

A bill (S. 809) authorizing the licensing and control of corporations engaged in the storing of food products for interstate shipment; and

A bill (S. 810) to establish an interstate marketing system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce;

A bill (S. 811) for the establishment of a probation system in the United States courts, except in the District of Columbia; and

A bill (S. 812) to amend an act entitled "An act to parole United States prisoners, and for other purposes," approved June 10, 1910, as amended by an act approved January 23, 1913; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A bill (S. 813) to establish a sanitary reserve corps for the Public Health Service; and

A bill (S. 814) to establish a department of health, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Public Health and National Quarantine.

A bill (S. 815) to revise, amend, and codify the laws relating to publicity of contributions and disbursements at elections at which candidates for the offices of United States Senator and Representative in the Congress of the United States are nomi-

nated and elected, regulating and limiting the purposes and the amounts for which contributions and disbursements may be made, and for other purposes; and

A bill (S. 816) to provide for public education upon political questions and for the dissemination of information upon political issues and matters of a political nature of public interest by an authorized publicity pamphlet; to the Committee on Privileges and Elections.

A bill (S. 817) conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims for adjudging the rights of the Otoe and Missouri Tribes of Indians for compensation on a basis of guardian and ward, and conferring jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to adjust the claims between the Otoe and Missouri Tribes of Indians and the Omaha Indians to certain moneys received by the Omaha Indians; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 818) to establish a United States court of patent appeals, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Patents.

A bill (S. 819) to create the department of education; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. KING:

A bill (S. 820) for the construction of a Federal building at Fillmore, Utah; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. ASHURST:

A bill (S. 821) granting a pension to Martin T. Knapp; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KNOX:

A bill (S. 822) for the relief of James W. Cross; to the Committee on Claims.

A bill (S. 823) to donate a cannon to the city of Trafford, Pa.;

A bill (S. 824) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the town of Warren, Pa., six German cannons or fieldpieces;

A bill (S. 825) to donate a cannon to the city of Erie, Pa.; and

A bill (S. 826) to donate a piece of field artillery to Girard College, of Philadelphia, Pa.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 827) granting an increase of pension to William C. Shaffer; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GORE:

A bill (S. 828) to amend an act entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded or poisonous or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1913; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. ELKINS:

A bill (S. 829) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Wheeling, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 830) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of New Martinsville, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 831) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Parkersburg, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 832) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Elkins, Randolph County, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 833) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Grafton, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 834) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Martinsburg, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 835) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Moundsville, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 836) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Fairmont, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 837) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Morgantown, Monongalia County, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 838) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Bluefield, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 839) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Clarksburg, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece;

A bill (S. 840) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Charleston, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; and

A bill (S. 841) authorizing the Secretary of War to donate to the city of Huntington, W. Va., one German cannon or fieldpiece; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

A bill (S. 842) granting a pension to W. E. Crookshanks;

A bill (S. 843) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Lynch; and

A bill (S. 844) granting a pension to John Bennett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. WILLIAMS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 28) authorizing the appointment of an ambassador to the Republic of Peru; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 29) requesting the Commission of Fine Arts to submit to the Congress certain suggestions; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. MYERS:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 30) to permit of the disposition of certain lands in Montana ceded by the Crow Indians; to the Committee on Public Lands.

By Mr. OWEN:

A joint resolution (S. J. Res. 31) to amend an act entitled "An act to provide further for the national security and defense and for the purpose of assisting in the prosecution of the war, to supervise the issuance of securities, and for other purposes"; to the Committee on Finance.

#### AMENDMENT OF REVENUE ACT.

Mr. KING submitted an amendment intended to be proposed by him to the joint resolution (H. J. Res. 25) to repeal sections 630, 900, and 904 of the act entitled "An act to provide revenue, and for other purposes," approved February 24, 1919, which was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

#### THE COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET.

Mr. WILLIAMS submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 40), which was referred to the Committee on Rules:

*Resolved*, That a committee, consisting of the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations, the chairman of the Committee on Finance, the chairman of the Committee on the Judiciary, the chairman of the Committee on Naval Affairs, and the chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, together with the four senior minority members of the four committees first named, shall be constituted a committee to be called "the committee on the budget," and shall be charged with the duty of making recommendations for the coordination of governmental expenditures and governmental revenues.

*Resolved further*, That all appropriation bills, all bills for the expenditures of money, and all bills raising revenue shall be submitted by the committees having jurisdiction to the committee on the budget for amendments suggested by it before being reported to the Senate for action.

#### ADJOURNMENT TO WEDNESDAY.

Mr. BRANDEGEE. At the request of the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. LODGE], I move that when the Senate adjourns to-day it stand adjourned until 12 o'clock noon on Wednesday next.

The motion was agreed to.

#### HOUSE BILL REFERRED.

H. R. 1200. An act making appropriations for certain expenses incident to the first session of the Sixty-sixth Congress, and for other purposes, was read twice by its title and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

#### TREATY OF PEACE.

The Senate resumed the consideration of the resolution (S. Res. 12) submitted by Mr. JOHNSON of California on the 20th instant, as follows:

Whereas the peace treaty has been completed and has been delivered to the representatives of Germany; and  
Whereas a synopsis only of the treaty has been given publicity in the United States, and our people are entitled to know its full contents, and to what, if any, engagements they have been committed; and  
Whereas it is reported in the press that the entire treaty has been cabled to the State Department and is now in the possession of the State Department: Now, therefore, be it

*Resolved*, That the Secretary of State be, and he is hereby, requested forthwith to transmit to the Senate the full text of the treaty of peace completed at the Paris conference and delivered to the representatives of Germany.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] to refer the resolution to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, the revised covenant of the league of nations has been laid before the country. In my opinion none of the grave objections to be found in the original document have been removed. Upon the contrary, in a number of instances the evils have been aggravated or those evils now for the first time fully disclosed.

A striking illustration is found in the fact that we are now for the first time informed what nations are to constitute the members of the league. It will be remembered that the original covenant, so far as published, mentioned by name as members of the league the British Empire, France, Italy, Japan, and the United States, and that the names of the other members were referred to as being contained in a protocol, the contents of which was sedulously concealed from the American people and,

I presume, from the people of the world. Whatever motive led to this concealment, it is certain that the primal shock to American intelligence and patriotism would have been much greater had the people been at first frankly informed who were to be the partners of the United States in the world government about to be set up.

The names are now given. We know who are to sit about the council board of the international tribunal which is to undertake in many respects the government of the world. An examination of the character of this membership ought in itself to cause the instant rejection of the entire scheme. It brands the plan as futile and impossible and dooms it to ignominious failure.

If the proposed constitution of the league of nations were in fact what it is not, perfect in all its parts and capable, if wisely interpreted and justly enforced, of producing universal happiness and bringing unbroken peace to the world, still, if left to the interpretation and enforcement of the members of the proposed league, it would utterly fail in its object and bring misery rather than happiness to mankind. That assertion I now undertake to demonstrate.

It was Pope who said:

For forms of government let fools contest;  
What's best administered is best.

Making due allowance for poetic exaggeration, the couplet contains a great truth. Granted arbitrary powers, the wise, virtuous, and humane despot will nevertheless promote the happiness of his subjects. Upon the other hand, an enlightened constitution and code of laws in the hands of an ignorant, depraved, or cruel president have never afforded the people protection against outrage and wrong.

Numerous illustrations of this truth are found in the Governments of certain South American and Negro Republics which have copied the letter of the Constitution of the United States, but which have nevertheless been perpetually the victims of tyranny.

If the league were to be composed of the most enlightened nations of the world, it might be argued that we could consign to

them many questions of importance, trusting to their sense of justice and equity for fair decisions.

An examination, however, of the membership of this present league will first astonish and then arouse the indignation of every thoughtful man. It will come as a distinct shock, first, that this is a colored league of nations; that is to say, the majority of the nations composing the league do not belong to the white race of men. On the contrary, they are a conglomerate of the black, yellow, brown, and red races, frequently so intermixed and commingled as to constitute an unclassifiable mongrel breed.

The league is composed of 32 nations. I present them in two classifications—white and dark—including as white all those countries in which the white race predominates, and classifying as dark those nations in which the dark-skinned people are in the majority. To this there is in the list one exception—Cuba. I have placed it among the dark races because fully one-third of its people are of negro stock and for the further reason that in the island race equality is completely recognized and miscegenation is commonly practiced. On the other hand, I have placed Uruguay in the white column, although it has a large Indian population, together with an excessive immigrant population of undesirables. In these tables I also show, where figures are obtainable, the degree of illiteracy. It will be found that among the dark races illiteracy is astonishingly high. The figures as to population are the latest obtainable. But in some instances the nations have not reached the point of civilization where a reliable census has ever been taken. In such cases the best estimates available have been followed.

Mr. President, as I shall comment on each of the respective nations as I proceed, giving the population, I now at this time ask to print without reading the list of the dark nations, together with their populations and percentage of illiteracy, and the list of white nations, with populations and percentage of illiteracy.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, leave will be granted.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Dark countries.					White countries.		
Country.	Year estimated.	Population.	Percentage of dark and mixed races.	Percentage of illiteracy.	Country.	Population.	Percentage of illiteracy.
1. Liberia.....	1916-17	2,000,000	100	98	1. United States.....	110,000,000	7.7
2. Haiti.....	1911	1,500,000	90	Very high.	2. Belgium.....	7,500,000	13.1
3. Hedjaz.....	1911	300,000	100	High.	3. British Isles.....	45,000,000	11
4. Panama.....	1916	450,000	90	High.	4. Canada.....	8,300,000	11
5. Honduras.....	1911	562,000	85	68	5. Australia.....	5,000,000	1.8
6. Nicaragua.....	1914	703,500	90	High.	6. New South Wales.....	2,000,000	2
7. Guatemala.....	1903	1,842,000	85	92	7. Czechoslovakia.....	13,000,000	.....
8. Ecuador.....	1900	1,500,000	93	High.	8. France.....	39,500,000	3
9. Cuba.....	1907	2,048,000	33	44	9. Greece.....	2,750,000	57
10. Bolivia.....	1900	1,816,000	87	82	10. Italy.....	28,500,000	34
11. Peru.....	1908	4,500,000	86	Very high.	11. Poland.....	10,000,000	.....
12. Brazil.....	1904	24,500,000	88	80	12. Portugal.....	6,000,000	68
13. South Africa.....	.....	5,000,000	80	69	13. Roumania.....	7,500,000	41
14. Siam.....	1909	6,230,000	99	Very high.	14. Serbia.....	3,000,000	84
15. India.....	1911	294,361,000	95	92	15. Uruguay.....	1,378,000	.....
16. China.....	1906	407,253,000	100	High.			
17. Japan.....	1917	56,860,000	99	Low.			
		811,425,500	89			289,428,000	

<sup>1</sup> Negro Yearbook.

<sup>2</sup> Statesman's Yearbook, 1169.

<sup>3</sup> Average.

NOTE.—Figures are from Encyclopædia Britannica and Statesman's Yearbook.

Mr. REED. From the foregoing table it appears that when the members of the league of nations meet about the council table there will be 15 men representing white nations and 17 men representing black, brown, yellow, and red races; and that among the nations classified as dark the average of the dark-skinned people compared with the total population is nearly 9 to 1. It is also shown that among these races the degree of illiteracy is astonishingly high. Where figures are available the percentage runs from nearly 50 per cent in Cuba to 98 per cent in Liberia. The average is about 85 per cent. Thus we not only bring to the council board races which are dark skinned, but also those so low in civilization that they constitute the very dregs of ignorance. As I shall later show, they are the victims of superstition and are steeped in barbarism.

Even among the white races that are to sit in the council of the world and determine the fate of America we find nations so backward as to raise a serious question regarding their ability to perform the functions of civilized government. Witness Serbia, 84 per cent of whose people can not read or write; Portugal, with 68 per cent of illiteracy; Roumania, with 41 per cent; and

Greece, with 57 per cent. To the votes of a tribunal thus constituted it is proposed to submit for final decision questions which may involve the very life of the United States. By their votes we may be plunged into war; by their decision subjected to wrongs of the most grievous character; by their decree the very fate of the world may be determined.

Let us now a little more in detail examine the character of these new governors of the world, the exponents of the "new magic." That examination will disclose that in a large part they have in the past been unable to maintain anything approaching a decent or civilized government. Indeed, many of them could not have existed except as wards protected by the United States or other civilized nations. In this connection notice that the United States, with its population of 110,000,000, is given no greater voting strength than the smallest of the nations concerned. To this attention will hereafter be directed.

LIBERIA.

Let me now call your attention, O you men of the South, to Liberia—Liberia that is given a vote equal to the vote of the United States; Liberia that shall vote upon the fate of the

world. Its total population, according to the Negro Yearbook of 1916, was 2,000,000. The number of Afro-American Liberians is estimated at 12,000. About 50,000 of the coast negroes are classed as civilized or semicivilized. The rest are in their original state of African barbarism.

Here, then, we have a total population of 50,000 civilized or semicivilized negroes against which is to be balanced 1,950,000 savages. The Encyclopædia Britannica tells us that "in the forest depths beyond 40 miles from the coast many of the indigenous races still practice cannibalism." The Republic from the first has been a joke nation. Negroes from America have refused to emigrate there. In 1910 America, acting in conjunction with Great Britain, France, and Germany, took over the administration of the finances, military organization, agricultural, and boundary questions. The customs were placed in charge of American officials and a loan of \$2,000,000 arranged. On top of this we have since the war, just after or just before Liberia declared war and "sent her serried hordes to battle at the front," loaned her 5,000,000 good, hard American dollars. The representatives of these 50,000 civilized and semicivilized negroes, not counting the cannibals, are now to be permitted to sit in the council of nations and help to settle the policies of the world and the destiny of the United States.

No better commentary on the absurdity of the right of such a nation to sit in the council of the world, cast a vote equal to that of the United States, can be found than the fact that, although the American negroes have been frequently importuned to emigrate to that country, they have consistently refused. Although in that land of liberty all are excluded from voting save persons of negro blood, still our American negroes are too progressive and too intelligent to cast their lot with such a nation in such a place. Men of the South, when you go back to your people, if you shall vote for this league of nations, answer to them and answer to the rest of the world how you justify excluding the negro from the ballot box in this country and at the same time propose to give to this negro nation, with only 50,000 civilized people, the right to cast a vote equal to the vote of the first nation of the earth. Take that question back and answer it. Answer it to your consciences here and answer it by your vote. Do not try to dodge it, for there is no dodging. Even in the North there has practically come a state of acquiescence in the custom of not allowing negroes to vote down South, upon the theory that white men would better control the affairs of those States. Now you propose to go to Africa, bring in a representative of 2,000,000 negroes, 1,950,000 of whom are savages, some of them cannibals, and give them a vote which will settle perhaps the fate of the United States or the destiny of the world. Of course, as it is in the league of nations, it is enshrined in the holy of the holies; accordingly many of you will shut your eyes and open your mouths and swallow, with the docility of those who have well learned the lesson of obedience.

That nation which is not fit to govern itself, for which the United States is to-day compelled to act as receiver, is to sit in a league of nations and vote. But, somebody will say, we will control their vote. Is that so? Then why are they there? Is this league of nations a fake, and are these people to be controlled as mere automatons? If so, we start out with a fraud upon the world; we seek to perpetrate a trick upon humanity; and we brand ourselves as unworthy of the confidence of men.

#### HAITI.

I now invite you to a change of scene, but not to change of environment or color. Haiti. What man is there in all the world who saw us a few months ago send our marines into Haiti to preserve order and stop murder and pillage and riot, and to compel obedience to the decencies of life—what man is there outside of the precincts of some building where the insane are cared for would have prophesied a year ago that it would now be solemnly proposed that Haiti shall sit in the councils of nations empowered to vote a decree that may settle the fate of the United States? Who but a man bereft of reason would have thought that the representatives of the United States would ever have consented to so monstrous a proposal?

Haiti: Total population, 1,500,000 in 1911. Practically 99 per cent of the people are negroes or of negro extraction. Illiteracy is the common condition. The Republic was established by assassination. In 1804 the blacks rose in revolt and massacred the French, man, woman, and child, almost to the last individual. From that time to this their Government has been a succession of petty tyrannies generally established in blood and usually extinguished by battle or murder. Their elections are generally held by a group of assassins who meet together and determine the exact moment at which they propose to kill the ruler and to put another one in his place.

I desire to read from the American Geographic Magazine of 1916, and I am inviting all the reformers there are here, and all the dreamers who dream dreams and see visions, and all of those who believe in the new magic, to follow me as I peruse these somber lines. Says this disinterested authority:

It was Dessalines who led these forces which defeated the French, massacred their women and children, and set up an independent Government. From that time, 1804, to the present they have had 28 rulers, including a king and an emperor. Of these, only 4 completed their terms of office, 2 died in power, 5 were assassinated, 10 were exiled, 1 committed suicide, and 1 abdicated under compulsion.

Of Christophe, the second ruler, Sir Frederick Treves gives us this glimpse:

To Dessalines succeeded Christophe, one of the most ludicrous figures in modern history. He was a mulatto slave who took upon himself the title of Henri I. He created a copious black aristocracy—

Which I presume now will be transformed into a modern democracy—

whereby the water-side porter became a duke and the footman a marquis. He drew up a code of laws, the Code Henri in imitation of the Code Napoleon. His court was as gorgeous as the court of an opera bouffe. More than that, he built the palace of Sans Souci, an unbelievable edifice, worthy of Arabian Nights. The ruins of this fantastic edifice still crown certain gracious heights near Cape Haitien. Henri I did one wise thing. He shot himself after a burlesque reign of some 13 years.

The author adds—

He, Sir Frederick Treves, might have added that the fastidious Christophe used a silver bullet. Lead was too plebeian for his aristocratic brain.

Another ruler was Soulouque, an illiterate and superstitious negro, who under the title of Emperor Faustin I established a nobility—

[Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The galleries will refrain from demonstrations.

Mr. REED. This author continues:

Among the recipients of his honors being His Grace the Duke of Limonade and His Highness Prince Bobo.

In 1912, when the Knox mission to Latin America visited Port au Prince, President Laconte was in power. The city then thoroughly fitted Ober's description of it when he wrote:

"As to Port au Prince, I can bear testimony respecting its utter filthiness and agree with a recent resident there that it may bear away the palm of being the most foul-smelling and consequently fever-stricken city in the world. Everyone throws his refuse before his door, so that the heaps of manure and every species of rubbish incur the way. The gutters are open, pools of stagnant water obstruct the streets everywhere and receive constant accession from the inhabitants using them as cesspools and sewers."

But conditions were good then to what they became later. Laconte had set some of his generals to breaking stone for macadamizing the streets, and white residents said that the town was cleaner that year than it had been in their memory.

#### A REIGN OF TERROR.

But Laconte did not rule long. He was assassinated, the palace was burned down, and there was inaugurated a carnival of crime and an orgy of revolution such as history perhaps never before was called upon to record. Indeed, the four years that began with the assassination of Laconte and ended with the surrender of the last rebels to United States authority were a nightmare of terror.

In one case the body of a dead ruler was lying in state in the cathedral when a military company was drawn up and commanded to fire into the coffin, which they did with riddling effect. In still another case 110 leading citizens were shot and a reign of terror surpassing even past performances was inaugurated.

This in its turn resulted in the storming of the French legation, where President Guillaume Sam, who had ordered the execution of these people, had taken refuge. He was dragged out; his body was drawn in quarters and dragged through the streets.

Then follow some historical sketches of that country, which I do not pause to read, but I do pause long enough to read to these reformers who want to put the advanced peoples, who represent science and humanity and religion, in command of the bad—I pause long enough to read you this little sketch, and may it sink into your hearts:

Every authority on Haiti agrees that vaudoux or voodoo worship exists there and that it is probably a survival of African fetishism. It is agreed by all authorities that now and then in the frenzy of the snake dances the worshippers refuse to be content with anything less than a sacrifice of the "goat without horns"—a living child. When one of the recent presidents of the republic was assassinated he carried the emblems of vaudouxism next to his heart, showing that the cult has existed even in the highest places.

So these baby murderers, these creatures of the forest who sacrifice children to their idols, are to have a place in the councils of the nations, and their vote is to be the equal of the vote of the United States. My friend from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] shakes his head in the negative. I say, "yes." It is time for misrepresentation to cease. Haiti sits as a member; every member has one vote, and but one vote. How, then, can it be denied that they have a vote?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I want to inquire of the Senator whether he has changed his opinion heretofore expressed in the Senate, that this league was to be dominated by the monarchs and kings of Europe and Asia?

Mr. REED. Yes; I changed my opinion, for then I thought that no sane man would ever propose that any but the leading nations of the world should sit in this council and vote. I

never dreamed that anybody would propose that the representative of Liberia, the representative of Haiti, and the representatives of other countries that constitute the dregs of civilization would be given a vote.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And has the Senator also changed his opinion heretofore expressed that this is a league which is going to be dominated by Great Britain and her dominions?

Mr. REED. I will answer that. I say that among the great nations Great Britain will have six votes, if not seven, to our one. That is expressly guaranteed in this league. When I discussed this question heretofore, I said she might at some time have five votes. I did not then know, and surely the Senator from Nebraska did not know, that she was already guaranteed six votes, for the Senator from Nebraska on the floor of the Senate denied that the British Empire would have five votes to our one, but she has six votes given to her.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Of course, the Senator from Nebraska denies that statement. It was the Senator from Missouri who made the statement that this was a league which was to be dominated by the British Empire.

Mr. REED. Exactly.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Then he said it was going to be dominated by monarchs of Europe and of Asia. Now he says it is going to be dominated by the little half-baked countries that he is proceeding to name.

Mr. REED. Oh, Mr. President—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to know which the Senator means.

Mr. REED. Well, I will tell the Senator where I stand, and he will find that I am standing upon the rock of truth and have nothing to take back; but I think before we get through this debate he will have to take back everything he has said.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator from Missouri admits he has changed his position two or three times.

Mr. REED. Oh, no; I do not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I want to know which rock the Senator is standing on at the present time.

Mr. REED. Well, I am standing on one which is so solid that the Senator can not push me from it. He need not worry about that.

The first speech I made upon the league of nations was before the so-called constitution of the league had been given to the world, but had been discussed through the newspapers. All we had was news leaking out and obtained by the newspaper men as best they could. Upon that I discussed the question of what kind of league we would have to have if one possessing any real power were created. I therefore discussed what was in fact a hypothetical league.

The next speech I made on the league of nations was on the 22d day of February—Washington's Birthday. At that time we had been furnished with a copy of the original draft of the first league of nations as prepared and presented. That document gave us the names of but five member countries, and sedulously concealed from us the other countries that were to be admitted. I then discussed the question and said that that league, if it were organized, would probably be controlled by Great Britain, because it contained a clause which gave to the colonies and to the dominions of Great Britain the right to vote; and that, therefore, Great Britain might obtain, if she availed herself of the powers of the league, a vote for the dominion and for each of her four colonies; but whether they would obtain it or not seemed to be a matter for the future. But I said when Great Britain did obtain it, with her then power and influence with the other nations, she could dominate this league. Now we find that all the time it was written not that Great Britain may in the future obtain this advantage, but that all the time Australia and Canada and New Zealand and India and South Africa had been written in the league and given a vote. So Great Britain then, as now, was guaranteed 6 votes to the 1 vote of the United States.

Now, I come and say that on top of that infamy, that iniquity, that unjustifiable situation, it is proposed to fill this league up with the backward nations of the world, and that, if those nations were to unite, they could constitute a majority; and upon any race question they will, in all probability, constitute a majority.

The Senator from Nebraska can talk about abandoned positions. If I abandoned my position as often as the advocates of this league have changed theirs, I should move so fast that I would resemble the country acrobat whose neighbors boasted that he could spin on his heel so fast the observer could not tell whether the patch was in front or behind.

I propose to proceed with Haiti, and let my friend from Nebraska defend his position regarding Liberia; let him go to the people of Nebraska and tell them whether he believes that 50,000 semicivilized negroes along the coast of Africa should cast a vote

in the league of nations equal to that of the United States. I ask the Senator the question now.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask the Senator this question—

Mr. REED. No; I ask the Senator from Nebraska a question.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, unfortunately I have not the floor.

Mr. REED. Oh, I am giving it to the Senator to answer this question. Is the Senator willing or not?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Willing to what?

Mr. REED. To give to 50,000 civilized or semicivilized negroes along the coast of Africa the right to cast a vote in the league of nations equal to the vote of the 110,000,000 people of the United States?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. My judgment is that if Great Britain and France do not object to these small nations, that are practically under the protection of the United States, being financed by the United States, and largely controlled by the United States, coming into the league, it is not likely that we will suffer very much from them.

Mr. REED. I am asking the Senator if he is willing to consent to the proposition? Can we not have a categorical answer? Is the Senator willing to put these 50,000 negroes up as the equals of the 110,000,000 people of the United States?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to ask the Senator whether he has named any country that is not practically under the protection of the United States?

Mr. REED. Why, certainly; I will name some.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And dominated by the United States at the present time?

Mr. REED. I will name some. Just abide in patience a wee bit; I am coming to that just as fast as my poor tongue can travel. I observe that I am unable to get an answer to my question. I therefore proceed.

Mr. President, let us see about this tutelage and guardianship. Again I say either these nations will sit there as free nations, with the right of self-determination, or else a monstrous fake and hoax and fraud is being put off on the world. How do you know you will vote the representatives of this race always? It is my opinion that you could buy the representative of Liberia at any time with a peck of potatoes if somebody did not bid a bushel; and the representative of Haiti for even a less sum unless somebody raised the "ante." But at any time we are likely to be outbid.

The Senator states that Liberia is under our protection. Just at present she is in the hands of this country financially as receiver; but the French influence there was, until recently, more than ours. But why is Liberia given a seat in the league of nations if, as you intimate, another country is to control its vote? What kind of logic are you employing, sir, when your only excuse for admitting into the league the depraved, the vicious, and the wicked is that they will not perform their functions as members but that they will be controlled as cats-paws and voted as automatons by some other nation? Are we to establish voting mandatories in the league? And does the Senator insist that the United States is to act as vote mandatory for Liberia?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understood the Senator made some such charge with relation to the dominions of Great Britain—that they would be controlled by Great Britain.

Mr. REED. I do; and I say it is monstrous to put them in. Now, I presume the Senator's plea will be that Great Britain is to have five or six votes, represented by these great colonies of hers, and we are to have as an offset these negro dominions, so that both the United States and England will each have a number of fake votes in the league of nations, that is to constitute the brotherhood of man and the high tribunal that is to usher in the millenium! The league is to be packed with fake votes, whose voices upon command shall proclaim the coming of God and the complete equality of the races of men! At such a proposition the gorge ought to rise, but it will not rise in the stomach of the Senator from Nebraska.

I was discussing Haiti when I was interrupted by the Senator from Nebraska. I then for a time returned to Liberia. I now read a little further about Haiti:

Marriage is neither frequent nor legally prescribed, since all children are considered legitimate. In the interior polygamy is frequent. On the whole, it must be owned that after a century of independence and self-government the Haitians have made little or no progress, if, indeed, they have not shown actual signs of retrogression. Justice is venal and the police are brutal.

Well, if down there they sell their decisions in their courts, I suppose their representative might sell his vote in the league of nations.

All classes seem to be permeated with a thinly disguised belief in voodooism (a devil worship imported with the slaves from Africa). (Encyclopedia Brit., 11th edition, 1911.)

I am going to give, for whatever pleasure he can get out of it, a seat between Haiti and Liberia—a seat of honor—to my distinguished friend from Nebraska.

HEDJAZ.

I pass to another country that will not be controlled by America, another country, that, if controlled at all, will be controlled by France or England; happily it may be, for if it is controlled by France or England we may at least conclude that its vote will not be worse for the world than France or England desires; but if it be cast on its own account then only the Infinite can tell how it may vote. I refer to Hedjaz. Few Americans ever heard of that blessed country until this war began. And yet its representative is to enjoy a vote in the league of nations equal to the vote of this great Republic. It has a total population of 300,000—less than the population of one ward of certain American cities. One hundred and fifty thousand of these people are the wild Bedouins of the desert, wanderers, creatures who follow the camels and sleep under the skies, who live as their fathers lived 10,000 years ago, and who have not accumulated an idea since, except that they have adopted Mohammedanism. Who is going to vote them—America?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Will the Senator explain what they can vote on? I think that would be interesting.

Mr. REED. On anything that America can vote on in the league of nations, and have an equal vote.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is entirely mistaken.

Mr. REED. Ah, does the Senator claim the league of nations has nothing to do? Let us have it out—does it have nothing to do, or does it have something to do?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The league has very little to do.

Mr. REED. Then the league is a fake, is it not?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Practically all of its powers, as the Senator well knows if he has studied the constitution of the proposed league, are in the hands of the executive council, and the only five permanent members of that executive council are the United States, Great Britain, France, Italy, and Japan.

Mr. REED. Then you have not a league of nations; you have a quintuple alliance. Instead of having a league of nations of the world, as the President said he was going to have, you have five great nations that have united themselves to govern and dominate the world. You plead too much, my friend. You have stood declaring in this Chamber and on the public platforms of the United States, in substance and effect, that this league of nations was to be an assembly of the nations of the world, destined to become a great force, that would control the evil passions of men and of races and bring to the world peace, harmony, and good will, and now you stand here declaring, as your only excuse for its existence, that it is a powerless thing, that it is a thing without body, parts, passions, or anything else to constitute a governing body—you stand here and proclaim to the world that the whole thing is a fake, that it is a pitiable fraud, that it is a miserable pretense; and therefore it does not make any difference what you put into it, as nothing is to come out of it.

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

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

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I am giving the Senator's statement. He has stated that the small nations which he has named will have as great a vote as the United States, when he knows, as a matter of fact, that no nation not one of the five permanent members of the executive council can have as much vote, influence, and power as the five members named on the executive council permanently; he knows that.

Mr. REED. Oh, Mr. President, I said that in the league they will have as much power as will the United States—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Well, I should like to ask the Senator if the executive council is not the governing body of the league?

Mr. REED. Wait a moment—and when I said that I meant exactly what I said, that when it comes to a vote in the league—and everybody knows that there are two elements; there is the membership, and then there is an executive council, and I have been talking about the membership—as members in the league the nations to which I have referred have exactly the same vote as the United States, and the Senator knows it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I should like to know what questions can come before the membership? Can the Senator state them?

Mr. REED. Yes; I will. The Senator seems to have lost his temper, his poise, and his usual good nature.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Missouri will desist for a moment. In interrupting the Senator from Missouri the Senator from Nebraska and others will get either his consent or the recognition of the Chair.

Mr. REED. Although I am being diverted from my object, which was to make a close argument about the league member-

ship, I will depart from it at this point long enough to read this for the delectation of the Senator from Nebraska:

The assembly—

That is the league, is it not? That is the membership—  
*may deal at its meetings with any matter within the sphere of action of the league, or affecting the peace of the world.*

Now, this assembly, of which Liberia is a member, of which Haiti is a member, and of which the United States is a member, are granted the authority to deal with *any question affecting the peace of the world*; and when they come to those questions Haiti and Liberia each have the same vote as the vote of the United States. A man who will deny that is simply dishonest, unfair, and unwilling to have the truth go before the American people.

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania?

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. KNOX. Perhaps the Senator from Missouri will read that paragraph of the fifteenth section which says that any question which is carried to the council may be carried from the council to the assembly at the request of either party.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, will the Senator permit me to answer that question?

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

Mr. REED. Let me read that first, and then I shall be glad to have the Senator answer it.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I understand it, and I have an answer.

Mr. REED. Perhaps the Senator would prefer making the answer now.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I will make the answer. The Senator from Pennsylvania refers to disputes between two nations. They may be referred to the body of delegates instead of being heard by the executive council; but when heard by the body of delegates the same rules apply as in the executive council, and the vote must be unanimous except where specifically otherwise provided. That makes it impossible for any little countries like these to control the decision unless the great nations of the world are agreed.

Mr. REED. And it makes it impossible for a great nation like ours to control the decisions if even one of the little countries is not agreed.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Certainly.

Mr. REED. So that you tie the hands of the United States by the vote of the gentleman from Liberia; and where do you come out? All you have argued thus far is that your league is an innocuous thing because it is powerless, and yet you tell us it is to save the world!

Mr. KNOX. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator from Pennsylvania.

Mr. KNOX. As the reply of the Senator from Nebraska was addressed to me, I should like to add that if you take the trouble to read this thing, you will find out what it says. There is so much of "it means thus and so because somebody says so, and he said so because somebody else said so." If you take up the twelfth section, you will find that it is the fundamental right of every member of the league to raise any question against a nation that, in its judgment, affects a good understanding between nations, or which is liable to disturb the peace of the world; and then if you turn to section 15 you will find that that matter goes to the council, and then either party may carry it from the council to the assembly; and it is just as the Senator from Missouri has said—that while, of course, these little nations could not put over an injustice in their own favor, yet they could, by their vote, prevent justice from being done to the greatest nations of the world.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I am obliged to the Senator from Pennsylvania and I am obliged to the Senator from Nebraska for these interruptions. I will attempt to discuss that particular phase at the proper time. I want to discuss now the personnel of the league. I am discussing the jury that is to try the great world causes; I am challenging the array. I am saying it is dishonestly drawn and outrageously brought together. I am going to pause long enough to challenge the lawyers of the Senate: Which one of you, having an important case to try, involving the life or the property of your friend or your client or yourself, would be willing to submit it to a jury composed—and I will put the good nations in with the bad—of an Englishman, a Frenchman, an Italian, an American, a Jap, a Chinaman, an Indian from India, a Siamese, a Negro from Liberia, a half-caste from Honduras, a Negro from Haiti, and an Arab from Hedjaz? Which one of you would submit the question of your own life or your own liberty or that of your friends to such a jury? And if you would not

submit matters of property of the individual to such a jury, which one of you dare submit the life of your Nation, the honor of your country, the glory of your flag to such a tribunal? And what a beggarly thing it is to stand and say, "Though we set up the league with all this blare of trumpets, though we proclaim it the guarantor of peace for all time, though we impiously assert that it is the greatest conception since Christ's Sermon on the Mount"—still the moment it is shown that its power may be abused we immediately assert that it has no power for harm, because it has no power at all! What a miserable argument to say that the United States can not be bound by the votes of these degenerate races of men, because everything must have unanimous consent, when you must at the same time admit that that rule enables any one of these degenerate nations to prevent the United States and all the other members from accomplishing any reform or bringing about any good result. For if the United States can cast a negative vote that can save it from control, then the Negro Republic of Haiti can cast a vote that will block the machinery of the league and will withhold every reform that others may seek to effect.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

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

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I call the Senator's attention now to the fact that he has again shifted his position.

Mr. REED. Oh, no.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. He came into the Senate Chamber some weeks ago and said that the United States was going into a league in which it would be outvoted and ruined. Now he is condemning the league because it has not the power to do that thing.

Mr. REED. Oh, Mr. President, one has to shift his position when he has an antagonist who will not stand still three seconds. [Laughter in the galleries.]

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I should like to have the Senator meet the issue.

Mr. REED. I will meet it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will desist for a moment. The occupants of the galleries must preserve order.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I ask the Senator whether he did not complain on a former occasion that the United States was going into an enterprise in which a majority might decide against it?

Mr. REED. Yes.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. And is not the Senator here now condemning the league because it requires a unanimous vote?

Mr. REED. Oh, no. I am using your own argument to eat up your own argument with; that is all. I did say on a former occasion that a majority vote could bind the United States, and the Senator from Nebraska said it could not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I did, and I insist on it now.

Mr. REED. And your friends over in Paris, knowing that you were wrong, wrote into the league a clause saying that except where it was specifically otherwise stated a unanimous vote should be had, thus saying that when you said to the American people, as the chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, that a decision by the league required a unanimous vote, you were utterly mistaken, and they repudiated you the first time they met.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President, I ask the Senator now will he come to the point? Has he shifted his ground or not?

Mr. REED. I have not.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Did the Senator formerly condemn the league because a majority vote might control, and does he now condemn it because a unanimous vote is necessary?

Mr. REED. I condemn any league—

Mr. HITCHCOCK. I guess that is right.

Mr. REED (continuing). That proposes to put the vital interests of the United States within the power of a majority of foreigners, or to put the United States into a position so that once an order has been made it never can escape from that, except by the unanimous vote of other nations. If the Senator will simply pause long enough to analyze that, he will see how logical it is.

I object, in the first place, to giving to the representatives of foreign countries, by a majority vote or by a unanimous vote, the right to bind this country on vital questions. Now, according to the Senator's construction, this league can not bind us without our consent having been given. Very well. It goes further than that. Our consent once having been given, we can never escape, unless we can get every one of the nations of the world that is a member of this league to grant its gracious consent. That leaves us utterly defenseless. The covenant as construed by the Senator is exactly like the laws of the Medes and Persians. Once a decree has been rendered, once an order has been made, it can not be changed, except by a unanimous vote.

That is almost the equivalent of saying no change can ever be made when the subject is one of serious dispute.

Let me take an illustration. Suppose that this league by unanimous consent were to fix the size of the American Army at 250,000 men, and suppose the United States were to vote for that decision, believing it to be a proper thing at that time. Suppose that subsequently we should conclude that we needed an army of 500,000 men. We could not have that army without the consent of the league. If Great Britain voted "No" we could not have it. If every nation voted "Aye" except Liberia, we could not have it. So we place our Nation in such a position that its fate may be determined adversely by the single vote of one degenerate race or by the vote of one of our enemies.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. Mr. President—

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

Mr. REED. I do.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. The Senator is confusing the duties of the league. The duties he refers to belong exclusively to the executive council.

Mr. REED. Very well. Do they require a unanimous vote?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. They do not go before the league.

Mr. REED. I insist that they do; but I do not care to argue it. If you are going to put the matter before the executive council, does it require a unanimous vote?

Mr. HITCHCOCK. It certainly does.

Mr. REED. Very well.

Mr. HITCHCOCK. But I object to the Senator saying that Liberia could object, because Liberia is not a member of the executive council.

Mr. REED. I do not care to discuss the question from that narrow basis. Liberia might not be a member of the council, but it is certain Japan will be, and eight or nine other countries may be, and any one might cast a vote as fatal to us. But even if I discuss the inconsequential, I pause to insist that we do not know whether Liberia may not finally get on even the executive council, although I think it unlikely. We did not believe Liberia would be in the league. We did not think any one would put it in, but you did put it in. I remember making a speech in Missouri, out at the State university. I was discussing the possibilities of this league, and went on to say that a lot of the smaller nations might have a vote equal to ours. I said, "It is even possible that Liberia may be given such a vote"; and then I said, "No; that is not fair; I withdraw that statement. It is possible, but no sane man would propose it"; and hence I apologized for having mentioned it. Imagine my consternation and astonishment three days afterwards when it was announced that Liberia was in the league, along with Haiti.

But now I am discussing our friend Hedjaz. [Laughter in the galleries.]

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator will desist for just a moment. The occupants of the galleries will abstain from that character of demonstration or the Chair will have to take such steps as are necessary to preserve order in the galleries.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, I hope the Chair will not be too stern with the galleries. I am to blame. Besides, the Chair is interrupting me more than the occupants of the galleries.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Chair does not mean to interrupt any Senator.

Mr. REED. I know. I apologize if my remark seemed somewhat impolite. I did not so mean it.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. But the Senator is well aware of the fact, of course, that the rules provide that it is the duty of the Chair to preserve order in the galleries.

Mr. REED. Oh, I understand, and I apologize if I have spoken in a way that was misunderstood. I meant no more than to indulge in a pleasantry.

The total population of Hedjaz is 300,000, but it is given a vote equal to the United States. One hundred and fifty thousand, as I said a moment ago, are wandering Bedouins of the desert. The Encyclopedia Britannica has this to say:

Though physically the most desolate and uninviting Province in Arabia, it has a special interest and importance as containing the two sacred cities of Islam—Mecca and Medina—the birthplace and burial spot, respectively, of Mahomet, which are visited yearly by large numbers of Moslem pilgrims from all parts of the world.

Of the Bedouins, it says:

All these nomadic tribes receive money payments of large amounts from the Turkish Government to insure the safe conduct of the annual pilgrimage, otherwise they are practically independent of the Turkish administration.

As a matter of fact, they have for decades been the highwaymen of the desert, and have levied their tribute under the

guise of protection upon every pious soul who has come to weep over the ashes of Mahomet. One hundred and fifty thousand Bedouins wander the desert. One hundred and fifty thousand other Hedjazians live in the towns; all of them are Mohammedans who regard it a virtue to kill a Christian. All of them who can afford it fill their harems with slaves captured or purchased; and yet this body of men, under the control certainly of France or England, not of the United States, if they are controlled at all, are to cast a vote equal to the 110,000,000 sovereigns of the United States!

Let those who like that swallow it; but the man who can swallow it would agree to a proposition to give a vote to the inmates of every first-class lunatic asylum of the United States, or to grant a seat in the league to the naked Hottentots that remain uncaught in Africa.

#### PANAMA.

Again I present you with another one of these kindred spirits, just now embarking on the reform of the world and in the control of the evil passions of men. I refer to Panama.

Population, 450,000. That is not as many people as live in the city of Kansas City alone. Ninety per cent of these are a mixture of negroes and Spanish mulattoes. Yet, you men of the South, you lily-whites, you gentlemen who say that white men alone should control in your own States, are willing to allow this meagre population, 90 per cent of whom are negroes and mulattoes, living hundreds of miles from our shores, to have a vote equal to the total vote of the United States in the league of nations! Go back to your people and justify yourselves if you can. Tell them this is the new democracy, a magic democracy, in which one negro outside the United States has a vote substantially equal to 220 of the white citizens of this Republic! But perhaps they have been put in for the purpose of toning up the moral situation, for we are also to look after the morals of the world, I read.

The morals of these people are shown by this fact from the Statesman's Yearbook of 1918, which recites that—

In 1915 there were 12,040 births, of which 8,077 were illegitimate. The slothfulness of the inhabitants—

This author continues—

is illustrated by the fact that although the soil is of great fertility fully three-eighths of it is unoccupied.

And I suppose as they meet here in Washington to organize the league of nations the representative of Panama, bearing a milk-white banner emblematic of purity, and the representative of Hedjaz, at the head of his harem, will lead the procession, each appropriately adorned with rings in ears and nose.

#### HONDURAS.

Population, 562,000, estimated, because they have not advanced far enough to count the people. They have not had sense enough to take a census. Indeed, I presume the task would be difficult, for many of the natives are hard to catch. They have been running ever since the Spaniards came down there and murdered a lot of them. Total population, 562,000—a good deal less than the city of St. Louis. These are chiefly Mestizos and Indians. The Mestizo is a conglomerate. His blood is composed of that of the Spanish buccaneer and marauder, some negro, some Chinese, but principally it is Indian blood. It is said that over 200,000 inhabitants are of pure Indian blood, and 90,000 of these are mountain Indians, who are thoroughly wild and in their aboriginal state. The Encyclopædia Britannica declares that a complete and accurate census can not be taken throughout the country, since the ignorant masses of the people, and especially the Indians, avoid a census as in some way connected with military conscription or taxation. Primary education is free, secular, and compulsory, but the percentage of illiterates is very high, especially among the Indians; and further information that I have from other sources is that while they have upon their statute books compulsory education, it is in fact practically not availed of at all.

Honduras's history, says the Encyclopædia Britannica, has been one round of intrigues of aspiring revolutionists with other revolutionists of Guatemala, Nicaragua, and other neighboring States. They have had nothing like a stable government. They have had nothing like a government of sobriety and of law. And yet the representatives of these people, not far enough advanced to take their own census, not sufficiently stable so that a man elected to an office there knows whether he will hold it a day or a week—this country, where a revolution is a common method of election—is proposed now to be set up to govern the world and to bring order to the universe! Who is to cast that vote? Are we to own it also? If so, how much are we to pay for it? Who is to control the vote of that Indian who comes here, or that mulatto who comes here from Honduras?

By what system of logic will you justify giving to the inhabitants of a country that has a little over a half million population a vote equal to the United States, with its 110,000,000 people? One man in the United States, one country township in the most remote district of Mississippi or of Georgia or of Missouri is better entitled to a single vote than the entire country of Honduras. This is another member of your world jury. You may accept him. I object. I challenge his capacity. The average citizens of that State could not vote in Massachusetts, because he could not pass the educational qualifications. The average citizens of that State could not vote in Mississippi or Georgia or North Carolina, because of his color. Neither could he vote in many States, because of the provisions of their constitutions, as has just been suggested. No; they could not vote for constable, as the Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. GORE] states.

#### NICARAGUA.

Now I come to Nicaragua. The great mass of the population is a composite race, descended chiefly from the native Indians, their Spanish conquerors, and negro slaves introduced during the Spanish colonial period. I am reading from the Statesman's Yearbook, on page 1122. The total population of this country in 1914 was 703,500, not quite equal to the population of the single city of Boston. I believe Boston far outruns it now. Yet it is given a vote equal to the vote of the United States! Oh, my friends, the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK] shakes his head, because he holds that members of the league do not have anything to do; they are, he thinks, mere figureheads. He thinks that the executive council is going to run everything, by which he admits that his world league is a failure and a fake, that it can not be trusted; therefore he insists that it has been given nothing to do. But it does have much to do—a question that will be debated at another time. We have already gone far enough into it, and I have already read that there is consigned to this league—not to the council, but to the league itself—every question affecting the peace of the world. Any other construction makes the thing a fraud and a fake and a joke.

Due to a revolution in 1909 and subsequent annual insurrections, United States marines are now garrisoned in Bluefields and other principal coast towns. The immediate cause of this is found in the fact that the Government, always a mere succession of tyrants, finally for a time rested in the hands of Zelaya. This tyrant was overthrown, and the conversion of the country from an unspeakable despotism into one of ruinous anarchy resulted. I read from the National Geographic Magazine of 1916, page 151:

The rival factions—

Says this author—

issued fiat money as freely as tap water flows from a spigot. The treasury was bankrupt, interest was in default, foreign creditors were threatening—

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. Pardon me one moment—

foreign creditors were threatening, through their Governments, to collect their debts with gunboats and cruisers, and there was not enough money to be had by the party in power to pay salaries, much less soldiers' wages.

#### HELPING NICARAGUA ESCAPE THE THROES OF CHRONIC REVOLUTION.

In its insecure tenure under these conditions the party in power was only too willing to save itself and incidentally the country by appealing to the United States, and by offering to make itself an instrumentality in America's hands for the rejuvenation of the nation.

The United States accepted the offer and Nicaragua has been practically an American receiver, order being maintained by American marines. The United States was compelled to take these steps in Nicaragua or to be forced to abandon the Monroe doctrine. Now, this country, incapable of government, absolutely in such condition that our country had to interfere and act as its receiver, is to be placed in the league of nations to cast a vote equal to the vote of the United States! Its population of the dark and mixed races—that is, of Indians and Negroes and Mestizos—is 90 per cent of the total.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President—

Mr. REED. I yield to the Senator.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Has the Senator spoken about the neighboring State of Guatemala?

Mr. REED. I have not. I am coming to it.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Yes. The conditions are quite similar, I dare say, as in Honduras and Nicaragua.

Mr. REED. I think they are.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Guatemala is represented in the present peace conference, is she not?

Mr. REED. I imagine she is.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Has the Senator learned that any disaster is likely to ensue to the world by reason of the representation of that State in the peace conference?

Mr. REED. Oh, Mr. President, I want to be polite, but is not that begging the question? You might just as well say that because a thief had been at large for 10 days and had not yet stolen anything that is proof he never will and therefore that all citizens should receive him into their homes. If Guatemala has been over there, she has not been permitted to say anything yet. The Senator will doubtless reply, She is never going to be. If so, why is she given a seat in the league?

#### GUATEMALA.

I come now to Guatemala, for that is my next topic. The total population of Guatemala in 1903, which was the latest I could get, was 1,842,000. Eighty-five per cent are Indians and Mestizos and 92 per cent can not read or write. Of course, that qualifies them to sit in judgment upon the world and to pass their opinion with reference to all creation!

I have gone over the question of their illiteracy and I shall not repeat it. The *Encyclopædia Britannica* says:

The condition of the Indians on the plantation is often akin to slavery, owing to the system adopted by some planters of making payments in advance, for the Indians spend their earnings and thus contract debts which can only be paid by long service. The inhabitants tend to increase rapidly, due to high birth rate and low mortality. About one-half of the births among the Indians and one-third among the whites are illegitimate.

Mr. President, I do not care to stop to comment on a situation such as that as I pass along. I have already made comments that I think fairly well cover the case and will let it apply to this.

#### ECUADOR.

I come now to Ecuador. No general census has ever been taken. According to the official estimate of 1900, and it was only an estimate, the total population was 1,500,000, being 1,000,000 Indians, 300,000 Mestizos—a better word for them being "greasers"—100,000 whites, 44,000 Negroes, and 6,000 foreigners. The whites, although numbering only 100,000, form an exclusive governing caste, as in Chile. The territory of the Republic is divided among a few of them, and the government is in their hands. Of course, they are brought in here to increase the general average of democracy, and their vote necessarily would be cast in favor of the rights of man, this body that hold the lands and control all the people and runs the Government. The land is held by a few proprietors. The caste sentiment is strong among those who claim unmixed European descent. Consequently the Mestizos have a limited opportunity to improve their condition. During the years 1830 to 1909 Ecuador adopted no less than 11 constitutions.

I think I know why we have her in here. She is an expert on constitutions. She has written more than any country on earth and ought to know more about the experiments under them.

Although primary education is free and obligatory, a considerable part of the population is unprovided with schools and is indifferent to them. In 1900 there were only 94,500 pupils in the entire country. So we have there a governing population of 100,000, and that governing population that has enslaved the rest of their fellowmen, that governing population of 100,000, is to have a vote in the league of nations equal to the vote of the United States! But, of course, that is all right; it is written in the league of nations.

#### BOLIVIA.

We come now to Bolivia. The total population in 1900, the last figures I could get that seemed reliable, was 1,766,451; Indians, 50.7 per cent; Mestizos, 26.8; whites, 12.8 per cent; Negroes, 0.3 per cent; and unknown, 9.4 per cent.

All the census returns and estimates in such a country are subject to many allowances—

Says the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

The Indian population (920,860) is largely composed of the so-called civilized tribes of the Andes, which once formed part of the nationality ruled by the Incas. They are peaceable and industrious and form an important laboring element. They are addicted to the use of chicha (native rum), and have little or no ambition to improve their condition, but this may be attributed to their profound ignorance and to the state of peonage in which they are held.

And so they are to be put up to govern the world. I read on:

The white population (231,088) is descended in great part from the early Spanish adventurers who entered the country in search of mineral wealth. The percentage of whites does not increase, as in Argentina and Brazil, and can not until means are found to promote European immigration.

Mestizos (486,018) are less numerous than the Indians, but outnumber the whites by more than 2 to 1. It has been said of the Mestizos that they inherit the vices of both races and the virtues of neither. Yet with a decreasing Indian population, and with a white population wanting in energy, the future of Bolivia mainly depends on them. As a rule they are ignorant, unprogressive, and apathetic, intensely cruel, superstitious, and intemperate—

Outside of that, I suppose, they are all right.

It may be that education and experience will develop the Mestizo into a progressive nationality, but the first century of self-government can hardly be said to have given much promise of such a result.

The rest of this I reserve the right to print. I have been reading excerpts from the *Encyclopædia Britannica*.

Physically Bolivia is an inland Republic, intensely mountainous, with few good roads—communication is difficult—and she owns to only 430 miles of railroad.

Although Bolivia has a free and "compulsory" school system, education and the provision thereof have made little progress. Only a small percentage of the people can read and write. Although Spanish is the language of the dominant minority, Indian idioms are the languages of the natives, who form a majority of the population. A considerable percentage of the Indians do not understand Spanish at all and resist every effort to have it forced on them. Even the Mestizos are more familiar with the Indian language than with Spanish.

The school enrollment—1901—was only 1 to 43 of population.

Bolivia's right of suffrage is exercised by all male citizens over 21 years (if single) and over 18 (if married) who can read and write, and who own real estate or have an income of \$75 a year, said income not to be compensation for services as a servant.

The electoral body is therefore small, and is under the control of a political oligarchy which practically rules the country, no matter which party is in power. (*Encyclopædia Britannica*, 11th edition, 1911.)

Of course, that sort of education and environment ought to fit the gentlemen from Bolivia for a high position on the court of the world and intellectually ought to qualify him to teach the people of the United States how to run their business and manage their country.

#### PERU.

I come now to Peru. I ask you if there is a single one of these nations I have read up to this time to whose representative you dare refer a matter vital to the interests of the United States.

The population of Peru is a matter of highest doubt. According to some figures only a few years ago they had only 1,500,000 people. They now claim 4,500,000, but of these the percentage of the dark and mixed races to the white is 86. Education is exceedingly low.

I quote the *Encyclopædia Britannica*, eleventh edition, 1911:

Like the other States of South America, its constitution (1860) provides for popular control of legislation and the execution of the laws through free elections and short terms of office, but in practice these safeguards are often set aside and dictatorial methods supersede all others. Nominally the people are free and sovereign, but the ignorance of the masses, their apathy, poverty, and dependence upon the great landowners and industrial corporations practically defeat these fundamental constitutional provisions.

No country is better provided with more or better safeguards against electoral and official abuse than Peru, yet few countries suffered more from political disorder during the nineteenth century. The independence of the Peruvian courts has not been maintained, and there has been much criticism of their character and decisions.

Notice how far they go in education with 4,500,000 people.

Primary education is free and "compulsory" since 1905. However, in 1906 the enrollment in the private schools outnumbered the public schools three to one and the private institutions claimed only 22,000—

A fact which certifies not only to the ignorance of those people, but to their willing ignorance, for they decline education that is made legal and offered to them.

#### BRAZIL.

Mr. President, of all the countries on this side of the Atlantic, with the exception of Canada, which is a part of the British Empire, and, of course, excepting our own Nation, Brazil occupies the best position, the best right to a seat in the council of nations; and yet the total population in 1904 being 24,500,000, there were of this population only 8,000,000 whites. There were 8,000,000 mulattoes or Mestizos, 4,000,000 Negroes, 2,500,000 Indians, and 2,000,000 unclassified. So the whites of that country constitute only one-third of the population. If we ever come to a time of self-determination it is reasonable to anticipate that the colored races will claim their own.

#### SOUTH AFRICA.

Now, Mr. President, I pass to a British possession, South Africa, the South African colony based upon the ruins of two South African republics. The first interesting question is that of population. The total population is 5,000,000, of whom 1,000,000 are whites and 4,000,000 are blacks. It is therefore proper to classify this nation as among the colored nations of the world.

Here is a question to which I challenge your thought. Either the races of South Africa were capable of self-government or they were not. If they were capable of self-government, having gone to that distant land and set themselves up as independent governments, their people should have been permitted to retain their liberty.

But, sir, Great Britain came to that country and, with fire and sword, devastated it and broke up the arms and the armies

of these Republics. Either Great Britain committed one of the monstrous crimes of history when she thus overwhelmed these Republics capable of self-government, or else they were incapable of self-government. If they were incapable of self-government and therefore England was justified, then they are incapable now of sitting on the league of nations and casting a vote that will help control the destinies of the world. If they could not control their own destiny, if they were so backward that Great Britain was impelled in the interests of civilization to take their government away from them and to control them by her armies and her fleets, then under what logic do you propose to set them up now to help govern the world? Great Britain insists that to-day they are incapable of self-government, and hence holds them enthralled. Will that vote be controlled, I ask the Senator from Nebraska—who happens to have vanished from the Chamber, I am sorry to say—by our country or will it be controlled by the armed forces of Great Britain and cast as Great Britain shall dictate?

But if not, and if it have a representative form of government, then why should not the blacks of that country be entitled to a black man to represent them upon the league of nations? Either we are to have democracy or we are not. We are to have self-determination or we are not to have it.

I pass now from that, and yet I do not want to pass from it without calling attention to the fact that in that country the degree of illiteracy is 80 per cent. Eighty per cent of the people can not read or write, and yet their representative is to vote to control the destiny of the United States. They are to be in the league of nations what they are outside of the league of nations, the chattel and the pawns and the dummy directors of Great Britain.

## SIAM.

Again I call your attention to Siam—I have not any doubt this will appeal particularly to the Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HITCHCOCK]—as one of the nations that ought to sit on the league of nations and tell us how we shall run our affairs. Siam's population in 1909 was 6,230,000. Although it is one of the oldest countries claiming to be civilized, and although centuries ago it had a literature and an established form of government, only one out of a hundred of the people can read and write. It is steeped in ignorance and debased by superstition. Its government is a tyranny exercised by an hereditary monarch. It affords a most fitting illustration of a dying race. Its people are divided into castes overridden by Buddhist priests. The most ridiculous superstition and the vilest forms of fetish worship prevail.

I desire to print a list of the people as they are divided. Encyclopædia Britannica, eleventh edition, 1911, shows—

Total population (1909).....	6,230,000
Siamese.....	3,000,000
Laos.....	2,000,000
Chinese.....	400,000
Malay.....	115,000
Cambodians.....	80,000
Europeans.....	1,300 to 1,500
English.....	500
Germans.....	190
Danes.....	160
Americans.....	150

*Polygamy is permitted, but common only among the upper classes. The Siamese are mild mannered—*

Says the Encyclopædia Britannica, from which I am now reading—

patient, submissive to authority, kindly, and hospitable to foreigners.

Most of the industries are in the hands of the Chinese.

The Buddhist monasteries scattered throughout the country carry on almost the whole of the elementary education.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, will the Senator permit an interruption?

Mr. REED. I yield for a question.

Mr. PHELAN. Is the Senator aware of the fact that the hereditary monarch of Siam is a graduate of Oxford University, that he is a man of large education and very intelligent, or would it affect his argument at all if aware of that fact?

Mr. REED. I would not care if a hereditary monarch graduated at all the schools or universities, it would not make me love a monarch. Nearly all monarchs are well educated. One of the very best educated monarchs I know of was a gentleman named William of Germany.

Incidentally, I should like to ask the Senator from California, since he seems to like the king, if speaking for the people of California he would like to open the doors of California for these Siamese people to immigrate and settle in his State? Let us have a real straight-out answer.

Mr. PHELAN. Mr. President, I did not raise the question for the purpose of discussing the merits of the people of Siam, but the hereditary monarch and the ruling classes, according to their form of government, are educated and well-informed persons,

like the Senator from Missouri. I think, therefore, that, representing their Government, they can speak with intelligence and knowledge of the world. But that he is a monarch does not interest me, nor should it interest us in the effort to create a league of nations. We must accept the nations as they are, and possibly under the inspiration of the league there will be a broader democracy in the future.

As to California, we, like the Australians, are bent upon preserving her for a white man's country, and therefore we do not want to transplant the Siamese to California, nor would it be good for the Siamese. Under a league of nations racial distinctions are observed as a cardinal feature, and where a race is permitted to develop along those lines it is best for that race and for the rest of the world.

Mr. REED. Will the Senator pardon me if I suggest that under a league of nations races are not preserved in the manner he states, but, on the contrary, that is a live, burning question yet undecided, as I shall show a little later on.

The Senator states that he is unwilling to have the Siamese come to California, because he does not want them to mingle with his people, and he would not let them vote there, either, would he?

Mr. PHELAN. I do not believe they are assimilable.

Mr. REED. And while they are not assimilable with the people living in California, if you take them and put them in the league of nations, it is perfectly proper to have them vote on the destiny of the United States. You are perfectly willing to have that done, are you not, Senator?

Mr. PHELAN. In so far as they are members of the league they will vote. I do not know how far it will affect the destinies of the United States; but very little, I imagine. They are civilized.

Mr. REED. They would affect it by their vote the same as any other nation. Are you willing to submit a question vital to the interests of the United States to the vote of men you are not even willing to have land on the sacred soil of California?

Mr. PHELAN. The gentleman is opening a large question as to the influence of the members of the league in affecting the destinies of particular States. I am of the opinion that the United States will have a very large voice in determining the destinies of foreign nations.

Mr. REED. The Senator argues that we let these people all in as equals and then we proceed to run the whole thing ourselves. That is usually the argument of the man who has no argument, because either these people come in as equals or else they might better not come in at all. If they come in as equals, then, of course, they are equals, and if we have a right to vote upon a question, they have the same right to vote upon that question.

Mr. PHELAN. There is no question of equality involved in the organization of the league, so far as control is concerned, because the larger nations, four or five of them, are established permanently in control.

Mr. REED. Oh, no; that is just where the Senator is mistaken. I argued that question while the Senator was out, and as I want to get through some time this evening, he will permit me to make a very brief reply to his point. If you argue that the league of nations has no authority—I am speaking now of the membership—then you argue yourself out of court, for that which can do nothing amounts to nothing and becomes a farce and a thing for laughter, sneers, and jeers, like the American aristocracy, as Tom Hood said.

If, on the other hand, there is any power vested in the league, then the representative of Siam has exactly the same power as the representative of Uncle Sam, and it is a pitiable thing to find men standing here proclaiming in one breath that we must have a league of nations as a salvation of the world and that it is to be a great tribunal of equality and democracy, and in the next breath asserting that it has no power and can not do anything. I would be ashamed to make that argument to a country justice of the peace.

But I proceed. I was discussing Siam. Since the question has been raised, if my friends will take the pains to read they will find that among the most honored people of that country are those who have disfigured themselves in superstitious rites. They will learn that the country is divided into castes and classes, so that if one of the lower classes shall but touch the garment of one of the upper class he is unclean and must bathe himself seven or eight times before he feels that he is purified.

I have not time to dwell on these monstrous things. It is because of their debasement and their defilement that this degenerate and dying race has to have sent to it Christian ministers and Christian missionaries, and yet it clings to its old faith; it follows its old dogmas; it wanders amongst the shadows of ignorance; it cringes in the caves of fear; it crouches

before the coiled serpent of superstition. In the heart of every one of them are found those monsters of the mind that are only possible where the mind is but half civilized or half developed.

Here is another author on the subject:

[Quotation from *The World's Peoples*, by Keane, 1908, p. 203.]

Slavery or serfdom was not restricted, as mostly elsewhere, to a particular class, but extending to all the King's subjects. So that the sense of personal dignity was lost, and anyone from the highest to the lowest citizen might at any moment lapse into bondage. Like most Mongoloid peoples they are incurable gamblers, and before the recent reforms a freeman of any rank might stake all his effects, his wives, children, and self on the hazard of the die. \* \* \* But beneath it all spirit or devil worship is still rife, and in many districts Animism is the only religion. Even temples have been raised to the countless gods of land and water, woods, mountains, hamlets, and households. To these gods are credited all evils, and to prevent them from getting into the bodies of the dead these are brought out, not through door or window, but through a breach in the wall, which is afterwards carefully built up.

And they are to be at the council table of the nations. Of course, it is all right. If it had been proposed by an inmate of an asylum who was seeking relief, you would have voted him an incurable, but since it is written in the league of nations, we shall cry, "Holy! Holy! Holy!" and bow our heads in meek submission.

#### INDIA.

I can give you a picture of India in a word. She has a population of 294,361,056. She has been held in thralldom by a little English army, and has not had the spirit to rise and break her chains. Such a people mark and brand themselves at once as not only unfit for the government of others, but as almost unfit for their own government; yet I would not deny that right to the lowest of God's creatures if he lived off with others like himself and wanted a government of his own.

Amongst those 294,000,000 people there is no excess of superstition to which they have not gone; there is no shadow of intellectual night so black that they have not wrapped their souls in its sable folds; there is no species of caste by which men have sought to divide themselves and to keep oppressed by power and priestcraft their fellow men that has not been rife in India for centuries of time.

Again, a dying race, a country in which there are 147 distinct languages, where in religion there are 207,000,000 Hindus, 62,000,000 Mohammedans, 9,000,000 Buddhists, 2,195,000 Sikhs, and various other religions.

A singular fact in relation to them is that the chief article of their revenue is a duty laid upon opium, and in the fumes of that drug what is left of the living soul of India is expiring. This little chattel of Great Britain, this pawn of the British Empire, is brought in here and given a vote equal to the vote of the United States. Yet here, when some of her people emigrated to California, the people of California protested, and when they emigrated to Canada the people of Canada rose and drove them out as a polluted and dangerous people—dangerous to their civilization and ruinous to the wages of labor. Now, it is proposed that this nation, that Great Britain says can not rule herself, shall sit in the council, with her chains upon her wrists, a slave to Great Britain's power, and shall cast her vote equal to the vote of the United States! But it is written in the league of nations, and hence it is a sacred thing.

#### CHINA.

Then we come to China, and how shall I discuss her? Of all the ironies of history there has never been a thing like this. As we induct China into the league of nations, as she takes a seat in the charmed circle of the brotherhood of man, as she enters upon that reign of justice where all international outrage shall cease and when the power of armies shall no longer control—as she takes her seat she is handed a decree ratifying the ravishment of her Provinces by Japan—the theft of 44,000,000 of her citizens—and is told that, as a member of the league, she must sign a ratification and sanctification of that international outrage which has been perpetrated only within the last few months. China, that has been the one nation in all the world that for centuries of time has proclaimed the doctrine of peace; China, that has said the world is too civilized, or ought to be too civilized, to settle questions by the arbitrament of arms, is brought to the council table, and her sentence is that the sword that cut from her heart 44,000,000 of her people shall be sanctified by the league of nations, and shall be made holy by the primary decree of this congregation of saints! But it is written in the league of nations, and it is, therefore, a sacred thing.

If a Republican President had brought the league here; if Roosevelt had brought it here, there is not a Democrat who would not have been standing by my side fighting to the last ditch to rescue the country from the threatened danger, and all these eloquent voices would have been raised, and from your brains would have come those sparks of eloquent fire that would have set a conflagration in the hearts of all the Democrats in

this country and brought them with burning haste to your side to save this country from so monstrous and so cruel a fate.

Oh, but says the *Encyclopædia Britannica*:

If the Chinese character is inferior to the European, its inferiority lies in the fact that the Chinaman's whole philosophy of life disinclines him to change or to energetic action. He is industrious, but his industry is nominally along the lines marked out by authority and tradition. He is brave, but his courage does not naturally seek an outlet in war.

He ought to be brought here and sainted as the original pacifist of the world. That nation should be enshrined and made almost an object of adoration by those who now preach the doctrine of pacifism.

He is brave, but his courage does not naturally seek an outlet in war. The jealously exclusive Empire into which in the nineteenth century the nations of the West forced an entrance was organized for peace; the arts of war had been all but forgotten, and soldiers of all classes were the most despised.

The highest class in China (since the republic) is that forming the civil service.

And yet, Mr. President, this race, with this history and with these attributes, the Senators from California and other Senators from the West would exclude from our shores. They would say to the individual Chinaman, "You can not have citizenship in this country even though your vote shall be only as one to many thousands of Americans"; but they will consent, and they will insist, that China shall cast her vote as a member of the league of nations and that that vote shall be counted as equal to the vote of the United States!

#### JAPAN.

Now I come to Japan. Japan has a population of 56,860,000. Over 90 per cent of them belong to the dark or mixed races. It is said that the percentage of illiteracy is low, but so little is known regarding large parts of the Empire that the statement must be open to question. Nevertheless and notwithstanding all that may be claimed to the contrary, this country is not only a monarchy but it is a monarchy exercising a tyranny over both mind and body. For more than 2,000 years the reigning house of Japan has held undisputed sway. The recent slight changes in this Government are merely on the surface. The Japanese citizen remains unchanged.

I quote from *The World's Peoples*, by Keane, page 170, for the year 1908:

In Japan Shintoism, as reformed in recent times and almost merged in the Bushidoism now affected by the educated classes, has become much more a political institution than a religious system. The Kami-No-Michi, or "The Way of the Gods" or "Spirits," is inseparably bound up with the political interests of the reigning dynasty sprung from the sun goddess; hence its three cardinal virtues are:

1. Honor the Kami (spirits), of whom the Emperor is the chief representative on earth.
2. Revere him as thy sovereign.
3. Obey his will, and that is the only duty of man.

There is a fine representative to help establish a world democracy and to make the world safe for democracy!

There is no moral code—

Continues this author—

and loyal expositors have declared that the Mikado's will is the supreme or only test of right and wrong.

I now desire to put two questions, and to two classes of American Senators.

First. How will Senators from the South who represent States which have contended that the white race alone is fit to control the destiny of the States of America, who have, therefore, contended that the black man of the South should not be permitted to cast his individual ballot to be counted against the ballot of the white man—how can they contend that Liberia, Haiti, and other negro or seminegro nations should be permitted to sit at the council table of the world and each cast a vote equal to that of the United States?

#### NEGRO QUESTION AND THE LEAGUE.

And, Senators, you will have that question to answer to your people; and at that point, to show you that it is a living question and that you are playing with fire, I call your attention to *The Crisis*, a negro publication, which I understand is a paper of wide influence and power. I read an editorial from the May number:

*A league of nations is absolutely necessary to the salvation of the negro race. Unless we have some supernatural power to curb the anti-negro policy of the United States and South Africa, we are doomed eventually to fight for our rights. The proposed international will have overwhelming influences around it which will oppose the doctrines of "race" antagonism and inferiority. It will from the beginning recognize negro nations.*

How shrewdly this man had looked into the situation! I venture to say that the majority of the men in this room did not anticipate that truth.

It will from the beginning recognize negro nations. It will be open to the larger influences of civilization and culture which are ineffective in the United States because of the prevailing barbarism of the ruling

classes in the South and their overwhelming political power. What we can not accomplish before the choked conscience of America we have an infinitely better chance to accomplish before the organized public opinion of the world. Peace for us is not simply relief from wars like the past, but relief from the specter of the great war of races, which will be absolutely inevitable unless the selfish nations of white civilization are curbed by a great world congress, in which black and white and yellow sit and speak and act. The refusal to adopt the Japanese race equality amendment is deplorable, but it is an argument for and not against a nation of nations. It is the beginning of a mighty end.

Chew on that quid in your reflective moments, you men of the South!

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Mr. President, may I interrupt the Senator once more?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Montana?

Mr. REED. Certainly.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I wish to inquire of the Senator why he did not protest against Japan participating in the present conference that is settling these great world problems which are of such transcendent importance to this country, and having the same voice there that she will have in any assemblage of the league of nations?

Mr. REED. Because I was not asked my opinion, and was given the same opportunity to protest that the rest of the Senate has been given to advise or consent, which is simply nothing at all.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. But if the Senator had been asked whether Japan should be invited to participate in the present peace conference, what would he have said?

Mr. REED. If I had been asked whether Japan was to be invited to take part in the present peace conference with reference to the terms of peace, I would have to say that, as Japan had in some measure helped to win the war, she would have the right to have something to say about making the terms of peace, but I would insist upon that being settled as a separate proposition. I am not discussing the question of the terms of peace; I am discussing the question of a world government which it is proposed to set up, in which Japan shall be the equal of the United States, and now, even before that covenant comes here in an official form, I am protesting.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I understand the Senator is protesting against Japan's occupying a position in the world's conference of the league of nations and dealing with questions of vital importance to the United States. I am calling attention to the fact that she is even to-day doing so without any protest upon the part of anybody, and, of course, nobody could in decency protest against her action.

Mr. REED. Of course, if Japan, going in with England, France, and Italy, becomes a participant in a war against Germany and Austria and Turkey, and if thereafter we enter that war, we must recognize that fact that when the war comes to be settled all of the belligerents must be consulted. But that is not the question I am discussing. I am discussing the question of making arrangements by which a part of the governing control of the United States shall be permanently transferred to an international tribunal, on which Japan shall have a right to cast a vote concerning the destiny of this country. Against that I protest and shall continue to protest. The monstrous thing that is presented is this: We went into this war because our sovereignty had been offended against by Germany, because Germany had sunk some of our ships and had killed some of our people; and now it is proposed, although we went in for that reason, that we shall end by setting up a European, Asiatic, and African tribunal, in which we shall be a minority stockholder, and shall give to it the right to control the fate of America.

Mr. POINDEXTER and Mr. WALSH of Montana addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. WALSH of Montana. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment in order that I may finish my inquiry?

Mr. REED. Perhaps I had better yield first to the Senator from Montana in order that he may finish his inquiry, and then I will be glad to yield to the Senator from Washington.

Mr. WALSH of Montana. I merely desire to inquire of the Senator if he can now anticipate any question that may be presented to the league of nations of more profound importance than the question that drove us into the present war, the issues of which we invite Japan to join with us in solving?

Mr. REED. Oh, yes; I can imagine any number of questions. The question that drove us into this war was an infringement of our rights upon the sea. What has that got to do with the future government of America? Of course, we have helped whip Germany, and, having helped whip Germany, it stands to reason that the representatives of the United States will make Germany admit her wrong, make Germany agree not to do it any

more, and we ought to make her pay, and pay dearly, for every ship she sank, for every life that she took, and for every insult she put upon us.

Mr. POINDEXTER. Mr. President—

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Missouri yield to the Senator from Washington?

Mr. REED. I yield.

Mr. POINDEXTER. I can not refrain from suggesting, in answer to the question of the Senator from Montana, that there is nothing that Japan can do at the peace conference, however important those matters are, that will have any validity whatever upon the United States until it receives the approval of the Senate of the United States, two-thirds of the Senators present concurring. Furthermore, I apprehend that neither the Senator from Missouri nor any opponent of the league of nations has any objection to conferring and negotiating upon international matters in the future with Japan, with China, or even with the King of Hedjaz. Nobody proposes that we shall live an isolated life. What we object to is changing the principle upon which these negotiations are being carried on at the present time, in which each nation reserves its independence to ratify or to reject, and to submit the future of the world, as the Senator from Missouri has just said, to the decision of a different entity, from whom there lies no appeal.

Mr. REED. Mr. President, recurring to my topic—and I wish to say that I should have concluded this address in less than 60 minutes if I had not been interrupted, and I am very near the close—I now ask the second question:

#### "RACIAL EQUALITY."

How can the representatives of the Pacific Coast States who have contended and who still contend that neither Japanese nor Chinamen shall land upon their shores, and that both are totally unfit for citizenship, justify their conduct if they now vote that in the council of the world Japan and China shall each cast a vote equal to the vote of the United States? That question will have to be answered. It is a living question.

The shrewdest diplomats, next to those of England, appearing at the council now being held in Europe are unquestionably the representatives of Japan. Compared with them, I think that the American diplomat who is over there—well, they had better not be compared; let it go at that. It will be remembered that the representative of Japan offered an amendment declaring for racial equality. I read now from the New York Times Current History for May:

The commission rejected an amendment offered by the Japanese delegates for incorporating into the preamble a declaration on "racial equality." It failed to receive unanimous approval, and hence was declared rejected.

Evidently there were a good many votes for it when it only failed because the vote was not unanimous.

The official statement on this subject, issued April 12, said:

At a meeting of the league of nations commission on Friday, April 11, the Japanese delegation proposed an amendment to the preamble of the covenant as follows: To insert after the words "by the prescription of open, just, and honorable relations between nations," an additional clause, to read: "By the indorsement of the principle of the equality of nations and just treatment of their nationals."

The amendment was admirably presented by Baron Makino. In the course of his speech he emphasized the great desire of the Japanese Government and of the Japanese people that such a principle be recognized in the covenant. His argument was supported with great force by Viscount Chinda.

A discussion followed, in which practically all of the members of the commission participated. The discussion was marked by breadth of thought, free and sympathetic exchange of opinion, and a complete appreciation by the members of the commission of the difficulties which lay in the way of either accepting or rejecting the amendment.

The commission was impressed by the justice of the Japanese claim and by the spirit in which it was presented.

This is the official report, à la Creel, although I believe he did not make it; somebody else was issuing official reports; then,

Therefore the commission was reluctantly unable to give to the amendment that unanimous approval which is necessary for its adoption.

My understanding is that at the last the one man who stood out was the representative of Australia. Australia has declared for a white man's government from the first, and to all intents and purposes they do not allow anybody else to emigrate there. The Japanese amendment came that near to being adopted.

The Japanese delegates announced that they reserved the right to bring the amendment before a plenary session of the conference. The chief opposition to the Japanese proposal came from Australia.

So, my friends from California and from the great golden States of the West, you have a proposition to confront. When you organize this league of nations, and when that league of nations undertakes to pass upon this question of race equality, remember that, according to this official report, substantially the only opposition at the last to a declaration of race equality came from Mr. Hughes, representing Australia; and remember that pressure can be easily brought to bear upon Great Britain by Japan because of their mutual interests in the Orient and

because of their intertreaties which bind them together; and remember that apparently our own representatives did not protest. Now, I put it to you, how can you stand, how dare you stand and protest against Chinese and Japanese landing on your shores, or Chinese and Japanese children having places in your schools beside your children, while at the same time you vote to erect a league of nations that will have the right—the members of the league itself will have the right—to determine whether a question in dispute between Japan and the United States is likely to create war, and thereupon to assume jurisdiction to settle that question? How dare you vote to erect a league of nations and confer this power upon Japan and China, give them the backing of a majority of other races not of the white blood, and yet ask the people of this country to stand by you in your action to exclude Chinese and Japanese from your own sacred soil?

Mr. President, I call the attention of men of the South and men of the West, and I am making my argument to them because these particular questions presented to-day have a particular interest to them. I put the question to you to remember history. You may think you can control the votes of these black races, and maybe they can be controlled upon many important questions, but you will never control them on a question where race equality is to be decided. Men of the South, you raised the negro; you lived among him; and notwithstanding all that has been said, you have always claimed, and claimed with much truth, that you were his friend and his benefactor, although you were his master. You love to boast that the old negro stayed at home with your wife or your mother while the husband or the father stood on the red line of battle. You love to tell how to-day they are still faithful in their hearts; and yet there has never been a time when you could control their votes, and why? Because they said that the Republican Party had given them equality in the world; that the Republican Party had declared that they were men; and no amount of persuasion, nothing short of something that looked very much like sheer force, has been evoked to keep them from the polls. The best you have been able to do is to keep them from having the vote; and I warn you, men of the South, I warn you that when the representatives of these black races—and they are in the majority—assemble around the council table of the league of nations, when the question of race equality comes up, they will vote for race equality, because it has been the dream of their hearts; it has been the hope of their souls; it has been the star toward which they have turned their longing eyes; it has been the one great desire of soul and body and heart and all that makes them men.

My countrymen, I say to you that if you erect a league of nations you will have taken a long step toward the declaration that America's doors shall be opened to the people of all lands; and we shall have Chinese and Japanese knocking at our gates, and along with them all of the races of Asia and of Africa that desire to enter the golden gates of this great country. We may laugh at it to-day, but it is before us. The controversy is on, and it will be seized by this body of men and will be employed by them.

So I pause now to challenge your thought only to this one thing:

Why is it that these nations, most of them the dregs of civilization, most of them the most backward of men, some of them to-day held in a condition of peace by the arms of other nations—why is it that they are selected to sit about a council board that is to determine the creed of the world and that is to evolve something superior to American civilization itself?

I tell you, sirs, that I will never consent to take one single atom of power from the American citizen and confer that power upon the representative of any of these backward races, upon the representative of any of these yellow or brown races. *More than that, I will not consent to grant any governing power over this country to any race of men on earth save the citizens of our own Republic.* He who shall do it under the pretext that as he does it he does nothing, and yet claiming at the same time that he has produced some organization here that is to change the world, who talks with a forked tongue, who looks in two directions at the same time, who assumes contrary positions—the man who does that, and by that kind of policy fastens on this country a league that shall in any respect control this country, betrays the Republic, betrays its Constitution, betrays his oath of office, betrays the cause of justice and the cause of man.

Permit me to say in conclusion that I have no prejudice against races because of color. I do not want to stir against them any rancor or distrust. I speak as I have only because we are presented with a great practical question. In face of such a situation we can not afford to disregard the facts of history. We must not close our eyes to the stern realities of life.

I hope these races may advance, but I am unwilling they shall control the destiny of the United States now or hereafter.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. President, with the understanding that it will not displace the resolution of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], I ask unanimous consent for the immediate consideration of the resolution that I send to the desk. I do not think anybody will object to it. It will not take any time for its consideration.

Mr. CURTIS. It is with the understanding that it does not displace the unfinished business.

Mr. ROBINSON. Will the Senator yield to me for a moment to make a statement?

The PRESIDING OFFICER. There is a motion pending before the Senate. The resolution of the Senator from New York can be taken up only by unanimous consent.

Mr. CALDER. I ask unanimous consent for the consideration of the resolution which I send to the desk. I am sure no one will object. It deals with the treatment of the Jews in Poland, Roumania, and Galicia, and is a matter in which they are particularly interested.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Does the Senator from Arkansas object?

Mr. ROBINSON. I have no objection. I merely desire to make an announcement. Inasmuch as it is expected that the Senate will adjourn in a few moments, I desire to state that if the business of the Senate permits, on the next meeting day, which will be Wednesday, according to the order heretofore adopted, I shall address the Senate on the subject of a league of nations.

#### PERSECUTION OF JEWS.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New York [Mr. CALDER] offers a resolution, which will be read by the Secretary.

The resolution (S. Res. 41) was read, considered by unanimous consent, and agreed to, as follows:

Whereas it is reported that innocent men, women, and children, particularly of the Jewish faith, are being outraged and massacred in Poland, Roumania, and Galicia: Therefore be it

*Resolved*, That the Department of State be, and hereby is, directed to communicate such reports to the President of the United States, and request that he confer with the representatives at the peace conference of the countries where such outrages and massacres are reported to occur and inform them that this body and the American people generally deeply deplore acts of violence and cruelty committed against men, women, and children because of race or religion.

#### ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. CURTIS. At the request of the Senator from California [Mr. JOHNSON], I move that the Senate adjourn, the adjournment being until Wednesday next under the previous order.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 40 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Wednesday, May 28, 1919, at 12 o'clock meridian.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Monday, May 26, 1919.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

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

Ever blessed God, our Heavenly Father, we thank Thee for the day that has passed, with its quiet, rest, reflections, and spiritual uplift.

May it strengthen us for the duties of the hour, that with clean minds and pure hearts we may do whatever we are called to do willingly, conscientiously, efficiently. After the similitude of the Master. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Saturday, May 24, 1919, was read and approved.

#### SWEARING IN OF MEMBERS.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr. OLNEY, and the gentleman from New York, Mr. CALDWELL, are both here and desire to have the oath of office administered to them.

Mr. OLNEY and Mr. CALDWELL appeared at the bar of the House and took the oath of office as prescribed by law.

#### RESIGNATION FROM A COMMITTEE.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following communication, which was read:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, D. C.

Mr. SPEAKER: I hereby tender my resignation as a member of the Committee on Accounts, this May 26, 1919.

BEN JOHNSON.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the resignation will be accepted.

There was no objection.